

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Friday, 30th March 2018 at 10.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| 1. | Professor A.K. Grover
Vice Chancellor | ... (in the Chair) |
| 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 Prabhjot Singh | |
| 11. | Professor Ronki Ram | |
| 12. | Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan | |
| 13. | Shri Sanjay Tandon | |
| 14. | Dr. Satish Kumar | |
| 15. | Dr. Subhash Sharma | |
| 16. | Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha | |
| 17. | Col. (Retd.) G.S. Chadha
Registrar | ... (Secretary) |

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) Prof. Yash Gulati, former Chairperson of the Department of Hindi, on February 26, 2018;
- ii) Prof. Sudhakar Pandey (Retd.), Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, on February 26, 2018;
- iii) Dr. D.V. Rao husband of Dr. Anju Rao, Associate Professor, Dept. of Botany on March 6, 2018;
- iv) Mrs Rajesh Bansal mother of Prof. Meenakshi Goyal of Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Instt. of Chemical Engg. & Technology on March 25, 2018.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Professor Yash Gulati, Professor Sudhakar Pandey, Dr. D.V. Rao and Mrs. Rajesh Bansal 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 honourable members that:

- i) Prof. Manmohan Singh, former Prime Minister of India and PU alumnus, will visit Panjab University along with Mrs. Gursharan Kaur to deliver the First Dr. S.B. Rangnekar Memorial Oration, mooted by Department of Economics of PU, on April 11, 2018 at 10 am. Dr. Rangnekar has taught Dr. Manmohan Singh at Hoshiarpur and they both worked as colleagues later at Panjab University, Campus.
- ii) Five Professors of Panjab University, namely, Prof. Suman Bala Beri, Prof. Vipin Bhatnagar & Prof. Manjit Kaur from the Department Physics, Prof. O.P. Katare (UIPS) and Prof. Kewal Krishan from Anthropology Deptt.), have been honoured by the Union Minister of Human Resource Development with the Faculty Research Awards, 2018. These five researchers are among the top 10 most outstanding researchers in their respective field(s) of specialization on the basis of documentation sourced out from science indexed journals. The awards have been constituted by Careers360.

At this point of time Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested that as and when a news regarding award to any person etc. is received, there should be some mechanism to send an email to the members so that in case they want to congratulate somebody, they can do so immediately to which the Vice Chancellor said that his suggestion is well taken. He further said that in the email section they have a very nice group of Syndicate and Senate members. If this small information is received by the members immediately, the reaction would be faster. There are now twelve such points, by the time they finish the meeting, this will not be of any importance to most of them.

- iii) Professor Kewal Krishan Tewari from USA, vide email communication of March 2, 2018 has expressed his desire to further augment Smt. Prem Lata & Prof. D.V.S. Jain Research Foundation Fund by sending a cheque for ten lakhs rupees. He had sent Rs. 10 lakhs last year as well. So, there is a fund created by Professor D.V.S. Jain and his spouse which has already Rs. 50 lakh. He added 10 lakhs last year and he has offered to add Rs. 10 lakhs more to the same fund. The details about its use will be worked out by a committee to be constituted in consultation with Prof. D.V.S. Jain.
- iv) Shri Sanjay Tandon said that if they send him an email, he would feel good and next time he may give Rs. 25 lakhs to which the Vice Chancellor said, it is alright.
- iv) Professor Darshan Singh, Professor Emeritus in the Chair of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies, PU, has donated a Cheque amounting to Rs.4 Lakhs (Rupees Four Lakhs only) for the creation of an endowment in the memory of his daughter Ms. Shishu who was Professor in the

University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), to organize a Memorial Lecture, in the UIPS and Guru Nanak Sikh Studies alternatively. The lecture would be held every year, one year in UIPS and the other year in Guru Nanak Sikh Studies. The University desires a minimum donation of Rs. 4 lakhs to organize a lecture every year.

- v) Ambassador (Retd.) Paramjit S. Sahai, retired IFS officer, Chandigarh, in his communication of March 28, 2018, has informed the University that he would like to make a token contribution of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) to Panjab University by way of seed money to be used for organizing next two International Conferences on 'India's Foreign Policy in Contemporary Era' (Rs.50,000/- for each conference). A conference was organized this year and he was so moved that he said that they should do it every year. This time it was funded by the ICSSR.
- vi) Prof. Jitendra Mohan, Professor Emeritus of Psychology has been invited to deliver keynote address on 'Mindfulness, Yoga and Health' at the 29th International Congress of Applied Psychology at Montreal, Canada from 26-30 June, 2018. He will also chair a Scientific Session there.
- vii) Prof. R.K. Pathak of Department of Anthropology has been awarded with Dr. Panchanan Mitra Memorial Lectureship for the year 2016 for outstanding contribution in the field of Anthropology by the Asiatic Society, Kolkata. Asiatic Society, Bombay and Asiatic Society Kolkata are one of the oldest societies in the field of science.
- viii) Dr. Prashant Jindal, Assistant Professor, University, Institute of Engineering & Technology, PU, has been awarded Commonwealth Rutherford Fellowship 2017-2018 for carrying out research in the area of additive manufacturing for medical implants at Nottingham Trent University, UK for a period of one year.
- ix) Dr. Monica Munjial Singh, Assistant Professor, Centre for Social Work (U.I.E.A.S.S.) has been honoured with 'Bharat Ratna Indira Gandhi Gold Medal Award' for her outstanding individual achievement in education on March 8, 2018 at Bangalore by the Global Economic Progress & Research Association (GEPRA).
- x) Ms. Jasnoor, a final year student of B. Pharmacy of the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, has been selected as one of the ten International students to pursue the NANOMED Erasmus Mundus Joint Master's Degree Program. She has been awarded a scholarship of 50,000 Euros by the European Union for her 2 year International Master's Degree in Nano-Medicine.

- xi) Panjab University, Punjab Engineering College and CRIKC institutions have received a proposal from Prof. Hardev Singh, Chair Trustee of Haydn Green Foundation, to create Haydn Green Institute International Innovation and Entrepreneurship Corridor (HGIIIEC) linking CRIKC Institutions in India with University of Nottingham (UoN), UK and UoN, China Campus at Ningbo in China.
- xii) With reference to Panjab University's proposal submitted in 2017 for the consideration of Institution of Eminence status, this is an all India competition, University Grants Commission vide its communication received on March 28, 2018, has invited PU to make a presentation before the Empowered Expert Committee (EEC) constituted for the selection of Institutions of Eminence, on April 3, 2018 in New Delhi. Ten institutes in the State sector are to be considered for this status and they would be provided upto Rs. 100 Crore every year for a period of 10 years in a project mode, 5 years at a time. I, just received last evening a confirmation that Rakesh Bharti Mittal of Bharti Foundation which had once given us an endowment of Rs. 50 lakhs to create a Professorship at U.I.E.T. and also hosts a lecture in memory of Satpal Mittal. He has consented to be the Chief Guest for the U.I.E.T. Convocation this year on May 5, 2018. This Chair had been lying dormant. With great difficulty it had been revived and they had sought a report from us as to what all has happened over the years. The report was submitted, today they have one crore rupees in that endowment and we have a Professor appointed who is Honorary/Visiting Professor Smt. Pomila Kumar who has been now visiting from Bangalore frequently. So, there was something which was lying dormant has commenced. The donors have accepted the lapses on our part that for many years it was lying dormant and he is coming to be the Chief Guest at the UIET Convocation. I am hopeful that the involvement of Mittals' in the Panjab University as well as the involvement of Munjals' in Panjab University would enhance in the years to come. Both these are international names, they belong to Punjab and their association with the Panjab University would do us good.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to make two observations. He would like to thank the office of the Registrar who under the directions of the Vice Chancellor acceded to the request of the members by sending the agenda in spiral binding form. He feels that they could make further improvements in the days to come. This could be done for the Senate agenda also. He further pointed out that if somebody is not in service, the word 'retired' should be clearly mentioned in the Vice Chancellor's statement.

RESOLVED: That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Prof. Suman Bala Beri, Prof. Vipin Bhatnagar & Prof. Manjit Kaur from the Department Physics, Prof. O.P. Katare (UIPS) and Prof. Kewal Krishan (Chairperson of Anthropology Deptt.), on having been honoured by the Union Minister of Human Resource Development with Faculty Research Awards, 2018.
 - (ii) Professor Kewal Krishan Tewari, USA, on being augmenting Smt. Prem Lata & Prof. D.V.S. Jain Research Foundation Fund by sending a cheque for ten lakhs rupees.
 - (iii) Professor Darshan Singh, Professor Emeritus, Chair of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies, PU, for being donating a Cheque amounting to Rs.4 Lakhs (Rupees Four Lakhs only) for the creation of an endowment in the memory of his daughter Shishu who was Professor in the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS).
 - (iv) Prof. R.K. Pathak of Department of Anthropology on being awarded with Dr. Panchanan Mitra Memorial Lectureship for the year 2016 for outstanding contribution in field of Anthropology by the Asiatic Society, Kolkata.
 - (v) Dr. Prashant Jindal, Assistant Professor, University, Institute of Engineering & Technology, PU, on being awarded Commonwealth Rutherford Fellowship 2017-2018.
 - (vi) Dr. Monica Munjial Singh, Assistant Professor, Centre for Social Work (U.I.E.A.S.S.) on being honoured with 'Bharat Ratna Indira Gandhi Gold Medal Award' for her outstanding individual achievement in education.
 - (vii) Ms Jasnoor, a final year student of B. Pharmacy of the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on being selected as one of the ten International students to pursue the NANOMED Erasmus Mundus Joint Master's Degree Program.
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (i), (v), (vi), (xi) and (xii) be noted and approved; and
3. that the information received by the Vice Chancellor with regard to conferment of any award, achievement or felicitation to a person be emailed to the members of the Syndicate immediately as soon as the same is received.

4. the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 24.2.2018, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

The Vice Chancellor said that they may have become aware that the Chancellor's office has sent a communication that the post of Panjab University Vice Chancellor is to be advertised this time. So, the approved advertisement has been sent to them and they have been asked to advertise that by the end of this month and give a deadline of one month, so the last date of submission of applications is 30th of April. The Advertisement has been approved by the Chancellor office and the date has also been told and the deadline has also been fixed. A copy of the approved advertisement was circulated to all the members. It is to come on March 31st, 2018.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it has happened for the first time.

Continuing the Vice Chancellor said that it would come in three newspapers i.e. Indian Express (all editions), Amar Ujala (all editions) and Tribune (all editions). Times of India (all editions) is costing two and half times the cost of Indian Express (all editions). Times of India is costing close to Rs. 20 lakh, India Express is close to Rs. 8 lakhs, Hindustan Times is close to Rs. 12 lakh, Bhaskar all editions is Rs. 10 lakhs. The advertisement for the post of Registrar's had been done like this when Professor A.K.Bhandari had been appointed as Registrar. So, they have followed that. It would also be uploaded on the website, it will also go to the Association of Indian Universities and it will also go to the University Grants Commission.

Shri Sanjay Tandon asked whether they are bound to spend so many lakhs of rupees on this advertisement.

The Vice Chancellor said that Chancellor's office has said that it should be advertised in leading newspapers.

Shri Sanjay Tandon wanted to know whether they have advertise it in three papers or it is leading one daily or two dailies.

The vice Chancellor said that the Registrar's position was advertised like this.

Shri Sanjay Tandon asked that he has trying to look as to what are the options for saving some purse and most of companies today have started saving money by putting the advertisements on their website, on LinkedIn or some other websites or somewhere else so that they could save as much money as they can. If they spend Rs. 40 lakhs on this, it would be wastage of money.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Shri Sanjay Tandon is right and a link should be created.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that if they put it on the website, then all the people could see the advertisement from there. Even the big companies have stopped giving the advertisements.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi expressed the apprehension that some person sitting at a far off place such as Tamil Nadu University or

somewhere else, he does not think they might be looking at the Panjab University website. He was of the opinion that it is always a better idea to advertise the post in the newspapers as somebody can challenge it as of date.

The Vice Chancellor said that somebody can challenge that Panjab University has spent Rs. 2 crores on the Senate elections and it is shying away from putting an advertisement in all India newspapers.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that it is also not fair to spend 40 lakhs on the advertisement.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that if they also advertise it in Times of India, then it would have been Rs. 40 lakhs.

The Vice Chancellor said that it might not be Rs. 40 lakhs that Rs. 8 lakhs would be spent for Indian Express, 5 lakhs for Amar Ujala and 2.5 laks for English Tribune. Shri Sanjay Tandon said that in this way they spent Rs. 15 lakh.

The Vice Chancellor said so far they have not spent this amount as the advertisement would be sent tomorrow. On being asked by Shri Gurjot Malhi whether it would go to Punjab Tribune, the Vice Chancellor said that the advertisement would go to all editions of English Tribune.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in fact Shri Sanjay Tandon has asked a specific and pertinent question. Shri Malhi ji is also right in saying that legally they might not be trapped by somebody, that he can know. In fact, it is in that background only, he wanted to know whether the Vice Chancellor would be able to tell the background and that the special decision has been taken to advertise the post in the leading newspapers because it will be happening in the history of Panjab University for the first time.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is a communication between the Chancellor's office and the Secretary of the MHRD.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the background what has happened, is it the Chancellor's office who had taken the decision to advertise the post. If so, does the Vice Chancellor know what could be the reasons. Relating to the point raised by Shri Tandon, is it the Chancellor's office who have asked to advertise the post in the newspapers or there could be other course to advertise the posts as suggested by Shri Tandon. Even if the advertisement is necessary, it can not only be given in three papers, it can be given in more number of papers also, for details the candidates could refer to the website for the post of Vice Chancellor. Actually, in the light of that he wanted to see how this decision has been taken, though he is not against the decision of advertising the post. But, what, in fact, has happened which compelled the Chancellor's Office to say to advertise the post which has never been done in the past.

The Vice Chancellor said that he cannot answer this as this is Chancellor's prerogative. This is one of the job that Chancellor's office does. They have to appoint the Vice Chancellor. They have asked the Registrar for a draft of the advertisement which was sent by the

Registrar. They have now sent an approved draft after modifications. They said that it should be advertised in leading newspapers. So, they looked at the precedent of the Registrar's position and they are just following that.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the same thing was done by the Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar for Vice Chancellor's position last year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not opposed to it and they are not to follow the Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar as all the State Universities are advertising the post of Vice Chancellors, but in the Panjab University, it has never been done earlier.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was told that the MHRD has directed all the Central Institutions, including Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, where such posts would have to be advertised. The post of Secretary, DBT has also has been advertised. The person who was Secretary DBT has moved and made the Principal Scientific Advisor to Govt. of India replacing Dr. Chidambram. The post of Secretary DBT has been advertised.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the possibility can be explored that what more institutions are doing this.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are very rich institutions and they will advertise in Times of India etc. He said that he is nobody to decide that the advertisement to be given tomorrow it might not come in this way.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that it is not in the purview of the Syndicate when the Chancellor has given directions. Members can discuss only to know the background.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just want to see if the money can be saved, that is all.

The Vice Chancellor said that the advertisement was shown to him online and he has asked to follow what they have done earlier to keep the expenses low.

**Promotion from
Associate Professor
Stage-4 to Professor
Stage-5, under Career
Advancement Scheme
(CAS) Department of
Geography, Panjab
University, Chandigarh**

2(i). Considered minutes dated 22.03.2018 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Geography, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. (Ms.) Simrit Kahlon be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) in the Department of Geography, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **30.04.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-3 to Associate Professor Stage-4, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, Panjab University, Chandigarh

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 22.03.2018 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Paru Bal Sidhu be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) in the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f **11.07.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-3 to Associate Professor Stage-4, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at V.V.B.I.S. & I.S. Hoshiarpur.

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 22.03.2018 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at V.V.B.I.S. & I.S. Hoshiarpur.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ritu Bala be promoted from Assistant Professor in Sanskrit (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor in Sanskrit (**Stage-4**) at V.V.B.I.S. & I.S. Hoshiarpur, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f **03.11.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

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

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 22.03.2018 (**Appendix-V**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Geology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ashu Khosla be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) in the Department of Geology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f **07.11.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

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

2(v). Considered minutes dated 22.03.2018 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Sh. Makhan Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Engg. (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Engg. (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **11.07.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

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

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

2(vi). Considered minutes dated 22.03.2018 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr.(Ms.) Amandeep Verma be promoted from Assistant Professor in Information Technology (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Information Technology (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **03.07.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

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

2(vii). Considered minutes dated 22.03.2018 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Ms. Puneet Jai Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor in Information Technology (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Information Technology (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **03.07.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

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

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

2(viii). Considered minutes dated 22.03.2018 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Environmental Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Madhuri Rishi be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Environmental Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **07.09.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letter of promotions to the persons promoted under Item **C-2(i) to C-2 (viii)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Preparation of roster for teaching posts

3. Considered suggestions (**Appendix-X**) made by Professor A.K. Bhandari with regard to preparation of roster for all teaching posts, pursuant to the letter dated 05.03.2018 of UGC (**Appendix-X**):

The Vice Chancellor said that they had approved a roster for the University sometime ago.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to inform that it was not approved in the Syndicate because there was some objection.

The Vice Chancellor said that it had been gone through by a Committee, but it was not passed by the Syndicate. But, in the meantime there was a communication from UGC which directed that they have to prepare a roster following a certain way which is different from what was done earlier and they are supposed to adopt that in some time period and given them the feedback as to what they have done. In the background of this, he requested Professor A.K.Bhandari as to what should be done. Professor Bhandari has given an input to them which is available to all of them. The roster has now to be prepared department-wise. It used to be like this long ago, so essentially it is like going back to what they were doing long ago. He

has made suggestions, which are in line with the UGC directions. So, now what they need to do is, before they advertise the positions, somebody has to do this job to prepare the roster department-wise and then whatever decision they would arrive at must be brought back to the Syndicate, so that they are not be seen to have made mistakes anywhere. So, his proposal is to make a four member committee. Let the Dean of University Instruction Chair it. Let Professor A.K. Bhandari be there. Let us invite one person from the reserved category i.e. Professor Anil Kumar, get one person from the teachers' association. So, the Dean of University Instruction would Chair, Professor Bhandari as someone to guide, Professor Anil Kumar, one person from teachers' and the Registrar. Let them sit together, give an output vis-a-vis the 27 positions which they have been permitted to fill.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should prepare the roster for all the posts.

The Vice Chancellor said that first they should prepare it for the posts for which they have been permitted to fill. If they did not start the process of filling the 27 positions, these 27 posts are just to replenish the retirements upto 2016 or 2017. Now more persons have retired. This is accumulating, so they should restart the process as early as they can. The Vice Chancellor requested that they should accept the formation of this Committee and the Committee could be requested to give its output vis-à-vis the 27 positions they have to advertise. He asked the Registrar to bring this as an agenda item in the next Syndicate and then they would take a call on it.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested to include the name of Dr. Ajay Ranga in the Committee as he used to raise this issue in the Senate to which the Vice Chancellor said that he would have one person from reserved category.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that there is no problem of including the name of anyone in the Committee. What they are approving principally is that the roster would be prepared department-wise and subject-wise, it is okay. But, how it would be prepared. How the Committee would prepare it.

The Vice Chancellor said that an algorithm is there to prepare the roster in as per the algorithm.

Shri Prabhjot Singh while referring to a book of the Government of India said that it is mentioned in this book as to how the roster is to be prepared. The Committee would feel practical difficulty in preparing this roster and they would ask for to guide them. He said that they have already a roster wherein all the Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors have been included. The UGC has sent the letter on the basis of a Supreme Court order. The Supreme Court has asked to, do it department-wise and cadre-wise. Cadre-wise means to prepare the roster separately for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors. Secondly, there are many departments where the number of Professors is less than five. In such departments, the reserved category person/s who are already working would become excess, what to do about those.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to how they would become excess.

Shri Prabhjot Singh explained that the roster would be prepared from the back date and the reserved category persons who are already working there.

The Vice Chancellor said that the roster would be prepared from the current date and not from the back date. There would not be any excess persons. Suppose, there are three Professors in a department, one of them belongs to SC Category. In this process they have to keep on counting. As per the rule, a person belonging to SC category should come after six general posts, but he has come after two. When they would fill three more Professors, then he would be adjusted there.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it would deprive the people for this benefit for the other fifteen years. So, it would cause a lot of heartburning.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would see to it when they would receive input from the Committee. The Vice Chancellor while telling a solution to this said that let an Empowered Committee give them an output. If that input is considered in consistent with the directive of the UGC, they can first examine it or after having examined it, they can send it to the UGC and inform them as to what they are going to do. On being asked by Shri Sanjay Tandon, the Vice Chancellor said that this has to be done within one month.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that suppose the report from the Committee is received within fifteen days, would it be circulated for comments?

The Vice Chancellor said that right now they can tell the UGC that the Syndicate has accepted to implement it. To implement and workout, a Committee has been entrusted the work of preparing of roster and this output would come.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that it is okay that they have agreed in principle to implement it as they cannot go beyond it as these are the directions of the Supreme Court. He suggested that the Committee be requested to keep in mind the instructions of 1997 of the Government of India in this regard where it is mentioned that there is no reservation for 4-5 posts.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested to include the name of Shri Prabhjot Singh in the Committee so that he could also give his views to the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor asked Shri Prabhjot Singh to be in the Committee, there is no problem in it.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that Shri Prabhjot Singh is right and they should take care of it so that there could not be any problem at a later stage.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that these are the directions from Supreme Court to MHRD, so what the Committee is to look into. It is

for the Estt. Branch which can seek guidance from Professor A.K. Bhandari or those who know about it because they do not want the issue to be politicized. Can any representative change what the UGC, MHRD and the Supreme Court has said, no they cannot. So, once they take the decision, they are bound by or even if they are not bound by, they have accepted it in principle, is the office not supposed to act in accordance with this. Professor Bhandari who has given the proposal can guide the office and in case some difficulties are found, they can share these and then they can take the services of Shri Prabhjot Singh or the names which the Vice Chancellor has mentioned. But, he thinks, let they should confine to office only whose job is, in fact, it is.

The Vice Chancellor said that the previous roster was also vetted by Professor Anil Kumar and Professor Bhandari.

Professor Ronki Ram said that this roster was not prepared over the years and there were numerous complaints from the SC/ST Cell. So, when they constituted a small Committee, they asked the concerned department whether they have a roster for the teaching and non-teaching posts. When they met to discuss upon the issue, under the present Registrar and the former Registrar, the question was that, the staff used to say that they cannot understand as this is a very technical issue and they are not able to find any solution. So, it was decided to have the services of those faculty members who have some understanding on the issue. So, Professor Bhandari was there. Professor Anil Kumar said that he has the knowledge to prepare the roster and he was also the incharge of the SC/BC/ST Cell. Dr. Ranga ji was also involved because he said that he also knows how the roster is prepared. Even after having such persons, they faced problems, but, somehow, they were able to find that this roster would be prepared, not department-wise, but overall basis and the 6th or 7th position then would be clear. Then the question came that the roster has to be prepared department-wise and within department-wise, they have to prepare the roster cadre-wise. For example, in 22.5% reservation in a University in teaching posts, they have total 776 posts at present. The question is that the UGC through the SC/ST Commission would ask them that they have this much of percentage as given by the constitution in their total number of posts. If they do not give as per the percentage, they would call the University officers and ask about the backlog. So, thereby many Universities, sometimes it was said that the entire posts are reserved to complete the process. Pointing towards Shri Prabhjot Singh, Dr. Ronki Ram said that that he (Shri Prabhjot Singh) has the knowledge so he can help the Committee. If 22.5% posts are reserved, so those 22.5 posts are to be calculated for Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors. Can they say that this percentage could be calculated in each category. If it is in each category, then they have to find that within the Lecturer category, there would 22.5% reservation, similarly, in the above categories. There are departments where two posts of Lecturer, one post of Reader and one post of Professor exists. There are departments where three posts of Professor, five posts of Readers and seven posts of Lecturers. How they would count it. What would be the 2.5 of the 4.5 percentage of the posts. That is the job which they have to do. So, it is not possible for an Assistant Registrar or Deputy Registrar to make this. In order to facilitate that, probably, this committee would find the solution to this very complex issue so that there would be no Court cases. In his category i.e. Professor category, how did they make it. If in a department one falls under

reserved category and University did give him the benefit and in other department, there could be two posts of Professors already under the reserved category. So this would create new grey areas for which they have to find answers. While pointing out towards Shri Prabhjot Singh, he said that he can help the Committee in this regard. Professor Bhandari has given a very good algorithm. So this could probably be done properly so that the University is not dragged into this controversy that they are not implementing UGC regulations as also the SC/ST directions.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee members would consult other Universities also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to make another observation. He does not know how far he is correct, but as far as his knowledge goes, the roster cannot be made in piece-meals. It cannot be made for the posts they are filling now and for rest of the posts, they would make later on because until and unless they have a roster in the University as a whole and is put on the website, no post could be advertised. The roster as an institution has to come on the website. They cannot make one roster for the posts being filled today or the other roster for the posts to be filled in later on. If it is difficult job, it is equally difficult for 27 posts also, if it is not difficult, it is not difficult for all the departments.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had asked Professor A.K. Bhandari, he said that roster would be prepared in a week's time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that full roster be prepared and Shri Prabhjot Singh be also included in the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the suggestions given by Professor A.K. Bhandari with regard to preparation of roster for all teaching posts, pursuant to the letter dated 05.03.2018 of UGC, be approved in principle.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Committee consisting of the following be formed to prepare the roster in consonance with the directions of the UGC enshrined in its letter dated 05.03.2018:

1. Dean of University Instruction (Chairperson)
2. Professor A.K. Bhandari
3. Representative of PUTA
4. Shri Prabhjot Singh
5. Professor Anil Kumar
6. Dr. Ajay Ranga
7. Registrar
8. D.R (Estt.) (Convener)

At this stage, Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the minutes of the last meeting have not been received by them so far.

The Vice Chancellor said that it takes time to write the minutes as the meetings continue for many hours. They have huge backlog. They had many meetings. Every month they have a Senate and Syndicate meetings.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that this process would continue and he suggested that after the Vice Chancellor's statement, there should be a statement about the minutes whether these are complete or not. It should be mentioned which minutes have been finalized so that they should at least know as to how many minutes are still pending.

The Vice Chancellor said that for Syndicate, the action taken report should be there.

Continuing, Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the Vice Chancellor has to once complete the minutes, otherwise within 7 days it has to be circulated and finished. None of the system in any organization will be functional if they do not finalize the minutes because until and unless they finalize the minutes, nothing could be implemented.

The Vice Chancellor said that right now the operative part of the minutes is written and the decisions are implemented as far as possible.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that instruction should be given to finish the minutes before the next meeting and the reasons for pendency is concerned should be considered.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is well taken and the operative part of the minutes should be well known to everyone before the start of the agenda for consideration, it would be informed about the status of the previous minutes, which items have been written up and drafts for which items have been prepared. The minutes are prepared items-wise. The work of preparation is too lengthy and the office does it in many parts. Once the office prepares 100 pages, those are submitted and start further preparing the next items.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that in Companies the minutes are prepared and sent to the members within three days. If there are any changes, the same could be reported in seven days, otherwise these are taken to have been confirmed.

The Vice Chancellor said that the operative part is written and it should be circulated to all.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the minutes could be sent through email and if anybody wants, he could comment so that something could be finalized.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a decision was taken in the Syndicate that since there is a delay in sending the minutes, the DVDs be supplied within three days or seven days. He did not know under what circumstances that has been stopped and now the office takes a stand that the DVDs would be supplied only after the minutes are approved. Now if the DVDs are to be provided only after the minutes are approved, how do one would know even if the operative part is sent to him, where is the problem in sending the DVDs.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that there is no need of DVD. What they have to do with the DVDs to which Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said DVD is necessary as the meetings are not prepared.

The Vice Chancellor said that the operative part is sent and not the DVDs because sometimes some members speak in Hindi or in

Punjabi. So it takes time to write in proper form. Then they come under pressure. People start coming to him and approach to write in their way.

Shri Gurjot Malhi said that he is not interested as to what he or some other members have said. He is interested only in the fact that this particular agenda should be in an electronic cover. They must have a Syndicate electronic cover which he could check anytime. Suppose he is interested in seeing the C-32 item of December meeting, he should be able to see and it should be mentioned as to what was resolved. It is very easy to do. He is not interested what the Vice Chancellor or some other members have said, this can be taken later.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they had together agreed to remove the names of all the persons who were speaking. Sometimes, they used to go in for an unnecessary lecture with a view just to get their name printed in the minutes. After closing the discussion held on the item and whatever decision has been taken that should be put in the minutes. The rest of the things as to what one member or the other members have said, all that is immaterial. When they mention the names of everyone and the meetings goes on for many hours, the minutes become very lengthy. The meeting goes on even upto 12 hours. Everyone wants to speak on the same issue. He informed that they finished the last meeting of Board of Finance within two hours. It looked like a professional meeting finishing within a right time. So, they should also think to consider this thing over here. After the Vice Chancellor's statement, the second point should be about the status of the minutes of last meetings. They should try to finish the minutes within seven days. If somebody has any objection, he should file it within seven days. The third point should be about the status of the Sub-Committees which are constituted by the Syndicate. If the minutes of any Committee are pending, it should be written there so that they could know in the first place as to what action has been taken on the decisions of the Syndicate and what is required to be done. Fourthly, they should come to the normal routine.

The Vice Chancellor said that first of all this agenda should be loaded. Within a week, the operative part should be communicated to all the members. Wait for two days' time and the resolve part should be treated as final and then the DVD should be released. Then give time to the office to try to prepare the minutes in a detailed way as far as possible before the start of the next meeting.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked, what is the need of DVD to which Shri Keshav Malhotra said, no, there is need for DVD.

Shri Keshav Malhotra said that earlier when he was not a member of the Syndicate, he asked someone if the minutes of the Syndicate meeting have come. Then he said that 'yes' the minutes have come. He wondered that the minutes have come very soon. Then he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) came to know that only the resolved part has come. Then he asked as to why the resolved part was not circulated because he has some objection on an item. He (Professor Keshav Malhotra) asked for DVD from the office. It was informed that the DVD cannot be provided until the discussion is finalized. It was very difficult to memorize as to what had been decided in the last meeting. So, he requested that they should send the DVD along with the resolved part so that if anybody has the objection, he should

clarify it by seeing the DVD. The operative part should be prepared within three days and the seven days' time should be given to see the DVD.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the seven days' time should start from the date the operative part is loaded.

The Vice Chancellor said that the resolved part would be sent to the members within seven days along with the DVDs. The members would be given two days' time.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Keshav Malhotra said that the two days' time is very less as they have to see the DVDs.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said why they would like to investigate everything,

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to tell something about the last meeting. A paper was presented. It was circulated and unanimously accepted and resolved to be approved. But it was not recorded. So a resolution given by the teaching community was approved here, has not been recorded, rather something has been recorded, though that was also the decision that the University should write a properly worded letter to the UGC. But the resolution which was given, it does not find any mention.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that in that case let him give one suggestion. To make sure that they have agreed to on something, immediately the Registrar or the Vice Chancellor should read out the resolved part of the agenda item under consideration. Somebody could take a dictation on the spot. In this way, there would be no problem to anybody.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it, in fact, happens that sometimes, they ask as to what exactly has been resolved.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said they could read out as to what has been resolved for an agenda item.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that suppose something has been dictated, but the resolve part they receive is different. He said that he is not doubting anybody, rather it is his experience. This was also endorsed by Professor Keshav Malhotra. They (Vice Chancellor/Registrar) say that the office people say that it is very difficult for them to write and if there is change of even one word, it would change the meaning, would they not doubt their integrity.

Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested that the Vice Chancellor should propose the resolved part within the agenda item and that could be considered for approval. There are number of meetings. After all everybody's time is important, time has cost today and they must respect that. They should mention at the end of every item the proposed resolution. If anybody has objection, he can point it out, otherwise nobody has a chance to amend it.

Professor Ronki Ram while endorsing the view point of Shri Sanjay Tandon said that there is no need to put in the minutes as to what someone has said. The discussion should remain as a soft copy and whosoever needs it, he should ask for it. This was also supported by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is very good what Shri Tandon ji has said, but it seems a bit difficult for him. However, they would gradually reach at his (Shri Sanjay Tandon) level.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they have to change and it may not happen that the next generation would question them as to what they were doing. The world has changed. Whatever is the pendency with them, it should be placed before them and they should say that the next meeting would not be held till the pending minutes are not cleared. Why they cannot do this. How anybody can stop. They should say that they are not ready to sit in the next meeting until the minutes of the previous meetings are finalized. Secondly, if there is any pendency, it should be reported. Thirdly, the Vice Chancellor should give a proposed resolution in the meeting (Syndicate) itself and whatever has to be done, it should be done in the meeting itself and why to wait for 4 days or 7 days. Why they should say that they will do it later on. They are not ready to change. If they say that they will change after five years, it would not suffice the purpose. The University is changing, the world is changing and adopting the paperless system. The agenda is so voluminous that it becomes difficult to pick up and manage. He has brought the old agenda papers to hand over to the Registrar. He feared that if by chance someone from his office sells the old agenda papers as waste paper and out of that some document is reported in the newspaper, it could create a problem for him that the agenda has been leaked. He is interested in nothing except that the functioning of the University should be smooth. He suggested that the agenda papers should be minimized with the usage of information technology and they should complete the agenda within 2-3 hours and not leave unfinished agenda.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that electronic cupboard could be prepared for the agenda.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Shri Sanjay Tandon is right.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as proposed by the Vice-Chancellor, at least 4 days time should be given.

The Vice-Chancellor said that typically they meet on Saturdays or Sundays. By Thursday, the resolved part would be sent to all the members and the members respond by Sunday so that from Monday onwards the process of taking action could be initiated. The DVDs would be released on Thursday.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, Professor Navdeep Goyal and a few others said that the DVDs should be given only to those who specifically demand.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Ashok Goyal requested that the DVDs should be provided whenever received.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha suggested that 1-2 more persons could be deputed for recording of the minutes.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the supplementary agenda was sent by messengers. He suggested that the same could be sent through e-mail instead of spending money on transportation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the resolved part would be sent to all the members by Thursday and the members would be requested to respond by Monday evening and the DVDs would be released as soon as the resolved part is written.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the DVDs should be released as soon as the same are received. He enquired whether it makes any difference.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let first the resolved part be written.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not that someone would approach for writing a specific resolved part.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the persons preparing the minutes come under pressure.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that with the receipt of DVDs, one could point out any discrepancy in the resolved part.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could not happen as Shri Ashok Goyal knows the politics of the University better than him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no politics in it. Sometimes something is resolved while something else is recorded.

After thorough discussion, it was:-

RESOLVED: That the resolved parts of the items be prepared within 4 days and sent to the members along with the DVDs to the members who may demand. On receipt of the resolved parts, the members would send their response within 4 days and thereafter the resolved parts would be circulated.

Template for the post of Assistant Professor

4. Considered minutes dated 09.01.2018 (**Appendix-XI**) of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to see the amendments suggested by Professor A.K. Bhandari on the issue of qualifications/template (**Appendix-XI**) for the post of Assistant Professor in the teaching Departments of Panjab University and constituent/ affiliated Colleges of Panjab University.

NOTE: Pursuant to the Syndicate decision dated 23.07.2017 (Para 19) (**Appendix-XI**), draft advertisement/ qualifications was prepared for the post of Assistant Professor at P.U. Constituent Colleges. The Principal of P.U. constituent Colleges were requested to go through the draft advertisement/ qualifications and the certain Principals met on 8.11.2017 (**Appendix-XI**) to finalize the draft of re-advertisement for the post of assistant Professor in the constituent colleges and they had suggested certain correction in the draft advertisement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there have been changes from the UGC and they have to prepare a fresh template.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha while referring to page 16 of the agenda pointed out that so many problems are faced at the time of approval on account of teaching experience. According to the 4th amendment and Punjab Government norms for aided posts, the experience should be counted from the date of eligibility. For example, a teacher has an experience of 14 years and has cleared the NET in the year 2004. A teaching experience of 15 years is required to become a Principal. There is another teacher working on *ad hoc* and is not eligible who cleared the NET in the year 2015 and became a Principal in the year 2016. The teacher eligible for the last 14 years suffered. Therefore, it should be clearly mentioned that the teacher experience would be counted from the date of eligibility.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the second paragraph it is clearly mentioned that "however, for guest faculty/part-time teachers the allocation of marks would half of the marks, as mentioned above. Further, the teaching experience in an academic year should consist of the total period for which a candidate has worked, irrespective of the breaks and the experience be counted from the date of eligibility".

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha and Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that it is mentioned only in the proforma meant for University teachers and not in the proforma meant for College teachers. Therefore, these lines should be put in the proforma for College teachers so that there is no confusion.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they are appointing teachers in the College without NET on a salary of Rs.15,600/- and with NET on Rs.21,600/-. The persons without NET teach for a year or two and they are given the experience certificate. So the $\frac{1}{2}$ mark is given for teaching UG classes and 1 mark for teaching PG classes. But when a Selection Committee goes to a College, it says that the marks for teaching experience would be given only if the candidate had the NET.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is well received that whether the teaching experience of an ineligible person, without NET and had been given a chance to teach in a College, the experience should not be counted. But Dr. Sangha is saying that the experience is being counted.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that in about 95-98% cases, the experience is not counted but in a few cases the Committee counts the experience. The experience could be counted for the appointment of teacher but for the post of Principal it is clearly written that the experience would be counted from the date of eligibility. So, it should be clearly mentioned.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the lines regarding allocation of marks be also mentioned in the proforma for College teachers.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let a Committee be formed to look into this aspect as also there is some discrepancy in the proforma. Under the column of assessment of domain knowledge & teaching skills, 15 marks have been mentioned for teaching experience (Punjab Government/UG) or/and post-doctoral fellowship. They understand the difference between post-doctoral fellowship and teaching

experience. The marks should not be more than 10 in any of the categories.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is mentioned that "1 mark for each half academic year/semester for post-doctoral fellowship/post-doctoral project from a public funding agency in India/post-doctoral fellowship from some foreign country/university, upto a maximum of 10 marks".

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that this thing has not been mentioned in the proforma for Colleges appearing on page 17.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be 10 for both the categories. The Committee could look into it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee should look into both the aspects and place the matter again before the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he, Professor A.K. Bhandari, Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha would look into it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that since the marks for publication are awarded, there is an ambiguity in that also. The ratio of awarding the marks for corresponding author is not clearly mentioned. The Selection Committee calculates the marks in its own way. It should be clearly mentioned whether the marks to the corresponding authors are to be divided equally or shared equally. For example, supposing a person is publishing a paper in Science Magazine, there are one hundred eighty authors and the maximum marks to be given are 25, then by dividing it by 180, how much marks an author would get.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that it is happening so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be clarified.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the Committee should look into this aspect also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they look the UGC guidelines, the marks are to be shared equally. Earlier, equally sharing of marks was not clear. There are some problems as is being pointed out by Dr. Amit Joshi. In fact, Dr. R.K. Singla had made a complaint to the UGC regarding some Professors of the University that they have not awarded the marks by dividing which as per UGC guidelines should have been awarded. So, there was some problem. But if they see the latest guidelines of the UGC, there it has been clearly mentioned that the first author would be awarded specific marks and others would be awarded so much marks. Keeping in view the new UGC guidelines, as pointed out by Dr. Amit Joshi, it should be clarified. So a Committee of members including Dr. Amit Joshi, Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha, Shri Ashok Goyal, he himself and Professor A.K. Bhandari could look into it. When earlier a meeting was held, it was discussed that everything except point 5 could be approved which was to be clarified by Professor A.K. Bhandari. However, it could not be clarified. Similarly, there are some things which have been pointed out now and these are very good suggestions which would be incorporated.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha pointed out that the description of six stars (******) has not been given. The clarification regarding sports and youth welfare achievements needed to be clarified. He further said that the subject of Physical Education should be separated because sometimes the Vice-Chancellor nominee in the field is not available. In the subject of Physical Education, there is no Master's degree, it is only M.P.Ed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that under the five stars (*****) it is mentioned that 1 mark each has to be awarded and maximum up to 5 marks. He has seen that a maximum of 1-2 marks are awarded under this category. He suggested that the weightage should be enhanced to 2 marks like for gold medal. Some students during their Masters or Ph.D. or Post-Doctoral Fellowship get fellowship like Commonwealth and Fulbright or any other international scholarship, same weightage should be given. These things should be mentioned in the proforma.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they could not go beyond the UGC mandate. There is overall criteria for determining marks to be given to a research paper published in a journal approved by the UGC. After that, some space is given to the University to make their own standard. For example, Panjab University, Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar have constituted their respective Screening Committees. The Screening Committee's job is that the candidate is to be presented before the Selection Committee that the candidate has given certain amount of marks which he/she has obtained and the Committee has to approve it. So, there is a column filled by the candidate and approved by the Committee. When the candidate is called before the Committee and the Committee has any doubt, it might ask about it. What they are doing in the University, except Guru Nanak Dev University during the tenure of Professor Brar as Vice-Chancellor, said that where is it written that any article published in any ISSN No., or any book published in ISBN criteria is to be awarded marks meant for those books as given in the University Calendar. The UGC says that only those articles are to be considered those published in ISSN and the Committee would look into the quality of those articles as every article published in ISSN is not of that quality. That job has been assigned to the scholars in the University. But the scholars say that they do not bother about it. If any article has a ISSN stamp, it would be considered as a good paper and they are not bothered about the impact factor of SCOPUS or not. Even if a person has published in a College Journal, they are giving 25 marks for that also. The value of the article published in that journal and a journal with ISSN is the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are discussing the issue as to how to screen the candidate. The merit of the candidate has to be seen by the Selection Committee. They are not discussing the task of the Selection Committee. No Screening Committee could evaluate the quality of the paper, there is no way to do it. So, let them not digress into an area which is not in their domain and could not provide any solution. They have to see whether a certain scholarship is equivalent to an award. So the award should also be mentioned. If there is a Fulbright Scholarship, it is equivalent to international award.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that national/international awards/fellowship should be mentioned in the proforma.

Professor Anita Kaushal suggested that for extra-curricular activities whatever is mentioned in the prospectus like NCC, NSS, etc. that should be incorporated in the proforma.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the resolved part is that a Committee including Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dr. Amit Joshi, Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Ashok Goyal would be constituted to incorporate the suggestions provided by the members.

Shri Prabhjot Singh while referring to the legal opinion of Shri S.C. Sibal appearing on page 19 said that how the advertisement appearing on page 23 is relevant. It seems that the advertisement is not according to the roster. So, the advertisement has no meaning.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that all these things needed to be changed.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that one Constituent College would be considered as a single Department and not all the Constituent Colleges as one Department.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the transfers could be done from one Constituent College to the other, the roster would be prepared subject-wise

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the following Committee be constituted to look into the amendments suggested by Professor A.K. Bhandari on the issue of qualifications/template for the post of Assistant Professors:
 - (i) Professor Navdeep Goyal
 - (ii) Shri Ashok Goyal
 - (iii) Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha
 - (iv) Dr. Amit Joshi
 - (v) Professor A.K. Bhandari
 - (vi) D.R. (Estt.)(Convener)
- (2) the experience be counted from the date of eligibility
- (3) the para regarding allocation of marks to the guest faculty/part-time teachers, etc. be also made a part of the template meant for College teachers.

**Recommendations of
the Board of Finance
dated 01.03.2018**

5. Considered the following recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 01.03.2018 (Items 1 to 15):

Item 1

That the proposal of Government of Punjab for release of grant of Rs 17.94 crores in three annual installments, starting from the year 2018-19, in addition to the annual release of grant with enhancement of 6% as well as the other points agreed by the Government of Punjab in the meeting dated 13.2.2018, be accepted.

NOTE: The emergent meeting of local members of the Board of Finance was convened on 13.2.2018, in pursuance of a communication dated 30.01.2018 received from Special Secretary Expenditure, Govt. of Punjab (**Appendix - _**).

Item 2

To note that this was agreed to by all the members of the Board of Finance that the issue of Intra University Bank transfers, keeping in view the specific comments of the MHRD/UGC as well as U.T. Administration, Chandigarh, for future, let such transfers be also go through the process of pre-audit, with clear understanding that there should not be any delays on part of the audit in dealing with such cases.

Item 3

That one increment over and above the pay protection as already allowed by the competent authority, i.e., Senate vide Para VIII dated 09.10.2016 to the following three Principals of Constituent Colleges be admitted by audit:

- i) Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu, Principal, Panjab University Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib.
- ii) Dr. N.R. Sharma, Principal, Panjab University Constituent College, Gur Har Sahai.
- iii) Dr. Kuldip Singh, Principal PU Constituent College Nihal Singh Wala (Moga).

NOTE: 1. The abve three Principals were recommended for appointment by the duly constituted Selection Committee in three constituent colleges of Panjab University.

The above recommendations of the Selection Committee were endorsed by the Syndicate in its meeting 1/15 May, 2016 vide Para 75 with recommendation that the pay of each candidate be protected as per P.U. rules and they be granted one increment over and above their respective protected pay. Finally, the Senate in its meting dated 9.10.2016 vide Para VIII approved the recommendation of the Syndicate.

2. In pursuance of the above decision of the Senate, the audit has admitted the salary of these principals after protecting their pay being drawn from their respective previous employers.
3. Regarding the grant of one increment over and above the protected pay, the audit enquired from the office about the supporting rule in this regard.
4. On this, it was clarified to audit that the one increment over and above the protected pay was allowed by the Competent Authority i.e., Senate in term of the regulation 4.1 Page-118, PU Cal. Vol-I as well as Clause XVII of Appendix-I of UGC regulation dated 30.6.2010 which are reproduced as under:

“Regulation 4.1 – Save as otherwise provided in the Regulations, the fixation of salary, accelerated increments, grant of allowance, etc., shall, in the case of employees holding permanent posts rest with:

- (a) **Senate- in the case of employees of Class A;**
- (b) **Syndicate - in the case of employees of Class B;**
- (c) **Vice-Chancellor - in the case of employees of Class C.”**

“Clause XVII - Discretionary award of advance increments for those who enter the profession as Associate Professors or Professors with higher merit, high number of research publications and experience at the appropriate level, shall be within the competence of the appropriate authority of the concerned University or recruiting institution while negotiating with individual candidates in the context of the merits of each case, taking into account the pay structure of other teachers in the faculty and other specific factors.”

5. The audit did not concur with the view point of office and gave the following observations:

“There is separate provision (4) for pay scales of Principals in Colleges, where as Regulation (xvii) relates to Assistant

Professor/ Associate Professor/ Professor in colleges & Universities. No doubt Regulation (1) (III) of P.U. Calendar Vol.I provides that teachers includes Principal of affiliated colleges but UGC make separate provision for them”

Moreover provision XVII of Appendix I clearly states that advance increments can be given while negotiating with individual candidates and not after the appointment of candidates. It is therefore advised the decision of the Syndicate be reviewed.”

Financial Liability : Rs.3,71,950/- approx. (from the date of their joining till 31.3.2018).

Item 4

That the expenditure on livery articles for Security Staff, Drivers & Other Class-C employees, based on the competent bidding process, carried out by the Central Purchase Committee of the University, through E-tender, be allowed and for future the Vice Chancellor be authorised to sanction the expenditure on the purchase of livery articles, within the sanctioned budgetary provision, at L1 rates, by following the due procedure of e-tendering/ GeM portal.

NOTE: 1. The rates of Livery articles for Security Staff, Drivers, Mukh Sewadars & Class ‘C’ employees were approved vide Item No. 13 in the meeting of *Board of Finance held on 27.7.2011.*

2. A Central Purchase Committee was constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for purchase of Stationery, Paper and Livery Articles for FY 2017-18. The Central Purchase Committee in its meeting held on 6.6.2017 approved the e-tender document for purchase as per purchase procedure mentioned in Accounts manual Rule 27.9.

The tender was e-published on official site of UT administration. The committee had opined to proceed on L1 basis i.e. lowest quoted rate basis amongst the technically qualified firms only on item wise basis.

3. Due to time gap of 6 years and consequent inflationary impact, the current rates of most of the items in comparison to the rates approved in 2011, are found to be on the higher side.

4. The comparative statement showing the rates of livery articles approved by the Board of Finance dated 27.7.2011 and the rates recommended by the Central Purchase Committee along with decrease,

increase of rates & justification for enhancement is placed at **Appendix - _).**

- 5.** The case was forwarded to the Audit which raised the following observations.

"The Board of Finance in its meeting held on 27.7.2011 has fixed the rate of Livery articles to be issued to the Security Staff and Class C employees. Now, the Panjab University has proposed to purchase the livery articles at the rate higher than fixed by BOF, by inviting open tender.

The audit has raised certain observation on dated 8.12.17 and 8.1.18. The Panjab University has proposed to procure the goods on the basis of lowest tenders rates invited by the Panjab University in anticipation of approval of BOF. There is no rule/ regulation whereby the vice Chancellor has been authorized to accord sanction in anticipation of approval of Board of Finance. It is therefore advised that matter be put to the Audit after it is considered by Board of Finance."

- 6.** It is proposed that rates of Livery items as recommended by Central Purchase on basis of e-bidding at L1 rates be approved as annexed at **Appendix - _).**
- 7.** In future, the Vice Chancellor may be authorized to allow the purchase of livery articles, within the sanctioned budgetary provision, through e-tendering at L1 rates by following the due procedure.

Item 5

To note that this was agreed upon by all the members of the Board of Finance that the issue of interest on amount of Rs. 20,66,60,586/- transferred from pension corpus to revenue account, matter should not have been brought to the BOF and rather should have been settled by the audit and accounts at their own level.

NOTE: 1. As per the decision of the Board of Finance vide agenda item No.26 (II) dated 11.02.2013, the 10% employer share in respect of employees who had opted for pension for the financial years 2010-11, 2011-12 & 2012-13 amounting to Rs. 20,66,60,586/- was transferred from pension corpus fund to revenue account of the university.

The ACLA observed that in addition to the above amount the interest may also be transferred from Pension Corpus Fund to Revenue Account, which

the pension corpus had earned on such amount during the financial years 2010-11, 2011-12 & 2012-13 vide its memo No. RAO/2013/226 dated 02.05.2013.

- 2.** In response to the above referred observation of the audit, the office has given its version vide letter No.1577/FDO dated 25.07.2013. The relevant extract of which are reproduced here below:

"Since the inception of the pension corpus fund, a budget provision has been made in the Revenue budget to supplement the corpus. Initially there were three sources of inflow to the pension Corpus i.e., (1) Interest earned on Corpus money (2) 10% employers contribution of employees who had opted for pension and (3) provision in the Revenue budget.

As per the report of the Sub-Committee for the assessment of budget requirement of the University constituted by the Government of India, MHRD vide order No.2/2/2010-U.II dated 19th July, 2010, it was recommended that on the basis of the estimated pension liability for a given financial year, necessary budget provision may be created after adjusting the estimated interest income on the corpus fund for such financial year. Accordingly, the practice of transfer of 10% employer's contribution from Revenue Account to pension corpus fund stand discontinued w.e.f. the financial year 2010-11 as per the decision of Board of Finance dated 11.2.2013 vide Agenda Item No.26 (II). It was also decided that the amount already transferred to pension corpus be refunded to revenue account. Accordingly, an amount of Rs. 20.66 crore transferred from pension corpus to revenue account.

In this regard, it is submitted that interest was never claimed in University inter account transfers. On yearly basis a provision is made in the revenue budget for transfer of amount to pension fund account. The status of budget provision incorporated in the revenue budget and the detail of actual transfer thereof to the pension corpus for the years 2010-11, 2011-12 and 2012-13 is as under:

	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Budget provision	Rs.16.24 crore	Rs. 22.83 crore	Rs. 33.70 crore
Details of actual transfer from Revenue account to Pension Corpus Fund	Rs.2.50 crore on 3/7/10 Rs.4.00 crore on 30/8/10 Rs.2.00 crore on 6/9/10 Rs.1.50 crore on 5/1/11	Rs.3.30 crore on 18/2/12 Rs.19.53 crore on 18/2/12	Rs.5.00 crore on 1/1/13 Rs.20.00 crore on 23/3/13 Rs.8.70 crore on 7/5/13

	Rs.6.24 crore on 13/1/11		
--	-----------------------------	--	--

From the above table, it is clear that the amount provided in the budget was not credited to the pension corpus fund proportionately and evenly on monthly basis. Rather the amount was transferred as per the availability of funds, depending upon the date of receipt of grant from Government. No interest has ever been claimed from revenue budget for not transferring the amount to pension corpus in time. It is pertinent to mention that the deficit of pension corpus is being funded through the revenue budget of University. Therefore, charging interest either for delay in transfer of amount from revenue budget to corpus fund or vice-versa is not reasonable and would unnecessarily inflate the expenditure on one side and income on the other hand.

The position was further clarified by the office vide note dated 05.05.2015 received in the audit vide diary No.299 dated 05.05.2015 which is reproduced here below:

"In continuation to the reply already submitted vide No. 1577/FDO dated 25.07.2013, it is further clarified that the actual deficit of Pension Corpus on yearly basis is being met by way of making an appropriate budget provision in the Non-Plan Account. Therefore, if the University transfers interest from Pension Corpus to Revenue Account then net result would be enhanced Pension Corpus deficit which ultimately has to be recouped from the Revenue budget. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served except that on one hand interest will be transferred from Pension Corpus to Revenue Account and on the other hand enhanced provision shall be provided in the Revenue budget to meet the Pension corpus deficit of that particular year."

3. Now after almost 3 years the audit has observed that the observation already given still stands.

Item 6

- (i) That in case of sponsored research projects/schemes as well as consultancy projects, for which the concerned Faculty member is responsible for the execution and submission of its progress report to the concerned funding agency, the annual audit of such projects/schemes be allowed by the professional CA Firms to be taken from the panel approved by the CAG, with condition that the provisions of Panjab University

Accounts Manual and General Financial Rules will be strictly followed including the pre-audit of proposals of procurement of goods and services valuing more than Rs.500 lacs.

- (ii) That the term of reference for audit assignment of sponsored projects and the consequential amendments in P.U. Accounts Manual, **as per annexure I & II**, be approved, pursuant to discussion in the meeting of the Board of Finance.

Item 7

That an amount of Rs.54.14 lacs be sanctioned out of Development Fund for construction of additional class rooms in the Block-II of the Department of Laws for the academic session 2018-19.

NOTE: An estimate of Rs.54.14 lac submitted by Executive Engineer, P.U. Construction office for construction of additional class rooms to the Department of Laws is available as per **Appendix - _).**

Item 8

That the status quo be maintained and no further enhancement in DA rate and increment be allowed to the teachers who are continuing in service beyond the age of 60 years as per interim orders of the Hon'ble High Court, till the final outcome of the pending appeals.

NOTE: 1. Various faculty members of Panjab University had filed a Civil Writ Petitions before the Hon'ble Panjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh for enhancement in the age of retirement from 60 to 65 as per the UGC regulations. The Hon'ble Panjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh dismissed all such Writ Petitions vide its order dated 16.08.2016 through a common order passed in CWP No.11988 of 2014 for all connected matters.

4. The concerned teachers filed LPA before the Division Bench of Hon'ble Panjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, which has passed an interim order dated 06.12.2016, the operative part of which is re-produced here below :

“ The resultant effect, as clarified in the order dated 26.10.2016, is that the appellants are entitled to continue without any break in service so as to enable them to draw the same emoluments/salary which they were drawing immediately before the order dated 16.08.2016 was passed by the

learned Single Judge. In this view of the matter, we direct that the order passed by the learned Vice-Chancellor on 25.11.2016 vide which he has directed to pay salary to the appellants as they were drawing immediately before the pronouncement of the order by the learned Single Judge excluding HRA, as an interim measure and subject to the final outcome of these appeals, is the most fair, just and workable solution. The University is equally justified in asking the appellants to give an undertaking to the effect that the payment made to them pursuant to the ad interim orders, shall be subject to final outcome of these appeals and thus it can be adjusted against the post-retiral dues in the event of non-acceptance of these appeals. The aforementioned arrangement shall continue till further orders.”

- 3.** The concerned teachers represented to the university authorities to grant the enhancement in the D.A. as well as annual increments even beyond the age of 60 years in view of the interim orders of the Hon’ble Panjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh.
- 4.** In this matter the audit has given this observation as under:

“The policy for enhancement of D.A. and annual increment to all teachers continuing beyond the age of 60 years be got legally examined in view of the interim order of the Hon’ble Panjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh in this regard”.

- 5.** As per the advice of the Vice-Chancellor the university obtained the legal opinion from Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Sr. Advocate. The relevant extract of which is reproduced here below :

“There is no doubt that the employees have rendered continuous service, which makes them entitled for the grant of annual increments, thus in my considered opinion considering all the facts and representations submitted by the teachers and keeping in mind that the issue involved in all the writ petitions and appeal before the Hon’ble High Court being same all the teachers are entitled to the grant of annual increments”.

Financial Liability : Rs.41.55 lac per annum (aprox.)

Item 9

That the rate of honorarium for the resource person in University colloquia as well as the rate of Secretarial Assistance to concerned staff being paid by the University @ of Rs.5,000/- and Rs.1,000/- respectively be approved. Further resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to approve the amount of honorarium of more than Rs 1000 subject to maximum of Rs 5,000/- per session, to the concerned resource person in other University events, depending upon the importance of event as well as the stature of the concerned resource person.

NOTE: 1). Panjab University has started Colloquia series in the year 2012 and since the inception of such series, an honorarium of Rs. 5000/- is being paid to the distinguished personalities as resource person. Till the last financial year all such payments were being admitted and passed by the audit. However, now the audit has raised following observations:

"Audit is very much aware of Rule 5.3 of Panjab University Account Manual 2012. The rule ibid provides that Vice-Chancellor shall relax the rules for payment of honorarium on basis of proper justification.

In the instant case honorarium of Rs. 5000/- has been given for delivering a lecture in Panjab University Colloquium. The Panjab University has not framed any rules for payment of honorarium for giving lecture in colloquium. Moreover, no justification has been by the department while obtaining sanction from Vice-Chancellor.

It is therefore advised that sanction of the Vice-Chancellor for payment of honorarium of Rs. 5000/- may got received by proper justification."

2). On this issue, the Vice-Chancellor has remarked:

"Let the colloquia honorarium so far be paid out of Foundation for Higher Education or some other budget head immediately. Let an agenda item be prepared for approval through Syndicate and BOF, if need be. Colloquia seminar do not exist on behalf of any University in India. This has been specially commended by NAAC as well.

Item 10

Noted and ratified the action taken in issuing FDR of Rs. 45,71,000/- including interest in compliance of the interim order dated 15.1.2018 passed by the Court of Ld. Sh. J.S. Sidhu, Additional District Judge, Chandigarh in the Objection Petition No. Arb No. 1/18 titled Panjab University Chandigarh Versus M/s Surjit Singh Sodhi and Anr.

NOTE: 1. Sh. Surjit Singh Sodhi, Contractor filed an arbitration claim of more than Rs. 1,12,00,000/- against the Panjab University regarding the execution of the work of 100 bedded hospital. The University contested the claim before the Arbitrator through Advocate. The Arbitrator passed the final award on 26.10.2017 by directing the Panjab University to pay an amount of Rs. 42,53,005/- to M/s Surjit Singh Sodhi along with costs of Rs.86,610/- towards a proportionate fee of arbitral tribunal, Rs.15,000/- towards cost of the Arbitration Centre and Rs. 25,000/- towards the fees of the advocate (Total Rs.43,79,615/-).

2. The award of Arbitrator dated 26.10.2017 was challenged by the Panjab University by filing an objection petition before the Court of Distt. Judge, Chandigarh who marked this case to Sh. J.S. Sidhu Ld. Additional District Judge Chandigarh. The Ld. ADJ passed the following orders on 15.1.2018:

“Reply to the stay application filed. Adjournment is requested for filing reply to the main petition. It be filed on 30.1.2018. In the meantime the petitioner is directed to deposit the award amount in the FDR in the name of Respondent No. 1 in view of order dated 3.1.2018, thereafter, the original FDR be placed on record and the original FDR will be released to the person entitled for the same after the final decision of the present case. Record of the Arbitrator be also summoned for that date. Arguments on stay application will also be heard on that date.”

3. In compliance of the above orders, FDR of Rs. 45,71,000/- (i.e., Rs.43,79,615/- plus interest of Rs.1,91,385/- @18% w.e.f. 26.10.17 to 25.1.18) as advised by the counsel of the University was submitted in the Hon'ble Court. It has been specifically mentioned on the FDR that **“Final disbursement of this FDR shall be made only with the consent of Panjab University”**.

4. The next date of the case is fixed for **14.03.2018**.

Item 11

Noted and ratified the decision of Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 48 (iv) (**Appendix-VIII**) (**Page-25**) for allowing the payment of Rs. 1.00 crore as application processing fee to apply for the status of “Institution of Eminence” out of UIAMS (Exam) Fund.

- NOTE:** 1. Panjab University has applied for seeking the status of “**Institution of Eminence**” to University Grants Commission (UGC), New Delhi. In this connection, the University has paid a mandatory application processing fee of Rs. 1.00 crores for the purpose.
2. The processing fee is refundable to the extent of Rs. 75.00 lacs to the University, if it is not selected as an Institution of Eminence.

Item 12

Noted and ratified the decision of the Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 (Para 22) for approving a budget provision of Rs. 73.00 lacs for setting up of **SWAYAM** and **SWAYAM PRABHA** access labs, under National Digital Initiatives of Government of India for the Higher Education, out of UIAMS (Exam) Fund.

- NOTE:** 1. Department of Higher Education, Government of Punjab vide letter No. 8/43/2017-4C1/1015466/3 dated 4.7.2017 enclosed D.O. No. 7-1/2017-DL dated 12.6.2017 (**Appendix - VIII-a**) (**Page 25a-e**) of Secretary, MHRD which was addressed to Chief Secretaries of all States regarding formulating a quick draft policy regarding on-line availability of educational resources through various flagships schemes of MHRD in higher education system i.e. INFLIBNET, NPTEL, NMEICT, SWAYAM etc.
2. The Vice Chancellor constituted a committee which recommended setting up of two labs @ Rs. 3637000/- each for accessing SWAYAM and SWAYAM PRABHA modules/programmes of MHRD under National Digital Initiatives in Higher Education (**Appendix-VIII-b**) (**Page 25f-g**). The committee also recommended that one lab shall be set up on the top floor of building of Department of Computer Sciences and Applications and another shall be set up on the top floor of building of UIAMS, South Campus. The entire purchase shall be made through e-tendering.

Item 13

Noted and ratified the correction in the nomenclatures of following budget heads under Development Fund at Page 145 at. Sr. No. 166 (v) to (viii) [Budget Estimates 2018-2019]:

Sr. No.	Printed in Budget Estimates 2018-2019		Proposed amendment in Budget estimates 2018-2019	
(v)	Cleaning of overhead water tanks in PUC, Sector-14 & 25, Chandigarh	1500000	Construction of Car Parking at T-II Houses in PUC, South Campus, Sector-25, Chandigarh	1500000
(vi)	Raise the level of entrance door of B Type (97 to 108) and D Type (21 to 40) houses to prevent rain water from entering in houses in PUC Sector-14, Chandigarh	1000000	Cleaning of overhead water tanks in PUC, Sector-14 & 25, Chandigarh	1000000
(vii)	Electrical rewiring, Electric Fixture, Ceiling Fans in USOL, Department in PUC Sector-14, Chandigarh	4500000	Electrical rewiring of various categories houses in PUC, Sector-14, Chandigarh	4500000
(viii)	Replacement, Repair Maintenance of Ceiling Fans at Administration Block in PUC, Sector-14, Chandigarh	5000000	Electrical rewiring, Electric Fixture, Ceiling Fans in USOL & Department in PUC Sector-14, Chandigarh	5000000

Financial Liability : **Nil**

Item 14

Noted and ratified the decision of the Vice-Chancellor for allowing reimbursement of RS.91,314/- to Mr. Jatin Garg, Student, Department of Anthropology with the modification that payment be recouped out of the Budget Head 'Amalgamated Fund' as a special case, who got injured on 11.4.2017 during an unfortunate incidence that took place in a student agitation, while he was coming from hostel side. The members further suggested that this should not be made precedent.

NOTE: A note in this regard, received from Dean, Student Welfare is placed at **Appendix - IX (Page 26).**

Item 15

Noted the status of status of Inspection Report of Principal Director Audit (Central) and Local Audit Department, Chandigarh Administration and decided that Special Secretary Finance and F.D.O., P.U. shall meet on periodic basis for taking necessary action to settle the pending paras as soon as possible.

(Minutes of Board of Finance alongwith the term of reference for audit assignment of sponsored projects and the consequential amendments in P.U. Accounts Manual as per annexure I & II , as a part of agenda item No.6 of Board of Finance dated 01.03.2018 are available in the separate volume).

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that it would be better if the indexing of the agenda and minutes of the Board of Finance is done. While referring to **sub-item 11**, he pointed out that as per the rules, this item of UIAMS fund should not have been placed before the Board of Finance. It is to be done at the level of the Syndicate only.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it was earlier also discussed that since it had been approved by the Syndicate, there was no need to place it before the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to make a presentation for Institution of Excellence on behalf of Panjab University before the Empowered Committee on 3rd April. There would be a 10-minute presentation followed by 10-minute discussion before a High Empowered Committee which is chaired by the former Chief Election Commissioner, namely Mr. N. Gopalaswami. It has three other members, two from abroad – one from the University of Princeton, one from University of Harvard and the fourth member is a former Director, Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow. The time given to the University is at 2.35 p.m. for which a 5-member team is allowed. So, he, Professor A.K. Bhandari, Finance and Development Officer, Professor Rajiv Lochan, Director, IQAC and Professor Sanjeev Sharma would go for the presentation at India International Centre, New Delhi. When it was advertised, it was said that 30 institutes would be shortlisted out of which 10 are to be selected. About 100 applications were received.

Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested that it should have been made a part of the Vice-Chancellor statement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has already been included under point no. (xii) of his statement. If the University is not selected for this status, an amount of Rs.75 lakhs would be refunded and if selected, the University would get an amount of Rs.1000 crores over a period of 10 years. This money is in a project mode and the amount is to be spent so as to enhance the ranking of the institutions. So, what are their weak points at the moment. One is inadequate student teacher ratio, inadequate number of publications per faculty member and the third is newer courses which are being practised by top of the line institutions globally. So, their proposal only addresses these three things. Since it is to be run in a project mode, they could not make regular appointment. They have 1400 sanctioned posts of teachers and they have 1000 teachers. 400 contractual teachers would be appointed for 5 years at a time as the project is to be reviewed after every 5 years. The salary level has to be equivalent to either the INSPIRE faculty and they have a Panjab University specific INSPIRE scheme to appoint as many teachers as they are permitted as per their sanctioned strength. The money would go there. How to enhance the productivity of teachers in terms of research? Every teacher should be given one semester after every 5 semester so that they bring money for research and work their students to write more papers and during that period guest faculty should be hired. This is another plan. They have collaborated with the institutions in the recent years in Canada, England and Australia, in collaboration with these institutions they are supposed to bring the foreign faculty here and encourage their teachers to come and spend a sabbatical here. There is a Panjab University specific scheme 'GIAN' of Government of

India. They depend on IIT, Kharagpur to give some money out of the national scheme. So, there is a Panjab University specific INSPIRE and GIAN scheme. They would have contractual teachers on the lines of INSPIRE faculty scheme. They would have a scheme that they entice their faculty to take a time off to concentrate on research, write research projects and give utilisation of their research projects in terms of better research output whenever a project gets over. They should have guest faculty and enter into MoU with foreign universities and start training programmes so that the level of teaching could be improved and try some innovative things which are not being done anywhere in India so far.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired whether there is any criteria of eminence.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they were advised to target and model themselves along those institutions which are in the top 100. They have closely studied what the University of British Columbia, University of Simon Fraser and Australian National University do.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 01.03.2018 (Items 1 to 15) be endorsed to the Senate for approval.

Cut off date for implementation of new pension scheme for regular employees

6. Considered if, the cut off date for implementation of new pension scheme for regular employees, compulsorily, be fixed from 09.07.2012 instead of 01.07.2015 which was earlier approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015 (Para 13) (**Appendix-XII**), as per the rules of Punjab Government.

- NOTE:**
- 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015 (Para 13) has approved to implement the new pension scheme compulsorily for all regular employees who have been appointed from 01.07.2015 onwards.
 - 2. It was also decided to give an option to those employees who have been appointed on regular basis from 01.01.2004 to 30.06.2015, either continue with existing scheme of CPF or may opt for NPS compulsory.
 - 3. The change in cut off date i.e. from 01.07.2015 to 09.07.2012 has been proposed in view of the fact that the Panjab University follows the pension rules of Punjab Government and the Punjab Government has fixed 09.07.2012 as cut off date for the employees of its autonomous bodies, vide notifications dated 09.07.2012 and 13.10.2017 (**Appendix-XII**).
 - 4. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the President, PPUTA had written a letter that the Punjab Government had continued the old pension scheme up to the year 2012 but there is no mention of it here.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are pension regulations in which it is written that the same are to be followed and it has to be adopted from the date mentioned in the regulations.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the Central Government took a decision that all the employees who were employed on or before 31.12.2003 would be covered under the old pension scheme of the Government of India. Those appointed on 01.01.2004 or after would not be covered under the old pension scheme and there would be a new pension scheme for these employees. As far as Panjab University Pension Scheme was concerned, it was implemented after many years even though the scheme was envisaged in the year 1991 but could not be implemented and they had to struggle it for a long time but could not get it through. Then so many employees of the University wanted to opt for that. The University had taken the option from the employees who were in the job before the year 2003. So, it was a special pension scheme.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they have no point to discuss as it has been done by the Punjab Government.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the earlier pension scheme is to be extended to the employees employed after 01.01.2004 up to 1.4.2012 which has been implemented by the Punjabi University, Patiala about which the PPUTA had written a letter to the University. Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar has also implemented it.

It was informed (by the Finance and Development Officer) that Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University had implemented the pension scheme much earlier than the Panjab University. The Panjab University Pension Scheme was implemented in the year 2006 effective from a specified date in 2005. In that pension scheme, the employees had the option either to opt for the pension scheme or to continue with the CPF scheme. That pension scheme was notified by MHRD through official gazette. Any amendment that is to be made in that scheme has to be routed through the MHRD. That is the aspect in this notification. That has to be followed through mode of modification in the regulations.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to why the letter has not been considered.

It was clarified (by the Finance and Development Officer) that it has to be processed through the Regulations Committee and the letter being referred by Professor Keshav Malhotra has not come to the office as yet. The other aspect which has come is regarding the cut-off date for compulsorily implementation of new pension scheme. The Punjab Government has fixed the cut-off date as 09.07.2012 for all employees of its autonomous bodies and not for the employees of Punjab Government itself. The University had decided to implement it somewhere in the year 2015. To be at par with that notification, they have just want that the NPS should be compulsorily implemented for all employees who have been regularly appointed from 09.07.2012.

So, this is the proposal under consideration. So far as the other scheme that on the basis of Punjab Government notification that the employees of all its autonomous bodies should also be given pension, for that they need to amend the regulations.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in the Panjab University Calendar Volume-I it is clearly mentioned that whenever any change is adopted by the Punjab Government in its pension scheme, the same would be adopted by Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is right, but at the moment the pay master of the Panjab University is the Central Government.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is mentioned in the Act and the policy of pension of completion of 25 years should be implemented and there is no need of any approval.

The Vice-Chancellor said that for this purpose they would have to consult the RAO.

It was informed (by the Finance and Development Officer) that earlier they have sent some regulations through Syndicate and Senate for amendment which should not have been sent.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should not wait for the amendment and implement the same.

It was informed (by the Finance and Development Officer) that the Punjab Government has granted the benefit of full pension on the qualifying service of 25 years but in the Panjab University regulations it is mentioned as 33 years. They have recommended the amendment in that regulation to the Government of India.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Regulation 1.6 appearing on page 181 of Chapter-X Panjab University Employees (Pension) Regulations 1991 says "in the matter of application of these Regulations, regard may be given to the corresponding provisions of Pension Rules contained in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Vol. II, as amended from time to time, insofar as, these can be adopted to the service in the University, but subject to such exceptions and modifications, as the University may, from time to time, determine through Regulations". Instead of consulting the RAO, they on their own are taking the decision.

It was informed (by the Finance and Development Officer) that the regulation which Professor Keshav Malhotra has read out was considered at the time of considering this amendment. He was also of the view that there is an enabling provision in the regulation itself but at that time the Pension Committee was of the view that this regulation says that they have to do it by way of amendment to the regulation. It was discussed at that time also that keeping in view the enabling provision, they could do so but at that time the Pension Committee was of the view that this is not under the purview of the University and let it be amended through the Regulations Committee and seek the concurrence of the Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that anyway nothing could be done right now because they have already sent the regulations to the Government. So it is better to impress upon the Government to expedite the amendment. He met the Secretary, UGC last week and

asked him to at least get the two amendments approved, one relating to the grant of pension on completion of 25 years and the other relating to accumulation of earned leave for the teachers.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since it is clearly mentioned in the regulations that they have to follow the Punjab Government, it is wrong to send the amendments to the MHRD. Let them adopt and if the RAO does not accept, then they could think of it.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Finance and Development Officer to provide him the minutes of the Committee which had asked to send the regulations to the Government.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested that a Committee be formed on the issue and they would have detailed discussions.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra to look into it and submit a proposal in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that Professor Keshav Malhotra is very much aware of the fact of the pension scheme. The regulations of the Punjab Government and Central Government are there. Those rules are to be applicable provided they had the pension under normal circumstances. They did not have the pension till the year 2005. The Central Government has said time and again the Panjab University does not deserve the pension as the University gave the pension scheme at one point of time to which the Government did not agree and lost the opportunity like the Central University and PGIMER at one point of time. Then the Panjab University said that they had not refused and they had only contributory provident fund and the Government said that since the rate of interest at that time was 14% p.a., there is no need of pension as the CPF was the better option. When the interest rate has come down to 8% and the University wanted the pension to which the Government said that they could not do it. Then they met Dr. Manmohan Singh, the then Prime Minister of India and said that they had a pension scheme but did not opt at that time under certain circumstances to which he had said that why they did not opt for it. They requested that now they wanted to start the process and Dr. Manmohan Singh took personal interest in getting the pension scheme approved. The Government asked for the pension file and requested to tell as to how many employees are there and how much money is available with the University. After calculating everything, the Government okayed that the scheme is feasible if the University has some specified amount, i.e., Rs.208 crore with it. Then the University gave the projections about the money available with it. Then they had to go through the whole process in which there was involvement of the Finance Secretary, Higher Education Secretary and the Law Secretary. Only then they could get the pension scheme. In case they extend the pension scheme to include more employees, then the Government could say that it being a pension scheme of the University and the responsibility lies with it to run it for any number of years and if the scheme fails, the Government would not contribute anything.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even today the Central Government has washed its hands off and said that they would pay only money towards the salary of the existing employees at 1.1 times of the projected number of 1378 teachers. All the outflow towards the

pension is out of the University's internal income. When the 7th Pay Commission recommendations are to be implemented, the pensions are to be revised and when they approach the Central Government for more funds, he is unsure what would be the attitude of the Central Government. They could just wash off their hands and say the University has to run its pension scheme of their own and they would not compensate for the additional burden on the Panjab University for the implementation of the 7th Pay Commission recommendations. So, this is a very tricky and difficult question and he did not know what the opinion of the Central Government would be. He is not opposing what Professor Keshav Malhotra wanted and requested him to submit the proposal.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Syndicate and Senate had already adopted the Punjab Government notification for grant of pension on completion of 25 years service as per Punjab Government Civil Services Rules. They are waiting for about 4-5 years for amendment in the regulations sent to the Central Government for the approval. If these are received now with the efforts of the Vice-Chancellor, they would have to adopt the same. They have themselves created a web. They should first try to place the case of grant of pension on completion of 25 years before the RAO and if there is any objection, it would not be implemented. He pointed out that it is clearly mentioned in the regulations that they have to follow the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor requested **Professor Keshav Malhotra to bring an item for consideration of the Syndicate next time and they would approve the same.** Let they see the circumstances under which they had sent the amendment of regulations relating to grant of pension of completion of 25 years service to the Government. After looking into it if they feel that there is no need to bring an item before the Syndicate, then they would not do so. Right now, the item under consideration is Item C-6.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the issue raised by PUTA in their letter is a related one.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is sure that Professor Ronki Ram has a different opinion. What Professor Keshav Malhotra is saying that whatever is provided for in the regulations that could be implemented simply because one regulation says that it would cover only those employees who entered into service before 01.01.2004 which has been notified on 23rd February, 2006. The people who joined the service before 2006 when the pension scheme was implemented, they had joined keeping in mind that there was pension scheme in Panjab University and it was part of Panjab University Calendar Volume-I. The appointment letter also says that their service conditions would be governed as per Panjab University Calendar which contained the pension scheme. This date of 1.1.2004 came on 23.2.2006 and before that there was nothing like 1.1.2004. He said that those who joined on 1.1.2004 and up to 22.2.2006 under the bonafide belief that there is pension scheme in Panjab University as per the Calendar. Could they deny those employees the benefit on the basis of a notification which has been issued subsequently?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that in this case they would have to look the reasons as to why it was done from retrospective effect.

They would have to look the orders and there must be some reason for that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is written that all employees who joined service under the University before 1.1.2004. He had said at more than one occasion though it is part of the minutes which have been annexed with this item. It is important because the new pension scheme is to be made compulsory for those from 2012 who have joined after 1.1.2004. Until and unless they are sure that the people who joined after 1.1.2004 are not covered under these pension regulations contained in the Calendar, could they take a decision to compulsorily implement the new pension scheme on those employees also.

It was informed (by the Finance and Development Officer) that it is not so but it is compulsorily coverage of the employees for NPS who have joined this University on or after 9.7.2012 and not for the employees before that.

Shri Ashok Goyal then enquired as to what about those employees.

It was informed (by the Finance and Development Officer) those employees have the option of CPF.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the option has to be given. The regulation which he had earlier read is regulation 1.2. Then he referred to Regulation 1.9 of Pension Regulations. which states "An employee who is recruited at the age of thirty five years or more, may within a period of three month from the date of his appointment elect not to be governed by the Regulations of the Pensionary Scheme", meaning thereby, anybody who joins after attaining the age of 35 years, he will be covered compulsorily under the Pension Scheme and this been approved on 2006. If it has been approved in 2006 and the persons covered under the scheme are those who have joined after 1.1.2004, then how within three months they can exercise this option. If they have not got the three months period to exercise this option, that means they are automatically covered compulsorily under these regulations. At least those who have joined upto the date of notification i.e. 23rd February, 2006, that too, if they say particularly that those who have joined after 23rd February, 2006 are not covered under these regulations. As per the regulations, as in the present form all those who have joined after 35 years of age are to be covered under the pension regulations. He would like to tell them the history as to why it has happened. This is known to Professor Ronki Ram ji. This regulation 1.9 was already existing as per the pension scheme which was introduced for the first time in the University. In 1991 it was again revised because there was no limit as to who would be covered. The 1991 regulations were a part of the original regulations. In 1991 also these were not changed except that in place of 'after such and such date' it was changed to 1.1.2004.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi intervened to say as to what they would like to do now and what is the underlying problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the underlying problem is this that there is a category who has joined after 1.1.2004, in spite of the fact that the date has been fixed by the Govt of India.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked the person/s whose problem is this and wanted to know in simple words as to what he (Ashok Goyal Ji) wants them to do.

Shri Ashok Goyal replied that the persons who joined after 1.1.2004 and are more than 35 years of age, such persons are covered under the old pension scheme. He has been raising this issue for the last six years. It was a part of the minutes of the pension committee meeting. It was also decided that they will get it examined, everything else has been got examined except that aspect. He is not going to be benefited under any circumstances. He knows the limitations of the University as well as the Government of India. But his view has always been that they should interpret the regulations to the best advantage of employees. While Professor Ronki Ram says that he was personally there and he had agreed that they will not allow anybody other than those who have joined till 1.1.2004 to be covered under the regulations, so he is under moral commitment not to extend this benefit. As far as this regulation is concerned, as Professor Ronki Ram has also admitted, that this mistake has occurred and they should have got it amended. The law of the land is that till the regulations are amended, they have to enforce them.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked Professor Ronki Ram as to why they would not like to extend this benefit to the persons who joined the University service after 1.1.2004.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the Government had said that the employees who are in service till 31.12.2003, they would be covered under this scheme. Since there was no pension in the University, so they were pressing hard the Government to give pension to the Panjab University employees. With great efforts, the permission for pension as applicable to the employees of Government of India was accorded, but the Government of India asked for the number of employees, as on 31.12.2003, desirous to opt for pension. They said that the Central Government is going to close this scheme, but the Panjab University is asking them for pension scheme.

Shri Sanjay Tandon requested the Vice Chancellor that if the P.U. authorities feel that it is the valid point to give them some semblance of looking at that point through some methodology. They are just confined to one point from the last half an hour. He requested the Vice Chancellor to give his ruling and move forward.

While pointing towards Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi wanted to know from him whether his point relates to 1.1.2004 to February, 2006.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that they should constitute a Committee to look into the issue. He further said that he would like to read out regulation 1.8 (a) for their attention which states, "The employees who joined the service of the University before the date of notification of these Regulations shall have the option – (i) to continue to be governed by the Contributory Provident Fund-cum-Gratuity Scheme contained in Chapter VI..... (ii) to elect to be governed by the Pensionary Scheme contained in these Regulations".

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that this relates to the persons who joined the service after 1.1.2006. The only point is, what to do with the people from 1.1.2004 to February, 2006 i.e. for 26 months.

He suggested that a Committee should be constituted to resolve the issue.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that they should first see if any person had joined the University service during this period. There is possibility that no one has joined the University during this period.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said while endorsing the view point of Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that a Committee should be constituted to sort out the issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that the MHRD has washed its hands off to which Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the Committee would then write the same thing.

Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested to include the name of Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi in the Committee.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor whether they adopt the cut off date for implementation of new pension scheme for regular employees, compulsorily, from 09.07.2012 instead of 01.07.2015, the members answered in the affirmative to which the Vice Chancellor said, okay. For rest of the issue regarding old pension scheme for the employees employed before 8.7.2012, he would constitute a Committee to look into the matter

RESOLVED: That the cut off date for implementation of new pension scheme for regular employees, compulsorily, be fixed from 09.07.2012 instead of 01.07.2015 which was earlier approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015 (Para 13) (**Appendix-XII**), as per the rules of Punjab Government.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Committee comprising of Professor Ronki Ram, Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi be constituted to look into the issue of applicability of old pension scheme for the employees employed before 8.7.2012.

When Item No. C-7 was taken up for consideration, the Vice-Chancellor after giving some background and other details of the case abstained from the meeting. The Registrar also abstained from the meeting. The members elected Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi to chair the meeting for this item and the Controller of Examinations was requested to act as Secretary.

**Minutes dated
18.12.2017 of the
Committee, to look
into the issues arising
out of the letter No.
VPS-15/2/2002, dated
21.09.2017, received
from Under Secretary
to the Vice President of
India**

7. Considered minutes dated 18.12.2017 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 07.10.2017 (Para 2) (**Appendix-XIII**), to look into the issues arising out of the letter No. VPS-15/2/2002, dated 21.09.2017, received from Under Secretary to the Vice President of India, so that such occurrences as created by the action of the complainant (Senate member and Professor, PU) do not reoccur in future:

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 16) (**Appendix-XIII**) considered the above said minutes and after a brief description given by the Vice-Chancellor of the case, it was felt that since the matter needed thorough and long

discussion, the item be taken up at the last. However, the same could not be taken up for consideration afterwards and would be carried forward to the next Syndicate meeting.

While briefing the members about the issue, the Vice Chancellor said that a Committee was formed pursuant a decision of the Syndicate to look into the issues raised by a sitting member of the Senate in which serious allegations were made against the Registrar and officers in the office of the Vice President and all those things were sent directly to the Chancellor. A Committee was formed to look into it as to how such things can be avoided in the future. This Committee has given its recommendations. It says that such things are being held today and these were being held in the past also as there was no deterrence because the Syndicate or the Governing Bodies are not taking any action against their colleagues who repeatedly do this. The Committee has just given a representative list of persons. Most of the cases in this list are over. Dr. Ashu Khosla's case is over as he has tendered apology. Whatever issues were raised by Dr. Alok Srivastava, those are now over. On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra, as to what Dr. Alok Srivastava has done, the Vice Chancellor said that he had complained against an INSPIRE faculty that he has submitted a proposal to the UGC for grant of a project, whereas that person was not authorised to write for this proposal etc. etc. Dr. Alok Srivastava was not supposed to send that complaint directly to the Chancellor. If there was some issue relating to a colleague and if one thinks that the department has taken a wrong decision, would someone make a complaint directly to the Chancellor. These are not right practices. On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra as to what happened after that, the Vice Chancellor said that the UGC gave money for the scheme and after 2-3 years the scheme got over. The objections put in by Dr. Alok Srivastava were not sustained by the UGC. The Vice President also did not sustain it and no enquiry was held. No investigation was done. Project was completed and its utilization certificate was submitted. As regards the case of Dr. Neelam Paul, they have discussed it at length earlier.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that in each Committee where there are issues concerning teachers, there should be one representative of PUTA. He further pointed out that since there is no representative of PUTA, so their view point has not been taken. That is why the problems have arisen. The Committee was not constituted properly.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not have PUTA representative when PUTA President is doing all this. The item under consideration at the moment is the report of the Committee.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan asked whether they could take action against those persons who had made complaints directly to the Chancellor. If they cannot take any action against those persons, out of which some of them have apologized and some of them not, they should pass a resolution here that such a thing should not happen in future again.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it is already written in the Calendar and thus there is no need to pass a resolution.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that then they should decide as to what action has to be taken against them.

The Vice Chancellor while referring to page 107 of the agenda said that these are the proceedings of the Syndicate meeting, a Syndicate which has changed since then, that was the one Syndicate and this is another Syndicate. The Syndicate resolved that "a Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor D.V.S. Jain, Fellow, PU, Professor Emeritus and INSA Hony. Scientist and comprising other Senate members Sardar Tarlochan Singh, Ex-MP, Professor Pam Rajput, Professor Emeritus, Ambassador I.S. Chadha, IFS (Retd.) and Shri V.K. Sibal, IAS (Retd.) and Senior Advocate is constituted to look into the issue arising out of the letter under consideration so that such occurrences as created by the action of the complainant (Senate Member and Professor, PU) do not recur in future. Syndicate noted with concern that complainant's act has compromised the image of the University and its Governing Bodies". He has not formed this Committee. The Committee was formed by the Syndicate and that Committee has given its report which is before them. This is the only issue under consideration. The things arising out of this or that, he thinks, is not right to raise that such Committees should have PPUTA President.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there should be PPUTA President Representative to which the Vice Chancellor said, 'no'.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Syndicate has decided the Committee.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi would like to confirm from the Vice Chancellor whether the first person in the list, i.e., Dr. Ashu Khosla has apologized and that no punishment has been given to him. He said that they have to be consistent with others also and cannot give higher punishment to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that it depends on the fact as to what is the nature of the things. Everyone cannot have the same punishment.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that then the Vice Chancellor has to define the nature of things done by Dr. Ashu Khosla.

The Vice Chancellor said that he can look the old record in this regard in the Syndicate Section and if he wants, he could procure the relevant documents for him. The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Ashu Khosla was complaining that he was being denied promotion and the University was unfair to him. But the University was not being unfair to him, then he apologised. He now got the promotion. Earlier he was saying that he was not being given promotion and also not being allowed to compete for Associate Professor's position. He (Dr. Ashu Khosla) complained that he was not allowed to do so because he was not having any Ph.D. students and that he was not deliberately allotted Ph.D. student/s. He could complain it to the Vice Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor could look into it, but he was directly writing to the Chancellor.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the gravity of the offence in each case is different from each other. The Committee which was set

up should have defined the gravity of the offence and should not leave it to the Syndicate to define the gravity. All the eight people who are accused, the work of determining the gravity of each case should have been done by the Committee. Why should the Committee expect them to define the gravity.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could form another Committee or they could reject the recommendations of the Committee.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that then the purpose of the Committee is defeated.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should see as to who have apologised.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is no question as to who have apologised.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Dr. R.K.Mahajan had given a proposal. He does not know, but he could read what the Vice Chancellor has read for them which is available on page 107. He does not know how far the Syndicate has the spirit. He read out the relevant portion of the resolved part of the Syndicate decision dated 7th October, 2017, which states, “.....to look into the issue arising out of the letter under consideration so that such occurrences as created by the action of the complainant (Senate Member and Professor, PU) do not recur in future”. So, basically, the idea was that a lot of damage has already been done. They have to see how it can be assured that it does not recur in future. Now this Committee has said that the seven persons have written directly to the Chancellor and so action as per rules be taken against them. They have not suggested as to how these recurrences could be avoided in future and what measures should be taken. Dr. R.K. Mahajan has suggested to resolve and reiterate that the concerned rule to prevent such occurrences is violated very frequently by the teachers or the employees, a serious note has been taken by the Syndicate and it is further clarified and reiterated that anybody found violating this rule in future will be dealt with in accordance with the law. Secondly, as Shri Malhi Sahib is saying that let they should tabulate all the teachers, because he thinks that all of them are teachers only, the gravity of the violation and then take a decision. Then they, of course, have to take so many things into consideration because there is one name of a person who has since retired. Now, if a retired person has written directly to the Chancellor, that also has to be seen whether he is covered under the rules. Can they take any action against somebody who is retired or they are talking of something which he did prior to his retirement or if something has been done, this kind of action, in different capacity, then the one they are talking, all these things have to be seen. He further said that as per the rules, no person would approach the members of the Syndicate and Senate. Can they enforce this rule? He does not know under what circumstances the rule has been made that one is elected by teachers and after getting elected, could he tell them that they cannot approach him?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he could understand the practical difficulty, but it is a rule in the government departments that

the government servants cannot approach the members of parliament, though they are elected by them..

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is what he is saying is that here he is representing them.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the Members of Parliament also represent the government servants.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how he could represent them unless and until they approach him.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it is all over the world.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he (Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi) is saying is that the government servant cannot approach the member of parliament or M.L.A. in connection with any favour such as transfer, posting etc. But that does not debar a government officer to go to an M.P. to say about the bad condition of the roads in his locality, laying of sewerage pipes, making a garden out of the MP-LAD fund. But here the rules are framed in such a manner that nobody has seen the spirit. As far as writing directly to the Chancellor or to the higher authorities is concerned, basically, the idea is not that one is debarred from writing, the idea is that it should be routed through the employer.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said here also the spirit is the same. The rules say that for the personal grievances of the employees, they cannot approach the Senate members, whereas for public grievances, they could go to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they cannot meet the higher authorities to champion their own cause, but as a community they could do it. There are some rules, in fact, they need to be amended.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they could approach the higher authorities for the public cause only and not for their personal cause.

The Vice Chancellor said that this matter is far more serious than the nuances they are talking about. They should look at the discussion that was submitted to the Committee. If the Committee had not taken cognisance of this discussion, what he could do about it. The Committee was made of eminent people. If they have decided not to do it, then he felt sorry for it.

Dr. Subhash Sharma requested the Vice Chancellor to broaden the scope of the Committee so that they could clarify the issues properly.

The Vice Chancellor said that everything was given to the Committee and no restrictions were put. He felt anguish that a Committee consisting of such senior persons, have said nothing. The members of the Committee did not take any cognisance of it. They think that this offence is like Dr. Ashu Khosla's offence. Some of the members of this Committee are also the part of the earlier Committee, which even at that time taken cognisance of these complaints i.e. Dr. Madhurima Mahajan's Complaint, Dr. Alok Srivastava's Dr. Ashu

Khosla's Complaint. They were very well aware of these things when the complaints were written.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested to make a Committee and all such complaints should go to that Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that a Syndicate Committee made up of very eminent members of the society have already looked into it. If the Syndicate wants another committee, it is fine. The governance of the University is in the hands of the Syndicate and Senate. If the Syndicate feels that only this much should be done, it is okay. His term as a Vice Chancellor would be over after four months and the members are accountable to the society on behalf of which they are the members of the governing body of this University. Do the Syndicate members have only this much responsibility?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that this matter is hanging fire for a long time and he agrees that this should be resolved long back. He also agrees personally that all the eight people did commit some offence by writing directly to the Chancellor. If the Vice Chancellor wants to resolve it, the gravity of each of the eight cases have to be decided.

The Vice Chancellor said that he just wanted to respond that there are eight person listed in the Committee. He further said that he wish to go out as in some sense he is also involved in it because serious allegation have been levelled. The Vice Chancellor said that one of members should Chair the meeting and after saying this, he left the meeting and the members requested Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi to chair the meeting in the absence of the Vice Chancellor for the rest of the discussion.

(G.S. Chadha)
Registrar

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR

Therefore, as requested by the members, hereafter Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi chaired the meeting.

Professor Anita Kaushal said that it is important to know the background of the cases.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they made the Committee for some other purpose, but the Committee did not talk about that. They just mentioned eight names and recommended to take action against them whereas they have to suggest measures so that such things should not happen in future. This was also endorsed by Dr. Subhash Sharma.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this is the 7th item and they have already formed four committees on earlier items. If they keep on forming committees like this, it would be of no use. They would just keep on discussing the reports of the Committees.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they should decide that such things should not recur.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if they are asked as a group here to decide that the gravity of case at number three is more than the gravity of number one, a graded punishment has to be given, it is very difficult and for that they have to set up a Committee to decide the gravity of the offence. Suppose somebody has made certain allegations against a person to the Chancellor and if all the allegations are false, only then the gravity is very high. To prove that all the allegations are actually false, but to prove that it will take a long time. So, he suggested that they should take it in general that all the eight people have delinquency of a kind, but writing directly to the Chancellor is wrong. They should put on record this delinquency. How to take on the delinquency is that they should apologise, if they refuse to apologise, the University authorities should put it in writing that they are cautioned to be more mindful in future with regard to such actions. To his mind, that is the mildest punishment which they can do. He suggested not to go into the details. They should resolve that these eight people did commit a delinquency by breaking the rule and writing directly to the Chancellor which they should not have done. They be asked to apologise for having done so. If they refuse to apologise within a period of fifteen days, a letter would be issued by the Registrar saying that for this delinquency they should be more mindful of the rules in future.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the idea of the Syndicate while taking a decision to form a Committee, as described by Professor Navdeep Goyal, was not to create unrest. At the same time the Syndicate was of the considered opinion that no such recurrence be there in future, but the Committee has gone into different direction. Basically they do not want that tomorrow any organisation should also say, who are they to tell them to apologise. If that, it is in view of the spirit of the Syndicate and also keeping in view the spirit of the discussion they are having, they can issue a general circular that it has been noted that some of the teachers/employees of the University are in the habit of such things.

Professor Keshav Malhotra intervened to say that the general body of PUTA had requested the Vice Chancellor not to bring such things to the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they see the report of the Committee, it shows that the Committee was given a completely different task, what they did something different. Secondly, if they have a look on the rules, these have become very old and there is no doubt in it. So, they have to revisit the rules also. The rule making body is the Syndicate. He was of the opinion that rather they should also work on these rules. Virtually, the task given to the Committee was as to how they could modify the rules so that it might not happen in future. It should also be clarified as to what has to be done and what should not be done. He read out from the minutes of the meeting Part (b) of Rule 12 which states "Direct communication to or a personal interview with a higher authority and/or members of the Syndicate/Senate without permission of the Vice Chancellor shall be treated as contravention of the discipline of the University". He said that the Syndicate/Senate members belonging to the campus face much problem because the people whom they represent are not the employees of the University. But, what happens actually, such

persons do come to them. They come only when even after repeated representations, the work is not done though there is merit in it.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the point of discussion is with regard to the eight people mentioned in the list.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is not the question of eight people. This is not in the purview of the Committee.

Professor Ronki Ram said that as has rightly been said by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi that these people have directly written to Chancellor, they may be PPUTA members, PPUTA President or PPUTA Secretary, but as a member of the University faculty, one has to abide by the rules. If someone does something against the University, he may be a Professor or Eminent Professor, the rules would apply to him. The persons who have written directly to the Chancellor, they have violated the Calendar, they should be punished according to the Calendar, the person may be anyone. It does not mean that anybody could write anything to the Chancellor as per his wishes and malign the image of the University. So, he requested that whatever punishment they wanted to give, they should decide it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra wanted to know if he, as Fellow, could write directly to the Chancellor.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they cannot write directly to the Chancellor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked Professor Ronki Ram as to why he, as Fellow, cannot write to the Chancellor.

Professor Ronki Ram requested Professor Malhotra not to digress from the issue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if he is saying something, he (Professor Ronki Ram) has termed as digress.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked as to whom he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) would like to write to which Professor Keshav Malhotra said, to the Chancellor. Shri Malhi asked as to what the Chancellor would do if they write to him. The Chancellor would send it back to the Vice Chancellor for comments.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said, so what.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said, why they do not send it through the Vice Chancellor.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said, why they cannot write directly to the Chancellor. What is the harm in it?

Dr. Amit Joshi said, why the members of the governing body would write to the Chancellor through the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said, does it mean that the persons mentioned in the list did not commit any delinquency.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they are not employees of the University. This was endorsed by several members.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a Fellow could write directly to the Chancellor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that College employees, Fellows, President PPUTA, President Non-Teaching Employees Association could write directly.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a Fellow cannot write directly to the Chancellor as employee.

Professor Keshav Malhotra while talking about a teacher said that he had given a copy of the letter addressed to the Chancellor in the office of the Vice Chancellor, but later on he was asked to tell the diary number.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if the members feel that those eight persons have not committed any delinquency, then what do they suggest.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that officially those persons have committed the mistake.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he should not ask this question to the Chairman of this Committee (Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi), he should not ask this question to the Vice Chancellor, can anybody say that prior to these eight teachers, nobody has written letter directly to the Chancellor. How they can do pick and choose. Why not these seven, why not eight earlier also?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if they have more names, bring those names also in future, but decide something on this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal reminded Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi that he has said that they could not give more punishment to other persons, than what they have given to one person. So, it means that the persons who have committed this mistake earlier, they did not take any note of that also. He asked, can they take note of that?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said, it means these people have been forced to give an apology.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested not to attach the case of Dr. Neelam Paul with this. Dr. Neelam Paul was charge sheeted and departmental enquiry was conducted against her. His simple suggestion is that after taking serious note of it, a general circular be issued.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the names of these eight people should be mentioned, otherwise there is no point.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra while opposing to the said that this would be a stigma on them.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that, that is the entire intention of punishment.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said they have done it earlier and it should not be repeated. They should issue a general circular.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that their objective is that such things should not happen in future.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal said that the eight people mentioned in the list have now become aware of everything and that is why they have tendered the apology. There is no need to ask them to tender apology again and again, it would be a wrong thing.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they cannot resolve this issue like this and requested each member to give his/her view point one by one.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said in order to prevent the recurrence of such things, a general circular be issued and if they start mentioning the name of everyone, the issue would not end up.

Principal Anita Kaushal said that whatever has happened is very bad. A circular should also be sent to all the departments so that it can be brought to the notice of all the employees not to indulge in this. On being asked by Shri Malhi, she said that circular should also be sent to these eight people.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if one person has apologised and pardoned but the other persons who have not tendered the apology, they are also let off. Why the one who has tendered the apology should suffer and why his apology should stay on record for the same action.

Principal Anita Kaushal said that the quantum of punishment cannot be decided like this. On a query by Shri Malhi, she said that everybody should apologise and in addition to that a circular should be sent.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should divide the issue in two parts. The eight persons in question should be asked separately to apologise in addition to a general circular.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are two things. One, this case has not come here for the first time. This issue has also come up about 1½ year ago. Most of the cases have been settled as they have tendered the apology. So, they cannot really talk about eight people as such time and again. They cannot ask them to tender apology again and again.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked as to from where it could be ascertained as to what decision has been taken.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it is for the office to see as to what has been done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that these eight people also include Fellows.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that suppose a person has made a complaint directly to the Chancellor when he was an employee, but

during the pendency of the complaint be becomes Fellow, he then could be considered accordingly.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said there is no question in asking them to tender apology again and again.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he agrees with the general resolution that a general circular be sent to all asking them that nobody should behave like this. He questioned that out of the eight people, some people have been forced to apologise, other would be let gone, is it a fair decision or all the eight should apologise.

Principal Anita Kaushal said it is not a fair decision. It should be the same for everybody. All should apologise and then a general circular should be sent.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked specifically whether they want action against the eight persons or not.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said though action should be taken, but can they take actions against the retired employee. There would be a problem when they would discuss the cases individually.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if all of them apologise, if they do like this, then the punishment would be equal to everybody.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said it is okay, the one who has committed the mistake has to be punished. However, a Fellow can write directly to the Chancellor.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he just wanted to know their view as to whether these eight people should be punished or not.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said they cannot award any punishment. He suggested that just to wind up this issue, they should refer it to the Senate as the Syndicate is not competent to take a decision on this matter.

Professor Ronki Ram said why the Syndicate cannot decide it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the suggestion given by Shri Prabhjot Singh is quite right as the punishing authority is the Senate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he would like to decide in yes or no. If the members say, 'no', he would record 'no'.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that nothing should be done to these eight people.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi) should at least see, who are the eight persons? If somebody is working in 'Rehri Market' and his name figures in the list, do they punish him also. One is a retired Professor against whom they cannot do anything. Another is Fellow of the University and PUTA President and she is not covered under this rule. Out of the remaining six, some of them have already apologised, so what punishment can they suggest when they do not know anything as to what they have done. The

basic idea is to ensure that such a thing should not happen in future. The idea of Syndicate was also not to punish them. The Syndicate had said to revisit the rules and suggest measures so that such occurrences may not happen in future. Now they are discussing to award them punishment.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if they do not punish them now, it would continue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, let it happen.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should mention in the new resolution to be passed that the person who will indulge in such actions now, he would be punished.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that to his mind it is unfair to the future delinquent, why it should not be done for the past delinquent.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that then it should be decided on the basis of gravity of the case. All the persons cannot be given the same punishment. It is not fair to ask them to apologise, that also when one is a Fellow.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that punishment could be decided by the Senate.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked as to what punishment could be given to a retired person. What Ashok Goyal ji is saying, that is right.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should be warned not to do such things, otherwise they would be punished.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he has observed that the Committee does not do that work for which it is formed. They were discussing the matter by going ahead of what the Committee has to do. They have no jurisdiction to look into the mistakes committed by a person individually. So, selecting one person or selecting eight persons, it is one block for them. They are reviewing the work of the Committee. With this thing, he wants to mention that every time a Committee is formed, it looks like over here that they try to resolve the matter, but he thinks that they try to complicate the matters by making the Committees as it is quite visible from such committees. They do not resolve the issues, but further complicate it and rather they divide here as somebody says something and other saying something else. Now, the recommendations of the Committees when these come, they have opinion either to accept it totally or to reject it totally. They cannot say that for some persons, this is the rule and for others this is the rule, this is not possible. So, one thing is that the Committee has not done its work and this must be put on record. Secondly, they have this kind of delinquency which is happening again and again. One thing which Shri Gurjot Malhi ji has initially suggested is that they issue one circular which should go to everyone that this thing has come to the notice of the Syndicate and this would not be tolerated at all. The Committee has given the names of eight persons.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra intervened to say that he should not say eight persons, rather he should say those covered under the rules.

Continuing, Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he (Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi) should mention that the Committee has given it report. By accepting the report of the Committee, it is being said that this should not happen and it is cautioned that if some did this in future, he would be punished. At the same time, there are some counter things according to which it is said that some persons submit their complaint in the Vice Chancellor's Office, but the same are not sent to the Chancellor. Now here, there is double meaning of both the things. On the one hand they ask a person not to send any communication directly to the Chancellor and they are advised to submit their complaint in the Vice Chancellor's Office, but if the complaint is not sent to the Chancellor, what should be done. He wanted that this matter should be clinched. He is not in agreement with those who are suggesting to send this issue to the Senate. In the Senate, long discussion would take place and the same would be published in the newspapers which would just highlight the matter and nothing else. He suggested that they should issue a circular cautioning that this thing has come to their notice and seriously it has been taken on record and it shall not be repeated in future. They should at least once close this matter. The matter has taken such a big shape that one person while trying to fix another person has fixed the University. This matter is becoming a question mark on the credibility of the University. Even the Home Minister and the HRD Minister ask them as to what is happening in the University. He thinks it speaks volumes of them, the intelligence also, as to why they cannot resolve such a small matter. So, he requested to resolve the matter amicably and close it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that out of the eight cases, there are different categories, action on one case has been taken, on the other case action is being taken and some of them apologised, so they should not go into the issue of eight persons. Secondly, as regards the rules, the rules are not practical as on date and they need to be relooked also either by appointing a Committee or they should do something else.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked as to what is the resolve part of their discussion.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said one thing which has been stated by Shri Sanjay Tandon ji, that should be done.

Professor Ronki Ram said that first they should issue a general circular and relook the rules. Secondly, they have earlier circulated that those who have tendered the apology, that is okay and those who have not tendered the apology, it is must that they should submit their apology. A teacher who is also a Fellow also, there are persons who are not nominated Fellow, but are Fellow by virtue of their office such as President PUTA. So, they have also to decide what is to be done if one is a teacher as well as Fellow. He said that these are his personal views. They do not want that the peace of the University is disturbed with such things. They want that the University should run smoothly as it is the duty of the Syndicate being the governing body and they are for the governance of that. So, if they are governing body, their act in each and every respect should be for the smoothening of

the governance rather than disturbing it. They should not try to become a party of the things itself. Whatever the decision has been taken by the Committee and if it could do the job assigned to it, they as Syndicate would do it and try to ensure it. As has been said by Shri Tandon ji, people outside the University and in Delhi used ask them as to what is going on in the University. If this trend continues, they would not be able to run the University like this. If this is so, they should not hesitate to pinpoint who did a wrong thing and what sort of action should be taken. If action is to be taken with their own understanding, they are not going to harm somebody, but the person who did harm should not be allowed to go scot free.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that he is also of the view that one general circular should be issued. As regards the detail of eight persons, there is a question mark that the Committee has not done its duty as it has not determined the intensity of each case. It should not be quoted in the circular as to who has tendered the apology or not, it would put a stigma on them

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the Fellows could present their grievance in the Syndicate or the Senate and why he/she should approach the Chancellor. If the Vice-Chancellor is not heeding to any grievance, a Fellow could present that issue in the Senate. Since the Fellows are the members of the governing body, why they should write directly to the Chancellor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that why Dr. R.K. Mahajan had written to the Chancellor.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he had written as a public man. If 5 persons have tendered the apology, why the remaining persons have not done so. The remaining persons should also tender the apology. It is must and it would restore the respect of the Vice-Chancellor. So, a general circular be issued. They could not punish the persons.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that tendering an apology is also like a punishment.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that any representation should be given to the Vice-Chancellor to forward the same to the Chancellor. There is a rule in the Panjab University Calendar that if anybody wanted to write to the Chancellor, the letter has to be routed through the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired that if the Vice-Chancellor does not forward, then what to do.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the Vice-Chancellor does not forward the letter, then a reminder could be given.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired whether a person could send a copy directly to the Chancellor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that advance copy could be sent.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan also said that copy could be sent mentioning that since the Vice-Chancellor has not forwarded the letter twice, that is why one is writing to the Chancellor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to where it is mentioned so in the Panjab University Calendar.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that according to him, in the point raised by Shri Sanjay Tandon all the aspects have been covered. They are wasting too much time. Dr. Subhash Sharma had rightly said in the starting that the matter should be concluded and a general circular be issued. Shri Sanjay Tandon has clearly specified that when they are saying that the Committee has not performed its duty properly which was assigned to it, then what they are discussing. On the one hand, they are saying that the Committee has not done its job while on the other they are asking the persons to apologise. He suggested that a general circular should be issued. Secondly, they could not put a restriction on a Fellow.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it is not a question here.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is a question here as the name of a Fellow appears in the list.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that does it mean that those persons are not guilty.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is not an issue of guilty, they do not have the jurisdiction.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha pointed out that by such cases, the image of the University is being tarnished. Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has got an opportunity to solve the issue and he should try to solve the issue with a broader mind. As Shri Sanjay Tandon has said, a general circular be issued. Secondly, what Professor Navdeep Goyal has said, the rules should be revisited.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that Shri Sanjay Tandon has said this also that they should resolve the issue while giving a reference of the report of the Committee. When they would cite the reference of the report of the Committee, the names of 8 persons would automatically be covered. The circular be issued citing the report of the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Dr. Amit Joshi has rightly and pertinently pointed out that on the one hand they are saying that the Committee has not performed its duty and simultaneously they are saying that after accepting the report of the Committee, they are doing this. So, that would be contradictory. Keeping in view the spirit of the discussion of the last Syndicate in which the Committee was appointed and also today's discussion, only a circular be issued that the Syndicate has noted that the rule contained in the Panjab University Calendar is being violated by the teachers/employees of the University regularly and after taking serious note, it has been decided to communicate to all the teachers/employees that no such violation of the rule from today would be viewed seriously. That is the only thing that they have to do.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired whether this would carry any weight in the eyes of law.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it would.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if they are not punishing anyone, there would be violation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now comes the question of punishing. Let them see practically whether they could punish all these 8 persons which have been pointed out by the Committee. He has already told that two persons are already out of this rule, i.e., one is a retired teacher and another is a Fellow.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that Shri Ashok Goyal is saying that two persons are out but some other members are saying it is not so.

Shri Ashok Goyal, Dr. Amit Joshi and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that who says so.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if a person writes directly as a Fellow, it would mean that he/she is writing to the Chancellor for a general grievance. But if someone sends his/her own grievance, then he/she is an employee. The second aspect needed to be deliberated. That is why he wanted that the rules needed to be relooked into.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Dr. R.K. Mahajan had applied for some and he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) was also eligible for that. Dr. R.K. Mahajan wrote to the Chancellor as he was not an employee and the Chancellor redressed his grievance. Does it mean that he being an employee and a Fellow could not write directly?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the rules as it is today, the Fellows are not covered. But what Professor Navdeep Goyal says that if they have to cover them also to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is not so as nothing is mentioned about the employee who is also a Fellow. He said that a general circular has to be issued.

Professor Ronki Ram wanted to know as to what should be done if a person is an employee as well as a Fellow.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that a separate agenda be brought on this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a separate agenda item whether the Fellows working in the University could be covered under the rules be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that a separate item to revisit the rules be placed.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested Shri Ashok Goyal to draft the language of the circular to be issued. Shri Ashok Goyal said that it could be written as that the Syndicate has taken serious note of frequent violation of the rules by the teachers/employees. So, after

taking a serious note, the Syndicate has reiterated that if this rule is violated in future, serious view would be taken.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that his poser remains as to what they have done with the report.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they are not in a position to go into the tenets of the report. They could talk about generally but not about any particular individual because individual cases have not come on the table of the Syndicate. They are only saying that the Syndicate had appointed a Committee for this purpose which has submitted its report and after going through the report, the Syndicate's decision is that violation of the rules of the Calendar has happened by the staff of the University. Henceforth, this shall be taken very seriously and the teachers/employees are advised not to commit such errors. After doing this, they should put a lid on the matter. If they open the report in detail, then number of things would go helter-skelter.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that what Shri Sanjay Tandon meant to say is that the report of the Committee was put up to the Syndicate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that there should be no mention of the report of the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal also said that the report of the Committee should not be mentioned.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they are not mentioning the names. The report of the Committee headed by Professor D.V.S. Jain was put up before the Syndicate which deliberated on the report very carefully and it took serious note of the frequent violations of the rules by the University staff in this regard and decided to direct the Registrar to reiterate these instructions to the University staff once again with a clear direction that any violation of these rules in future would be taken very seriously.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is okay. The rules have also to be revisited. There is a provision everywhere globally that one has to route any letter through a proper channel but nobody could stop anyone from sending an advance copy.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that this could be considered at the time of framing the rules.

After completion of the discussion on this item, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi vacated the chair and thereafter the Vice-Chancellor rejoined to chair the meeting.

RESOLVED: That the report of the Committee dated 18.12.2017 was put up before the Syndicate which deliberated upon it very carefully and took serious note of the frequent violations of the rules by the University employees in this regard and decided to direct the Registrar to reiterate these instructions to the University employees once again with clear directions that any violation of the rules in future would be taken very seriously. A general circular be

issued to all the employees to refrain from writing directly to the Chancellor.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Committee to revisit these rules and make suggestions

(Parvinder Singh)

(Gurjot Singh Malhi)
In the Chair

Case of Dr. Gaurav Verma with regard to study leave

8. Considered the deferred item No.38 of the Syndicate meeting dated 24.02.2018 relating to the re-consideration of the case of Dr. Gaurav Verma, Assistant Professor (now Associate Professor), Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, with regard to his study leave, with pay, already granted to him w.e.f. 1.9.2014 to 31.8.2015, for availing "Raman Fellowship" awarded by UGC, pursuant to the audit observation.

NOTE: 1. Dr. Gaurav Verma was granted study leave without pay for a period of one year w.e.f. 1.9.2014 to 31.8.2015 for availing the said Fellowship as he was getting financial assistance to the tune of \$3000 per month.

2. Dr. Gaurav Verma vide application dated 27.6.2016 (**Appendix-XIV**) requested for converting his leave without pay to with pay as per UGC letter No. F-16/2012 (PS) dated 7.6.2013. His request was considered by the leave case committee in its meeting dated 25.5.2016 wherein it was recommended that leave already granted to him be treated as study leave with pay under Regulation 11(I) at page 140-143 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007 (**Appendix-XIV**) and UGC letter No. F-16/2012 (PS) dated 7.6.2013 (**Appendix-XIV**). The recommendation of the leave case committee were approved by the Syndicate meeting dated 31.7.2016 (Para 8) (**Appendix-XIV**).

3. The Under Secretary, UGC vide letter February 2013 (**Appendix-XIV**) addressed to the Registrar, Bangalore University has written that keeping in the view of high cost of living and financial difficulties being faced by the Indian scholars going abroad or study leave, the UGC has decided to revise the existing guidelines relating to grant of study leave.

The revised guidelines for grant of study leave issued by the UGC vide letter dated 7.6.2013 have been adopted by the Senate at its meeting dated 29.09.2013 (Para XX) (**Appendix-XIV**).

4. One of the clause i.e. (vii) of Regulation 11 (I) appearing at page 141 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 reads as under:

The amount of scholarship/fellowship or other financial assistance that a teacher granted Study Leave has been awarded, will not preclude his being granted Study Leave with pay and allowances but the scholarship etc. so received shall be taken into account in determining the pay and allowance on which the Study Leave may be granted.

The following guidelines may apply while determining and admissibility of pay and allowance where financial assistance is received by a teacher is:

(a) \$ 10,000 or above per annum — leave shall be granted without pay;

(b) \$ 5,000 and above but less than \$ 10,000 per annum — leave on half pay;

and

(c) Below \$ 5,000 per annum — leave with full pay

5. It has been mentioned in the revised guidelines that the amount of scholarship/Fellowship shall not be linked to the recipients pay/salary paid to her/him by his/her parent institution. The awardee shall be paid salary for the entire duration of fellowship/scholarship provided of course s/he does not take up any other remunerative jobs like teaching in the host country.
6. The audit has observed that approval of competent authority under Regulation 31 (I) Vol.-I for making amendment in the leave regulation for grant of study leave be added. As per Regulation 31(I) of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007 at page No. 12. The Senate with the sanction of the Govt. may, from time to time make regulation consistent with this act to provide for all matters relating to the University.
7. A per above audit observation Regulation 11 (I) required to be amended in view of the revised guidelines of the UGC issued vide letter dated 07.06.2013 for which the matter is required to be placed before the regulation Committee in view of Regulation 24 (b) appearing at page 33 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 and is being processed separately, however amendment of Regulation would need approval of MHRD.
8. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

9. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 38) (**Appendix-XIV**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

The Vice Chancellor while giving a brief background of the case said that the Government of India has a very prestigious scheme and as per that scheme the Universities would give them leave with pay. Most of the Universities have accepted this and they forwarded their applications, they committed that they would subscribe to the scheme and so somebody got the fellowship. The fellowship amount is actually very meagre i.e. to the tune of three thousand dollars a month. Today only, they have approved a case for doing International M.Sc. in Nanoscience and the scholarship in that case is fifteen thousand euros and in USA it is thirty six thousand dollars for Raman Doctoral Fellowship. But whatever has been written in their Calendar are so old that these have lost their relevance. They have not changed it ever and now it has no meaning now and it is very difficult to change the Calendar so easily.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should not do it only for one person. There are some other persons who have not been given leave with pay and they are also representing. If they have to do it, they should do it for all.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested to approve the case of Dr. Gaurav Verma now. However, he also supported to approve other cases together.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said there are other persons also. He knows one of them i.e. Shri Rajesh.

The Vice Chancellor said that then they should do it for all.

Shri Ashok Goyal also requested to approved this if the case comes to him (Vice Chancellor).

The Vice Chancellor said that it could not be done even if he approves it because the R.A.O. would again raise an objection.

It was informed (by the Finance & Development Officers) that it requires amendment in regulation and without amendment the audit is not going to admit it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not true. To his mind it is as per the revised guidelines of the UGC. They have already revised it. The Vice Chancellor is right that most of their regulations have lost their relevance. It is their fault that they do not amend the regulations and if they amend, they send them to the MHRD but these regulations do not come back after approval. But they have already taken a decision that in such like cases, a decision can be taken if regulations for amendment have been sent. These should be implemented in anticipation of the approval of the Government, specially such kind of academic decision which has already been taken. He said, let they start the process of amending the concerned regulations in view of the regulations of the UGC, send it to them. In the meantime, the R.A.O. has also said that it required approval from MHRD. They feel satisfied every time whatever/whenever UGC sends, they advise them to bring the necessary amendments in the statutes of the University. They adopt the amended statutes, but they do not

get back the relevant amended documents from the MHRD. Then, they get into a fix whether they should follow the existing regulations or the regulations which are to be amended. It means the fault lies with them because they did not amend the regulations from time to time. In such a situation, the RAO would say that he is not concerned with what the UGC says about it. They can say that they have adopted the revised guidelines of the UGC and after adopting, the process of amendment of regulations and approval from the Government is on and in the meantime, the Syndicate has sanctioned the leave. Do they think that RAO will not do it to which the F.D.O. said that he cannot say.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should take the case of both the persons together.

It was informed (by the F.D.O.) that they put it before the R.A.O. on the basis of that notification of UGC only. But all their regulations are not based upon UGC regulations. They have certain regulations which are not in line with the UGC regulations. So, they cannot do things in a selective manner. They have to adopt the UGC regulations in toto and amend their all regulations accordingly, but that is not the case. On a question, the F.D.O. said that they can have one line regulation. They can replace the leave regulations with one line that leave regulations will be as per the UGC regulations as amended from time to time.

The Vice Chancellor said that leave regulations have very serious implications. The UGC has already stopped leave encashment in all universities of Maharashtra. It was done by the State Government on the direction of the UGC. The Vice Chancellor informed that his wife did not get the leave encashment in spite of the leave being due to her credit.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it is clearly mentioned in a circular of 1990 that leave would be given only to that person who attends the office for eight days during vacations. He asked, which staff member come during vacations.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that all the employees come during vacations because the admissions start ten days before the end of summer vacations.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is a circular from the UGC according to which for Raman Fellowship a person gets three thousand dollars per month and the upper limit is perhaps sixty thousand dollars. But in the P.U. Calendar there is a stipulation upto certain salary, then one cannot claim that Fellowship, perhaps it is ten thousand dollars which is very old.

The Vice Chancellor said that these provisions were made long ago and those were not enhanced.

Dr. Amit Joshi said perhaps the UGC has enhanced it to sixty thousand dollars.

The Vice Chancellor said that the R.A.O. does not agree to it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they should make amendment in the Calendar and asked whether they would like to approve leave now.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal said that they would do it but they would do it for all.

The Vice Chancellor said that his view point was they had forwarded this application and adhered that full salary would be given. One thing could be that they should not forward such applications.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to whom the application is to be forwarded to which the Vice Chancellor said, to the UGC.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the UGC asks for an NOC first regarding agreeing to their terms and conditions and they would claim on the basis of those rules and regulations. The person has to go for one year and all the terms and conditions of the UGC would be written in the NOC.

The Vice Chancellor added that it would be written that the person would be given full salary, he would be granted duty leave. They have subscribed to the scheme and after having subscribed to the scheme, they are denying the people what they have committed to do.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they have subscribed to the scheme that means that they are automatically governed by that scheme.

The Vice Chancellor said that then the R.A.O. should let it be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then they should send it to R.A.O. and since in the instant case they are governed by the scheme which they have subscribed, keeping in view the guidelines in that scheme, it has been approved by the Syndicate. They should send it to the R.A.O. and let the R.A.O. put an objection to it and then they would see to it.

It was informed (by the F.D.O.) that in this case earlier he was sanctioned leave without pay. He has already availed this fellowship. The Syndicate in the initial instance has approved this leave without pay. Now he has put in an application to convert that leave into paid leave keeping in view that UGC regulation.

The Vice Chancellor asked, what about the second person.

It was replied (by the F.D.O.) that when that case of the second person was received by him, the office did not tell whether that person has to be get the Fellowship and so he was sanctioned with pay leave at the initial stage.

The Vice Chancellor said how it was done that one person was given leave without pay and the other with pay.

It was informed (by the F.D.O.) that it was mistake on the part of the Estt. Branch.

Shri Navdeep Goyal said that that person would also not get leave with pay.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he had also pointed last time that the Estt. Branch does not do its work and push the whole work

on the Syndicate and the Senate. The Estt. Branch should give a ruling according to the guidelines of the University and a decision should be mentioned by the person concerned and then it should come as a decision making for the Syndicate or Senate as the case may be. But, what is happening here is that they work down with every decision. Every case is coming to the Syndicate and on half of the issues they constitute Committees and on the report of the Committees, they are taking further decisions. Some of the Committees are not doing the job assigned to them. But they sit here for whole of the day, spend a lot of time and apply their mind, but at the end of the day they do not reach anywhere. So, he suggested that on a case the dealing branch should suggest the possible options which could be done in that case and then everybody here may be asked as to what option could be more appropriate. The decision could be taken in five minutes and if they discuss it for an hour or more, the decision would be the same. So, he would like to say that they should save time.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that there is no mention whether these are similar cases, how many years old these cases are, what would be the financial burden on the University. There are so many things which they need to know.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that as stated by Shri Vikram Nayyar, F.D.O., he (the person in question) first got the leave sanctioned from the Syndicate and he accepted it without pay and after accepting the terms and conditions, he proceeded on leave. When he had to go, he accepted all the conditions, but after one year, after availing the leave, if one says that his case should be clubbed with another case.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said, why the concerned department did not point out as to what has been done in an earlier case of similar nature. The concerned department should itself take a decision on such cases. It is not their work.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they cannot reopen cases like this. He had accepted certain conditions of the job at that time. He was given leave without pay and he had accepted it. Now they cannot reopen it without any purpose.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the circular was issued after his case but it was to be applicable from the back date.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the circular was already there as it was received in 2013.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said the circular received afterwards is not applicable.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that 3000 dollar is quite a sufficient amount.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the present times, 3000 dollars per month is not a sufficient amount.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said then even the amount of 10000 dollars is not sufficient.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi to understand that the person is married and with family and nobody could survive with 3000 dollars amount.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that then he should not have accepted the leave.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he was not forced to go.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested the Vice Chancellor to take any decision which deems fit to him.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is just telling them that in most of the Universities in the country, people would have been given leave with pay for this. If they cannot give leave because of their technicalities, it is fine.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested the Vice Chancellor to take any decision and they authorise him for this and they are with him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would just like to bring to the notice of the House that it is not reopening of the case. This case has already been dealt with by the Syndicate, not only Syndicate but by the Senate also.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that his question is that this case relates to the year 2014. He does not know whether there are other cases of 2008, 2007 or 2006 and how many would come in future. Let they should not reopen the past cases, but they should tell him what is going to be the total financial burden on the University if all the hundred cases are reopened. He must know because he is responsible for the university finances.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the Estt. Branch should say that there are no other such cases.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that tomorrow they would go to the Punjab Government begging money.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that as per the UGC norms they cannot give leave without pay.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it is a question to be seen later on, but first they should see whether they have money to pay.

The Vice Chancellor read out the UGC guidelines in this regard available at page 144 of the agenda papers which states that "UGC letter No.1-6/2012(PS) dated 7th/11th June, 2013 pertaining to revised guidelines for grant of study leave to University and College teachers (adopted by University Syndicate on 27.07.2013 (Para-11) and Senate on 29.09.2013 (Item C-22 on the agenda) provides that....when a teacher is awarded a scholarship or stipend (by whatever nomenclature used) for pursuing further studies leading to Ph.D./Post Doctoral qualification or for undertaking research projects in higher education institution abroad, the amount of scholarship/fellowship shall not be linked to the recipient's pay/salary paid to her/him by his/her parent institution. The awardee shall be paid salary for entire duration of fellowship/scholarship provided of course she/he does not take up any remunerative job like teaching in the host country". Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor said that this is what the UGC says.

In this background, Dr. Ramesh Kataria, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry was granted Raman fellowship for Post Doctoral Research at University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA. Dr. Kataria's case was approved in this background. Since Dr. Kataria was paid full salary, so Dr. Gaurav Verma would legitimately claim why he was denied salary.

Dr. Amit Joshi and Dr. Mahajan requested the Vice-Chancellor to approve the case of Dr. Gaurav Verma and other similar cases, if any, to which the Vice Chancellor said, okay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that for this kind of expenditure, he thinks that they should not bring in any financial liability because the University is basically meant for this only and that is why the UGC says that irrespective of the fact, the whatever salary a man is getting, he should be sent.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired as to when this rule came into force.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that this rule came in 2013 and it has also been adopted by the Syndicate and Senate in June. He pointed out that the main issue involved in this case that he had accepted leave without pay before proceeding on leave.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that this is not the case, actually he was not aware of it at the time of proceeding on leave.

Dr. Amit Joshi countered by saying that he was very well aware of it. He said that the Raman Fellowship form is filled online and it has not hard copy and it has been mentioned there that the person concerned would get full salary to which Shri Ashok Goyal did not agree. Dr. Amit Joshi said that this could be verified from the website itself.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it might have been written by the UGC, but their regulations say something else that the salary would not be paid.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that their regulations are also clear. In 2013, they had adopted the letter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that with the adoption of letter, the regulations would not change.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the regulations have not been changed in the case of Principals also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is what he is saying.

Dr. Amit Joshi said, but in that case they give extension.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that before taking any decision in such cases they should first know about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor has told that such a case has been done earlier also.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan and Dr. Subhash Sharma requested the Vice Chancellor to approve this case.

The Vice Chancellor said that the University is lucky that it is having two cases in the last four years. There are many Universities who are not having such a single case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thinks that there would not be any other case except the one which Professor Navdeep Goyal has mentioned.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan, Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu, Dr. Subhash Sharma again requested the Vice Chancellor to grant him leave with pay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the decision of the Syndicate be properly worded because it has to go to the R.A.O. and the same wording should be sent to R.A.O.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi wanted to know the amount involved in this case.

Shri Sanjay Tandon that they should arrange the required amount in the budget and then the Estt. Branch should say that there are no other such cases.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is allowed in the revised guidelines for grant of leave. Under those guidelines if they have allowed leave with pay to one person, then it could be applicable to other persons also.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said the concerned branch should check it and no other new case should be sent to the Syndicate again. They should once make a rule and the Estt. Branch should deal all the cases accordingly.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Estt. Branch should deal with all similar cases simultaneously.

RESOLVED: That the study leave without pay already granted to Dr. Gaurav Verma, Assistant Professor (now Associate Professor), Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, w.e.f. 1.9.2014 to 31.8.2015, for availing "Raman Fellowship" awarded by UGC be treated as leave with pay.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised, on behalf of the Syndicate, to take decision in other similar cases including that of Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Department of Physics.

**Request dated
12.06.2017 of
Officiating Principal,
Shri Dhanwantry
Ayurvedic College and
Dabur Dhanwantry
Hospital for grant of
permission for
opening of new College
namely Shri
Dhanwantry Ayurvedic
College and Dabur
Dhanwantry Hospital,
Sector-46 B
Chandigarh.**

9. Considered deferred item No.45 of the Syndicate meeting dated 24.02.2018 relating to the request dated 12.06.2017 of Officiating Principal, Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College and Dabur Dhanwantry Hospital for grant of permission for opening of new College namely Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College and Dabur Dhanwantry Hospital, Sector-46 B Chandigarh to run certain Under Graduate/Post Graduate courses (as mentioned in the application form) for the session 2018-19.

NOTE: 1. Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College and Dabur Dhanwantry Hospital was affiliated with P.U. and affiliation was granted in the

year 1991 for BAMS course. Since, then the College had been granting extension of affiliation subject to fulfilment of conditions as pointed out by the inspection Committee(s) from time to time.

2. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 15.05/29.06.2013 while considering the letter regarding admission to BAMS and BHMS for the session 2013-14 of Director, Principal Coordinator, Centralised Medical Admissions 2013 resolved as under:

That –

- (1) the Director-Principal-cum-Coordinator, Centralized Medical Admissions-2013, Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh, be immediately written to that both Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh and Shri Dhanwantri Ayurvedic Medical College & Hospital, Sector 46, Chandigarh are no more in the list of approved Colleges affiliated to the Panjab University. Therefore, admissions to BAMS and BHMS courses be not made; and

(2) xxxx xxx

3. Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic society challenged the decision of the Syndicate by filling the CWP No. 19126 of 2013 (O&M) in the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh. The Hon'ble Court vide order 22.10.2013 set aside the decision of the Syndicate dated 15.05/29.06.2013 issued vide letter No. Misc/A-6/10140 dated 07.08.2013 with a rider that the petitioner would not make any admission till the Government of India decides the matter in favour of the petitioners. In case the order of the Government of India goes against the petitioners, the petitioners would be at liberty to challenge the same before the competent court of law and in case it is in favour of the petitioners, the Panjab University may take decision by holding statutory inspection with a week, for the year 2013-14 and pass a formal order.

4. The petitioner society filed LPA No.1915 of 2013 (O&M) and a copy of the decision dated 26.11.2013 of the Hon'ble Court is also enclosed.

5. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 13/26.09.2014 considered and resolved that the students of Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College, Chandigarh who were admitted in B.A. 1st professional in the academic year 2012-13 be allowed to appear on their respective examination/s.
6. The College has now sought permission for opening of new College and has also submitted DD No.8464567460 dated 08.06.2017 amounting to Rs.10,000/- as processing fee for affiliation.
7. The Special Secretary, Health/MER, U.T. Chandigarh vide letter dated 28.04.2015 has written that they have no objection for starting of new courses at graduate and post graduate level and also for increasing intake capacity of the institution upto 100 from 50 seats subject to the permission of respective authorities as also CCIM, Department of Ayush, Ministry of Ayush to which the College is affiliated for awarding degree etc.
8. The affiliation Committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7,8 and 9) in its meeting dated 31.08.2017 considered the request of the College and recommended that the case along with the file and previous history of the case be sent to the Syndicate for taking decision in this regard.
9. An office note containing the history of the case is enclosed.
10. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 45) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

The Vice Chancellor said that this college (Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College and Dabur Dhanwantry Hospital) used to be affiliated with them. It has long history, this college had to be disaffiliated. The College Management went ahead and got themselves affiliated to a University which is outside Chandigarh. It was pointed out that it was not actually permitted, but they had gone and done it. Now they want to come and get re-affiliated to Panjab University and in the meanwhile he has come to know that they have made some admission for which they were not authorised. Only few days ago the Dean College Development Council pointed out to him that they have admitted students for while they were affiliated to them in a manner which is highly questionable and AYUSH is questioning the Panjab University. So, in the background of all this he is not personally recommending that they should open this chapter until they have resolved their past misconduct.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked the Vice Chancellor if he could read out what AYUSH has said.

The Vice Chancellor said till the old issue is not resolved, how they could go ahead.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is very right.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that it is a Chandigarh College and asked why it should not be given affiliation.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that first they should listen what the AYUSH has said.

Shri Sanjay Tandon informed that there was another college of Homeopathic Medical College and Hospital. He discussed all this with AYUSH.

The Vice Chancellor said that this case does not relate to Homeopathic Medical College and Hospital.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he is mentioning it just in reference to the context. It happens sometime that when such colleges do not get affiliation, the AYUSH starts to close the colleges. As soon as these colleges are closed, these become a public issue and the people start approaching them. He is of the opinion that since the college is located in Chandigarh, so there should not be any problem in granting them affiliation.

The Vice Chancellor informed that the University did not disaffiliate the college, but a case was running in the Court regarding this and they themselves disaffiliated from the Panjab University and got affiliated to Guru Ravidas Ayurved University, Hoshiarpur.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the college has been disaffiliated by the Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor replied that the college was disaffiliated after that.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they sought affiliation after they were disaffiliated by the Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor said they should also see under which circumstances they were disaffiliated.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there were 2-3 issues. These kind of colleges are governed by the regulatory bodies and these regulatory bodies do approve them for affiliation, but when the team from Panjab University went there, it used to put some conditions. When it was done by the regulatory body, then Professor D.V.S. Jain there since there were complaints, and then he wrote something else and after that he got ill and his signature were got done etc.etc, and many things happened. Obviously, if a University continuously harasses someone, natural he would feel annoyed. Now, as stated by Shri Sanjay Tandon that they would like to get affiliated to this University, if they would like to come, they have to check all the things and follow the set procedure.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that a letter was written by Gurdip Singh Kalyan, Chairman, Board of AYUSH and Unani System. On being asked by Shri Malhi, the C.O.E. said that the first letter was written in 2016 to Panjab University. They have pointed out that the Panjab University has made some admission. On 16th, they got the first letter. This letter was addressed to the Registrar which was marked to the Controller of Examinations. This letter was replied in the month of July. The second letter was addressed to the Govt. Medical College because the admission was made by the Govt. Medical College from the Centralized Admission Committee. The reply was not satisfactory. The Govt. Medical College gave the reply to the Vice Chancellor. Thereafter they got another letter and the third letter they received from the same authority in February 2018. It was regarding information for official purpose regarding some ineligible candidates which are registered by the University. There was a unit of 50 students and the admission was made for 43 as per the official reply, and the 7 students, who are admitted there names are written. They have sent the data and they (C.O.E. Office) have verified three days back and the Vice Chancellor has been updated regarding this. The admission was made by the Centralized Admission Committee, Govt. Medical college, in which 41 students were admitted in B.A.M.S. Course of 2011-12 through CET Examination which was conducted by the Panjab University. The list of students has been appended here. This registration form of 41 students was sent to the Panjab University which was made by the Centralized Medical Counselling and the application proforma was received by the R&S Branch on 14th August, 2011. This is the first phase for which they have complaints. Secondly 7 students were admitted by the College Management at their own level as they were not eligible as they did not appear in the CET examination 2011 and the names of those 7 students have been given. Two candidates whose names and roll numbers have been mentioned at serial number one and two which he could supply to them, they have appeared, but they fail to qualify. The second proforma was received from the R&S Branch on 28th October. First they received on 14th October and the second on 28th of October, but the college management has mentioned same date of it i.e. 30th September, 2011. That means the office did not detect this thing, i.e., the 7 students and 41 students are at par.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it means because of this delinquency the College was disaffiliated.

Continuing, the Controller of Examinations further started reading the letter and said that mentioning the date of enrolment, i.e., 13.9.2011 as per the records of the University, no NRI student is admitted, only college management, admitted to the third year in the management quota. The College has written on the form that it is their management seat, whereas Panjab University prospectus does not specify anywhere whether there is any management seat. So, this matter has been reported to the higher authorities and the strict investigation is going on. The Vice Chancellor has ordered that this should be forwarded to the CVO.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said on the admission level issue whatever punitive action is required, it is okay, but the students who have already got admission in that college, he is of the opinion, that the Panjab University should grant them affiliation and the colleges in Chandigarh should be able to perform. As regards the students who

did not qualify the CET examination, the University should write to the college that they are not going to approve their admission.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is an alternative system of medicine recognised in India and all these things are also being welcomed by a large population of the world, outside India as well. Indian system of medicine, whether it is Unani or Ayurveda system of medicine. It is a recognised system and many people have faith in it.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked as to what they would do about the students.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the first part is the process and if the college will not complete it, then what they can do.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi also wanted to know as to what would happen with the students.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wants to submit, probably this background may not be known by the House. First of all the Panjab University never disaffiliated them, it is wrong to state that P.U. disaffiliated the college, rather as Dr. Subhash Sharma has pointed out that if the College does not fulfil the conditions, what the University could do. The University only wanted that there are some conditions which needs to be fulfilled i.e. one inspection, second inspection and thereafter the third inspection at the intervention of High Court, the inspection report was submitted in the sealed cover to the High Court and the High Court refused to give the relief. The College filed an LPA. In the LPA, in fact, they pleaded that they wanted to get rid of Panjab University and that order of the High Court is also annexed at page 179 of the agenda papers. Now, because there was an issue that this college is situated in Chandigarh and they cannot be allowed to seek any affiliation from any University which is situated outside the Union Territory. Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to read what the High Court has stated in the order and he read out the last para of page number 182 which states that, "Learned Counsel for the appellant (*that is college*), in addition, submits that the appellant has also some apprehension even if he seeks affiliation with the Panjab University on account of Section 2 (k) of the said Act, which reads as under:

"2.(k) "University" means any University in India established by law and having a Faculty of Indian Medicine and includes a University in India established by law in which instruction, teaching, training or research in Indian medicine is provided"

It is submitted that the Panjab University does not have any faculty in India Medicine nor does it have an instruction, teaching, training or research in Indian Medicine and, thus, may not even be treated as a University to which voluntary affiliation can be sought under the said Act, an issue which may crop up at some stage, to be raised even by the Central Government. He, thus, submits that he would seek affiliation with a University as defined under the said Act to put an end to this controversy.

Shri Ashok Goyal further said that in the end the order states:

"The result of the aforesaid is that the appellant would exercise the option to seek such an affiliation in accordance with law and as per terms aforesaid and the controversy qua affiliation with the Panjab University comes to an end because of the own stand taken by the appellant."

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that rather they (college management) went away from the Panjab University, ran away from them, in spite of the fact that this could have become a political issue at that time, this was also discussed and the Vice Chancellor had said at that time that if the college wanted to disaffiliate itself, let them go because the situation is very bad. It is one college in the country, the only college in the country which is having affiliation with two universities at a time. This college affiliated with Ravidas Ayurved University, Hoshiarpur after the option was exercised and it remained affiliated college of Panjab University also, because they have to take examination. Whereas, when the college is affiliated to other University all the existing students automatically go to the other University, but the Panjab University took the examination of these students as a special case as the students were saying that they have taken admission in Panjab University. When Baba Farid University of Health Sciences came into existence, when Ravidas Ayurved University came into existence in Punjab, when PTU came into existence in Punjab, all the exiting students were also automatically shifted to the new Universities. So, in this case also, they should have been shifted, but anyway, he thinks even now in 2018, one or two examinations, they are still conducting for those students who were admitted in 2012.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said, that is all the more reason that they should provide them affiliation so that the students who are part of the city, they are benefitted out of the affiliation within the Panjab University. That is the reason, he is taking clue out of that what he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is saying. It is for the benefit of the people in general. It is for the benefit of the students and faculty. He is saying that there is a facility which is available in the city and that should be properly harnessed to the best advantage of the residents of the city.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he fully agrees to Shri Sanjay Tandon. In fact all these words which Shri Sanjay Tandon is saying now, all those who did not want this college to go to any other University, were said and the unanimous opinion was that if this dirt goes out, let it go They could see the DVDs of those days because the students had gheraoed the administrative office. It was also for the first time in the history of the University that the University at its own expenditure had arranged beddings etc. for the students.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and some other members asked as to why the students were protesting.

Shri Ashok Goyal replied that they were not taking examination of the students because there was a Court order. Ultimately, they decided that subject to the outcome of the writ petition, the examination of the students be taken, anyway the students went away. Now, but he has told, after this has come to their notice, if still he goes ahead with its granting affiliation, that the Panjab University has been working in connivance with this college because even the Supreme Court says that if some ineligible student has been allowed to be admitted in any course and even if the degree

has been awarded, that is liable to be withdrawn and cancelled. Here, he (C.O.E.) says that it came to the notice of the University for the first time in 2016. That means they have been sitting over it since 2016. It is 2018 now, and 7 students who are not qualified to be admitted in the college have been admitted and that too under the management quota meaning thereby, they can well imagine how crores of rupees came in their hands. Now the answer to the question as to why they want to come back here, because, probably as he is not sure, there are lot of complaints against him (Shri Ashok Goyal) in person and they have put affidavits in the High Court against Ashok Goyal and they have put allegations to this extend that Ashok Goyal's younger brother was employed in that college and he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has no hesitation in saying that some of the honourable members of the Syndicate also say that Ashok Goyal is opposing this college, just because his brother was employed in that college and he was shunted out of the college service and that is why he has been opposing. He had clarified five years earlier also, let his friends know the reality. It was not that. He has been opposing this college since the first year of its affiliation, that probably is 1992 or 1993. But he corrected it to 1991 or 1992. Right from the day one, they just see if it is 1991, in 27 years period, they should just see for how many years the college has got regular Principal. For at least 20 years at least this college was run under the nose of Panjab University without Principal, without any kind of faculty. When the Panjab University tried to become strict, though he had no role in that, they filed an affidavit in the High Court that Ashok Goyal was a very powerful member of the Syndicate and Senate, he in fact has been opposing. He just want to tell this picture in other way round that his brother who was working there, they approached him (Shri Ashok Goyal) through him and Mr. Vinod Sharma of the Piccadilly group. Mr. Vinod Sharma was the President of that College. He was approached to stop opposing this college, otherwise they will be constrained to shunt his brother out. Because he was opposing, his brother was shunted out, but it did not deter him even then, from pointing out as to what the difficulties are. Thereafter, one of the Vice Chancellors, called him and offered that the college is ready to take his brother back with all the back salary for the period for which he had been out. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) asked those people who told them that he is interested in that. It happened in the presence of one of the senior members of the Senate. They said, this is what the college say. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) said that even if they want to take him (Shri Ashok Goyal's brother) back, he would be the last person to go back there. Still they reinstated him on their own and then started requesting him. He said, as far as the future of the students of this city is concerned, they will not allow them to play with their future. It is not only the degree giving machine which has been handed over to them by the Panjab University. They should recruit the faculty, complete the infrastructure, impart proper training as after all it is the question of human life which is to be handed over to those doctors. Now it is something that his apprehension was right He (C.O.E.) is talking of 2011 and 2012. Is he right? Can he (C.O.E.) guarantee that there are no such illegal admission of non-qualified students prior to that and after that to which the Controller of Examinations said that they do not have such a data. That means right now they do not do. Now after this has come to their notice and this has been disclosed that it is their own prayer in the High Court that they should be allowed to go from there and in view of the fact that Panjab University does not have the faculty of Indian medicine, in view of that they pleaded and that pleading has been accepted by the Court. Are they in a position to

say that today they have got that faculty and they went to the University which is having that kind of faculty which fulfils the conditions laid down in the CCIM Act also which they were apprehending that tomorrow Central Government may question that how come they have been affiliated to the University which does not have the faculty as per this Act. Today again they are saying, forgetting everything and very surprising, this is also probably for the first time in the history of the University that a case has come for affiliation of a new college. On one side they are saying that the college is in existence for the last 30 years and here a case is coming for a new college, why, because they did not want this to be treated as an affiliated college and thereafter this has been disaffiliated on their own request and thereafter affiliated with some other University and thereafter coming back again to their University to malign the name of Panjab University. He said that he is definitely interested in the welfare of the students, he is definitely interested in imparting the education of Ayurveda, but not at the cost of maligning the name of Panjab University. After all they are answerable to the society. After having noted all these glaring facts, they cannot say to grant affiliation. It probably would be one of the rarest of the rare cases where Panjab University file criminal proceedings against this college for having admitted those students who were not eligible. Tomorrow, what is the guarantee whether somebody is 8th pass or 10th and is admitted or to be admitted in such a college. He said that an enquiry should be ordered within a time bound manner as to how the University accepted those students in their return, that too, which he (C.O.E.) says, were received into two instalments. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) the case that too under the orders of the Court, probably 30th September, 2011 was the last date, when there was a holiday in this University, the University was got opened specially to make the admissions.

At this stage Professor Ronki Ram intervened to say that there are many such cases in the University and he (Shri Ashok Goyal) should also say so strongly about them also. All cases should be taken on merit. If they put such arguments that the students has no fault and they should be given chance or this colleges is situated in Chandigarh or it is their duty to do this or that etc., this is not right. So, if they have to find a solution of the problem, they should have to treat all the cases without any disparity and the Syndicate has to take a call on it.

Shri Ahsok Goyal said he would like to thank Professor Ronki Ram for this sermon and he would keep it in mind to follow his sermons.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is very clear at page 205 (Note-2) of the agenda papers which states that

"the Syndicate at its meeting held on 15.5.2013/29.6.2013, (appendix_) while considering the letter regarding admission to BAMS and BHMS for the session 2013-14 of Director, Principal Coordinator, Centralized Medical Admissions 2013 resolved as under:

That

- (1) the Director-Principal-cum-Coordinator, Centralized Admissions-2013, Government

Medical College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh, be immediately written to that both Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Sector-26, Chandigarh and Shri Dhanwantri Ayurvedic Medical College & Hospital, Sector-46, Chandigarh are no more in the list of approved Colleges affiliated to the Panjab University. Therefore, admissions to BAMS and BHMS courses be not made;"

This was a decision which was taken at that time. The rest of the story has been pointed out by Shri Ashok Goyal. When the application came in 2017, it was also put up to the affiliation committee. He is surprised why this thing was never brought to the notice of the Affiliation Committee that this college is doing like that. If it would have been in their knowledge, probably, they would have never recommended it to the Syndicate at that time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to come to this point. He has gone through the agenda. This is also for the first time he has seen that a new college has applied for affiliation and the issue has been put up to the affiliation committee, which, in fact, is not the prerogative of the Affiliation Committee. It will go to the Affiliation Committee after the Syndicate has taken a decision to have the survey, to take the call that they intend to give affiliation and it is only after that the Syndicate appoints the Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, however, pointed out that such cases do not go to the Syndicate. He has never seen any such case going to the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a case of a new college.

Shri Sanjay Tandon asked then why that things should come to the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for survey they do not take permission of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor on behalf of the Syndicate gives this permission. It is the Vice Chancellor who marks it to send survey team. So, the Vice Chancellor using the powers of the Syndicate sends the survey Committee it never comes to the affiliation Committee to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it never comes to the Syndicate also. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal read out Section 27(2) of the Act which states "On receipt of a letter of application under sub-section(1), the Syndicate shall –

- (a) direct a local inquiry to be made by a competent person authorised by the Syndicate in this behalf;
- (b) make such further inquiry as may appear to them to be necessary; and
- (c) report to the Senate on the question whether the application should be granted or refused".

He further said that the affiliation committee comes into existence only after the inspection report is submitted. But in this case, leave aside the inspection, even the survey has not been conducted.

The Vice Chancellor said that this college has already been there. It has land and physically it has building also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, that is why, how it is a new college.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said if they say it is an existing college which was disaffiliated and now they would like to affiliate it, then it would have been a different issue. But, here they are talking to affiliate a new college.

Shri Ashok Goyal said for affiliating a new college, which has applied in 2017, the first thing which is required is the NOC from the State Government. Have they got it? They could not get it because it is not a new college. Who will give it? They just told the University that it is a new college so that the old chapter could be closed. Now, by chance the college is partially affiliated to Panjab University, the University got the complaint. It has come to their notice and he is hundred percent sure that besides this, they would find other irregularities also. Why he is pointing out? He is pointing out being the well wishers of the students only. Why any individual or a society should be allowed to play with the future of the students? Is it not the duty of the Panjab University to ensure that no set of persons is allowed to misuse the position of University or the CCIM or the society. Under these circumstances, he thinks, this item should be kept pending, the colleges already affiliated, they are already teaching the students, they are already working under some university and they have not come out even with a line of explanation that why they want to come back now from that university to Panjab University. Secondly, have they got any such Court orders under which they have gone from Panjab University to Ravidas Ayurved University, Hoshiarpur or have they got any such NOC from that University. What is the guarantee that they have not done anything hanky-panky with that university also and may be now they want to get out of that and they are coming to Panjab University. So, they are supposed to have NOC from Ravidas Ayurved University, Hoshiarpur. One of the possibility could be that what they were able to do here by admitting ineligible students here, might be they are not able to do there and that could be reason to come back to the Panjab University. They employ a retired person of Panjab University and thus they get access to the files here in all the departments, they deal the files themselves, they give the notings themselves and they get the letters dictated themselves, they type the letters themselves, which probably have become practically difficult because that university is situated at Hoshiarpur and they just cannot afford to do what they have been doing here. So, under these circumstances, first the enquiry should be conducted, besides what has been reported, if the allegations are right, he thinks the Registrar must have given the reply only after going through the record and he (Registrar) has seen earlier cases also because they remained with them only for one more year. So, they should see whether they have done anything in the session 2012-13 and also before that. He said that he should come prepared, but he does not have the record, the record is with the University. The statement of Professor Navdeep Goyal is correct. If it has gone to the

affiliation Committee, why the college branch did not tell all these things.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the question comes when this agenda is prepared, the information which Mr. Goyal has put on the table is possibly not there with most of them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said whatever he has read, he has read it from the agenda.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the background of all what he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has said, there are certain things which are not even known to them. Now the point is that it is becoming a little more subjective than an issue of the University. So, one thing is that they should delete the portion of wherever it is the personal part where he (Shri Ashok Goyal) was questioned, that should not become the part of the minutes because that thing should not come.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that it is a matter for record, a writ petition filed against Panjab University which is definitely a part of the record.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that in all fairness, they should keep that portion aside, this is his suggestion.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that he has objection to some of the Syndicate honourable members who have been preaching that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is opposing because of the this reason. He said he could tell the name of that member and also tell at what time in the evening it has been said.

The Vice Chancellor said that is not the part of the proceedings.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage and several members speaking together.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he took up this point only from the point of view of Chandigarh citizens. He does not have the knowledge what his learned friend has said. So far affiliation part is concerned that is to be dealt with by the concerned branch, they need to do the technical part of it in all fairness. But he feels that for the students of the city, for the people of the city, for the facilities which are built over here, they should be attached (with Panjab University), because he has his experience was little different with the other college in Sector-26 for which he had even talked to the AYUSH Ministry, the Minister and everyone. The students and the faculty have suffered a lot. That was the only view point and from that view point he talked about it. So far, the other technicalities are concerned, subject to their NOC from other University, they can grant them affiliation. They should try to be fair from the prospective point of view. If there are certain things which in the past they have committed, definitely as per the requirements of the University, they can punish them.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Homeopathic College and Ayurveda College must have got the land at concessional rates and they are not doing the things properly for the society.

Shri Ashok Goyal said probably, they were not given land on concessional rates. The land was cheap during those times.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that today's the rates of land are very, but 40 years ago the things were different.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that nowhere he has opposed the grant of affiliation. He is saying that while taking the decision, they should keep all these points in mind and subject to, let them complete the application along with the annexures which are required for a new college, if they are applying as a new college, i.e., NOC from the State Government. If it is already existing college which they know, it is, then let them come with an NOC from the University to which it is affiliated and come out with convincing explanation as to why they had gone earlier from here and why do they want to come back from there. May be, that can be explained that there is pressure of citizens of Chandigarh to bring it back to Panjab University, that is one of the recommendations or may be, they can say that it was not practically possible for them to deal with a University which is situated at 130 Km. from Chandigarh. Let them come with some explanation so that they could evaluate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal endorsed the view point of Shri Ashok Goyal.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the College should fulfil all the conditions.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that as stated by Shri Ashok Goyal that subject to NOC and all the conditions, the case for affiliation could be considered.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Dean College Development Council to provide a copy of the information which he has given.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that now they have mentioned about 100 seats, but the letter which the Controller of Examinations was reading, there is mention of 50 seats.

RESOLVED: That before taking any decision for grant of permission for opening of new College, the Officiating Principal be requested to obtain the NOC from the University with which the College is affiliated presently.

**Report submitted by
Shri S.S. Lamba,
Enquiry Officer**

10. Considered deferred item No. 46 of the Syndicate meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 46), if:

- (i) an enquiry Report submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba, Inquiry Officer vide letter dated 12.12.2017 (**Appendix-XV**) against Er. S.K. Sharma, SDE-II and Er. Harmandeep Singh, J.E., P.U. Construction Office with regard to allegations leveled against them in the case of purchase of furniture for boys and girls hostels (i.e. wooden beds with boxes 200 Nos. and PVC Chairs with arms 200 Nos. for an amount of Rs.13,24,000/- and steel almirahs 154 Nos. for an amount of Rs.14,93,415) and certain other discrepancies, be accepted.

- (ii) the above enquiry report is accepted, the penalty to be imposed on the delinquent officials- Er. S.K. Sharma, SDE-II, Er. Harmandeep Singh, J.E., 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 Er. S.K. Sharma, SDE-II is a Class 'A' post and Er. Harmandeep Singh, J.E. is a Class 'B' post.

As per Regulation 3.1 appearing at page 117 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the Senate is appointing authority of Class 'A' employees and the Syndicate is the appointing authority of Class 'B' 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-__).
5. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 16) (Appendix-VII–Page 238) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that five charges have been levelled out of which two have not been proved as stated by the Enquiry Officer. In this enquiry report two of the employees of the University are charge sheeted, i.e., one is J.E. and second is S.D.O. The enquiry officer gave opportunity to both of them. The S.D.O. participated in all the enquiry proceedings whereas the J.E. abstained himself from the enquiry proceedings. Rather, it seems from the agenda as if he is absent from duty for a long time. If they take into consideration his absence from the duty, was any action taken so far against him.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the issue of absence is being dealt with separately.

If a separate action is going on, it means he must be dismissed from the service as he is absenting himself from duty for the last more than one year. He is telling all this because this has relevance with the case. If they are to dismiss the person, he could be dismissed at the level of the Registrar because he is a Class-III employee of the University and this case should not have come to the Syndicate. If he has already reached to the stage of dismissal, there is no need to discuss it here. As regards the second person, i.e., the S.D.O., two charges have not been proved. The three charges which have been

proved show only negligence in supervisory duty on the part of the S.D.O. and no corruption charges are proved. The charges which have proved are regarding negligence of duty. The gauge of the almirahs was entered by the J.E. only in the Measurement Book. The S.D.O. signed it as a common practice.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that particular type of Godrej almirahs of certain specifications of thickness were supposed to be delivered and there is somebody who has to check all this.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is the duty of the J.E. to check it.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that he (S.D.O.) is also to check and ensure.

Shri Sanjay Tandon asked the Registrar as to what he proposes and what are the options with them.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that recommendation from the office must come and he asked about their recommendation.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked as to how much the total loss occurred on this account.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that nothing is known about the loss.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as regards the loss, instead of the material of 20 gauge, roughly 24 gauge was received.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked as to how much loss has occurred on this account.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the University conducted preliminary enquiry, one thing which came up from the statement of Shri R.K. Rai, XEN, was that the tender was got split. Many issues do come with the splitting of the tender. If the open tender is given for the whole material, then the rate and many other things would be different. He said that this vendor has been supplying all the material in Boys Hostel No. 8, Girls Hostel No. 7 and at P.U.SSG Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur also for about 6-7 years. It was enquired that the material supplied by him was that of low standard. The X.E.N. has stated in his statement that the almirahs and beds are normally supplied by different vendors and that is why they split the tender. But the same vendor is supplying these things for the last 6-7 years, so there is no reason to split it. Therefore, he would not like to agree with the report as there is need to check this part. It was there in the complaint that the material supplied by that vendor in all the hostels should be checked.

The Vice Chancellor said that they can say that it should be further enquired, but they cannot say that the report should not be accepted.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked the Registrar about the authority which floats the tender to which it was informed that the tender is floated by the XEN. Dr. Subhash Sharma said, but there are no

charges against the XEN and the enquiry is being conducted against the S.D.O. Why they are not holding enquiry against the XEN?

Dr. Amit Joshi while referring to page 230 of the agenda papers read out from Para-2 which states, "Though the pleas of C.O. Shri S.K. Sharma is reasonable that had the XEN cross checked the measurement, these shortcomings would have been detected". The S.D.O. is at the centre, XEN says that the J.E. has to check, but the J.E. is absconding and his whereabouts are not known. It is the supervisory duty of the S.D.O. to check. They are punishing the S.D.O., but there is no charge sheet against the XEN.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the fault of both of them is equal and the tender has been floated by the XEN. This was also supported by Dr. Amit Joshi.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that if they see the report, the Presiding officer is saying that there are three charges which are proved against these persons. As regarding the remaining two points, he is pointing the finger at the XEN. But it is not their jurisdiction, and one thing is that S.D.O. did not float the tenders.

Shri Sanjay Tandon intervened to say that they have one option is that the coverage of this enquiry may be extended and that (XEN) might be included and the point which Professor Navdeep Goyal has mentioned might be cross checked.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked the Registrar if the payment for this has been made to which the Registrar said, 'yes'.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal said that the payment was made very hurriedly.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked if the payment was made before the enquiry or after the enquiry.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that after the receipt of the bill, the bill was passed immediately and payment was made within one day.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that then there is connivance of all.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that when this case came to him, it was referred to a Committee. In a meeting, it was identified that the bill was passed within one day. He had enquired that how could this be processed so far, he got suspicious, thereafter they ordered this enquiry.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked, can this committee not enquire against the X.E.N. Does the Committee not have mandate to conduct the enquiry against X.E.N.?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that University did not level charge against the X.E.N.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that then the University should level charge against him (XEN) also.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the Enquiry Officer has mentioned about it and read out some portion of Charge No. 4 at the end of page 231 of the agenda which states,

"In view of above statement of the XEN, Sh. R.K. Rai, it is evident that:

(1) the responsibility of obtaining the security deposit amount or performance guarantee/bank guarantee or to take decision in this matter, was not of the COs, but was of the XEN or Junior Purchase Committee and COs had no role or duty in this matter."

Dr. Amit Joshi said that now they are deciding against those persons.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the other three charges are related to them.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the other three points relates to material which is not as per the specifications. He further asked as to who was to check the gauge of the material.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the gauge has to be checked by the staff and the higher officer has to endorse it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is a provision in the P.U. Calendar that the material has to be checked as per the specification by the XEN also.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that anybody at that level could do it and normally it is done by a senior officer. The senior officers, though accountable, but they just do sample checking.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that he had been in the Junior Purchase Committee about 5 years back, it is decided by the Junior Purchase Committee whether the tender is to be split or clubbed, where there is a nominee of the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is an add-on that Professor Navdeep Goyal has given this. First, let they opine whether the report is accepted or not. If they think that more things should have been enquired into, they can take a call and decide that more things should be enquired, they would then institute an enquiry.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that more things should be enquired including the role of the XEN.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what is to be done with these people.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the Enquiry Committee was set up and it has given its report. In the report, the Committee has held two people guilty who have actually verified the gauge and signed. Now if it is to be seen that somebody else who should also have to sign, it is a different thing. But these two people have signed and they have signed wrongly. These people definitely need to be punished and there is no doubt about it in his mind. Secondly, it is also a very valid point that the furniture of other hostels should also

be checked. They should expand the scope of enquiry and similar kind of purchases in other hostels should also be checked. If the XEN is guilty for Point No.1 and 5, then they should frame the charges against the XEN too. These three things have to be done, one the people who have been identified need to be punished, two, the scope of enquiry has to be expanded, three, the XEN has to be charged with the charges mentioned at Point No.1 and 5. He thinks that three things need to be done.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the XEN is also liable for Point No. 2 also.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has mentioned about the two persons, but the third person, i.e., Shri R.K. Rai has also signed the measurement book. So, all the charges which have been levelled on the S.D.O. should have been applicable on the XEN also which was also endorsed by Dr. Subhash Sharma. Continuing, Shri Prabhjot Singh asked this would mean that the enquiry would have to be conducted again.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said, let they should not waste time. They should not say for everything to send it back.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that nobody is saying that, this is okay.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that for this lapse, the J.E. should be suspended and the S.D.O. should be issued a warning to be careful in future.

Shri Prabhjot Singh who is to be suspended?

Dr. Amit Joshi said J.E.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the J.E. is already absent from duty.

Dr. Amit Joshi said if the J.E. is absent, then dismiss him from the service and the S.D.O. should be warned.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when he is talking about the building, there is one thing which needs to be found out and to his mind, overall it is very important. They should know whether only these three people were involved or there were some more persons were there and how many of them were common. Who were the common people involved in it, this is very important to know.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that after finding out these things, only then the gravity would be known. There might be possibility of negligence, but if some other persons are also involved, then there could be no negligence.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said they should definitely accept the report, but as far as punishment is concerned, the person who has to check and write the Measurement Book in the last, has a bigger role and there is no doubt in it. As regards the involvement of the S.D.O., if there is the same team at every place, then it is very serious and then the punishment should according to

that and if it is not like that, the punishment should be according to that. So, they could accept the report and enquire the other things as pointed out by him and decide as to what has to be done because they cannot punish a person twice for the same offence.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this could bring the gravity to the fore.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if they are to enquire the matter again, it would not mean that the enquiry would become redundant. This enquiry report would stay. If they would expand the scope of the enquiry, it would give them a complete picture.

Dr. Subhash Sharma while agreeing to the view point of Professor Ronki Ram said that only then they would be able to decide the punishment.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that there is a difference. This delinquency has been established today. But that delinquency about which they are talking might take one year, two years or three years more. In the meantime this fellow would continue to be eligible for promotion and other benefits. This should not accrue to them once he has been found guilty. They cannot leave people, this is a very serious offence. Either the person has misjudged the things deliberately or incompetently, either way it is a very serious offence. So, it has been established that he has done it. Now he would be guilty in nine more cases, but it does not mean that they should leave him. If this case is proved that he is punished and they find it that he is guilty in nine more cases, they can always punish him for those nine more cases. That is not the point that they have to take his past conduct also into consideration to punish him even more. For that reason he is not going to escape. But for this one case, he must be punished, otherwise what is the point of holding the enquiry and wasting their time.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked to what punishment they can impose for such a negligence.

Dr. Amit Joshi while talking about the punishment, he referred to the enquiry report at page 230 of the agenda.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that theft is theft, it may be of Rs. 5/- even, it is immaterial.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said there is difference in theft and corruption and they have to understand the difference as there is separate punishment each for negligence and corruption.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said if a person does not know about the gauge, then the person is incompetent. They have to call a spade a spade. They cannot hide things all the times under the table.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said it would not be fair to put a person behind bars for a small negligence and the others should be let free.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he is not saying so.

Principal Anita Kaushal referring to the major and minor penalties mentioned in the Panjab University Calendar.

Dr. Amit Joshi while referring to the enquiry report said that in that report it has been written that two persons are involved one is Mr. Harmandeep Singh, J.E. and the second is S.D.O. They have to decide the punishment of these two persons.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi intervened to ask as to whose signatures are there on the form to which it was told by Dr. Amit Joshi and Dr. Subhash Sharma that there are signatures of the J.E., S.D.O. and X.E.N.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that then all the three have to be punished.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they must have to go as per the report which has been submitted. If they have to accept the report, they have to accept this report only.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they can always accept a report with modifications.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they cannot go over and above the report. Either they have to accept the report or not. They must go through what is written in the report. While referring to the report at page 230, he said it is written that "though the plea of charge sheeted officer Shri S.K. Sharma is reasonable".

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he should also read the final conclusion given at the last of the report which says that the charges number 2, 3 & 5 stand fully proved. So, the matter ends, why they get into the analysis. The conclusion is important for them.

Dr. Amit Joshi said the decision which they have taken in the Syndicate not to record the decision, it should be taken back and proceeding should be recorded. They have experienced this just now. Because if they just read the resolved part only, then nobody would see as to what has been written in the discussion part.

The Vice Chancellor said, okay, don't take a decision.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the discussion must be recorded, otherwise, he requested to record his dissent.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members do they want to study the case, form a sub-committee and then to come back to discuss the issue.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he is of the opinion that there should not be a Committee just for a small thing.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not a small issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said somebody's future would spoil and it has become a small thing for them.

The Vice Chancellor said, what is at stake is the public property. He said that he has seen this and he has also pointed out this thing as to what has been purchased. He has himself checked everything in Hostel No.10.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked if any payment to the supplier has been made after the enquiry.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that first of all they should blacklist the supplier.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that has been done, but that has also not been done in a proper way. When he was blacklisted, the same was never circulated even to University departments with the result that nobody could know about it and he continued his business. These things came to light later on when the preliminary enquiry was held. At that time it came to their notice that this person is blacklisted and the same was not circulated. He was blacklisted for three years.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is consensus of all the members that, (i) action be taken against the J.E. (ii) to bring the X.E.N. in the purview of enquiry and (iii) action should be taken against the supplier. The only issue where there is some difference is regarding punishment to the S.D.O. There is consensus on three things and the issue regarding punishment to S.D.O. could be discussed and the issue should be closed. So, there is no need to constitute a Committee.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. Subhash Sharma asked the Registrar as to what punishment he would recommend.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that a total of around Rs. 28 lacs something damage has been done. The charge has been proved that these two people are guilty. The Enquiry Officer has very evidently stated that both of them are responsible.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked as to what is the recommendation.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that they have the provision under the minor penalties to have recovery from pay or the whole or part of any pecuniary loss caused to the University by negligence or breach or orders.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked as to how much is the total loss to which the Registrar said that it is about Res. 28 lacs. Dr. Sharma further said that it is the amount for which the material is purchased, but he would like to know the loss.

The Registrar said that it would be worked out.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the loss could be about 2 lacs only.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the loss could be even less than 2 lacs.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that as stated by Dr. Subhash Sharma that there is consensus on three points and the only issue where there is some difference is that of the S.D.O. The S.D.O. has relied upon the work of the J.E. and that could be considered. The Registrar could issue him a letter to this effect.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the recovery could not be imposed on one person, it has to be imposed on all the three persons.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi suggested that the recovery to be made from them should be distributed and the S.D.O. be issued warning.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said they could distribute the recovery among the three persons only when they would charge sheet the X.E.N.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said who would calculate the recovery to which Shri Malhi said it is the duty of the office.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that X.E.N. should also be added to make the recovery.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said as to how they would recover from the JE who is absconding.

Shri Prabhjot Singh and Dr. Subhash Sharma said that what they are talking is not practically possible. Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the J.E. is absconding and is on without pay leave, the case of his dismissal is also running, how would they recover the amount from him.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said something like pension, gratuity etc. would be due to him.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that he has rendered only 4-5 years job and he has nothing to take from the University.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said if it is so, then leave him. The recoverable amount could be divided into three parts. Two parts could be recovered from the other two persons.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they could divide the recovery at the same rate from all the three as one person might be getting twenty thousand salary and the other fifty thousand.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the fault of every person is different.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that if a mistake is committed by a Clerk, there is Assistant Registrar and Deputy Registrar above him, then how they could hold the Controller of Examinations for such a lapse. Here, it is basically the duty of J.E. The work is done on faith. If the things go on like this, then they would not be able to do any work and it would mean that for everything the Chief Secretary would be responsible. The X.E.N. and S.D.O. are supervisory posts. He said that the Syndicate could decide anything whatever they like, but in

the hierarchy, it is the duty of the J.E. It is not possible for the S.D.O. and the X.E.N. to check each and everything.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the order for purchase of material is given by the XEN and not by the J.E.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that they can prove that part, but to hold all of them responsible on the basis of M.B., it is not possible. It would mean that the Chief Engineer of every department is culprit.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said if the S.D.O. has signed the measurement book, then it becomes his responsibility also, otherwise there is no need of his signature.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that it is the responsibility of the immediate head. While citing about a case of his own colleges, he said that though the embezzlement of the Principal could not be proved, but due to his negligence, the case is still on.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if the S.D.O. is signing then he has the responsibility, otherwise there is no value of his signatures. Then why they get the signatures of the S.D.O.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that many frauds do occur in banks, does it mean that the all the persons in the bank are responsible.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that the S.D.O. should be warned, what they would get if they recover the amount.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the scope of enquiry should be extended to the X.E.N. also, the termination letter of the J.E. should be issued. As regards the S.D.O., a warning letter should be issued, till the final enquiry is closed against the X.E.N.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that recovery should be made.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked in what proportion the recovery would be made.

The Vice Chancellor said that the J.E. would be removed.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked suppose there is loss of Rs. 1 lac., then in what proportion the recovery would be made. He further said if they say that there is loss of Rs. 1 lac., the recovery from the J.E. also would be determined in proportion. They cannot recover the whole amount from one person.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the S.D.O. has not checked at all and if this is the kind of checking that the officers have to do which they are not doing, how they can get away.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they cannot recover the portion to be paid by the J.E. from the S.D.O.

The Vice Chancellor said that if he has done the things which has caused loss, these people should not get away to which Shri Gurjot Malhi and Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they are not saying that they should be allowed to get away.

The Vice Chancellor said that when the J.E. has not done his work, he has also caused the loss. Both of them should pay.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the X.E.N. should also pay because he has also done his signatures.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that rather more should be charged from the XEN as he is the person who has floated the tender.

The Vice Chancellor said that the role of the XEN has also to be probed and let the charge against XEN come here as proved. Right now what they have got as proved is only against these two people.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said by not enquiring against the XEN, they are saying that the whole amount be recovered from S.D.O.

The Vice Chancellor said, are they trying to say that due to technicalities, should they let everybody go away.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he is not saying so, but let the role of XEN be probed and after having it proved, the amount be recovered.

The Vice Chancellor said that they cannot wait for the charges to be proved against the XEN.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said then how they could recover the whole amount from the S.D.O.

The Vice Chancellor said, then leave them.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said, why to leave. They did not conduct enquiry against one person. Now, how they could make recovery from one person.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested the Vice Chancellor to tell about his recommendations.

The Vice Chancellor said that his recommendation has no meaning, these are the matters of argument. He has no recommendation, he is one of them.

Professor Ronki Ram said that how the Vice Chancellor could give the recommendation as he is chairing the session.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that whatever is being done, it is done on the basis of the Enquiry Report. If there are some arguments, these on the basis of enquiry report.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are the government and requested that they should decide and he is not the ruling party.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that let first they fix the charge against the XEN and then they would decide the punishment. Since they are not deciding about the major culprit, then how could they punish the other persons.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he does not agree with it and the SDO should be punished.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the SDO could be punished only when the charges against the XEN are framed. If they let off the major culprit and punish the other person, what is this argument.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if they take the point that the money involved is immaterial, then why they are making the recovery.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they are not letting off the SDO but a proper enquiry be conducted and whoever is responsible, should be punished.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the charges against the persons have already been proved. First, this chapter has to be closed.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that then the enquiry committee be rejected as it has not completed its task.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that in the report it is clearly mentioned about the XEN that if the XEN would have cross-checked the measurement, these shortcomings would have been detected before accepting the goods.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that it is mentioned that because of the above admitted facts, Sh. S.K. Sharma CO cannot escape his responsibility for accepting the goods.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that nobody is saying that the persons should not be punished, that is a unanimous opinion. Somebody is saying that the persons should be punished later but he is saying that the punishment should be given today itself. It is the only difference. They suggest that the scope of the enquiry should be enlarged to other hostels including the XEN. Secondly, in the case of J.E. if he is absent, he should be dismissed. In this case, these two people are guilty and have to be punished and they all have to decide about the punishment whether it is warning or some other thing. But the persons have to be punished today itself but not later. Thirdly, they have to make the recovery and it has not to be effected only from these two persons but the XEN also.

Professor Anita Kaushal said that they could stop the increments or further promotions.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan suggested that an FIR be lodged against the supplier.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that there is no such negligence that the increments should be stopped. They could make recovery of the amount involved and that has also to be recovered in equal share from all the three persons after calculating the loss.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now the Committee has not proved anything against the XEN, then how could they give the punishment.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that at the moment, the recovery be stopped and punishment be imposed on both the persons found guilty.

The Vice-Chancellor suggested that let first they expand the scope of the enquiry. He enquired whether there is unanimity on it, to which most of the members said, 'yes' but Professor Keshav Malhotra said, 'no'.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has no hesitation in saying that while taking decision, they could not be emotional. They could not lose track of what the loss is, they are bound by law. First of all, they have to see as to what is the item before them. The item is to decide the quantum of punishment or penalty. That means whether the report is accepted or not, that is afterwards, but let they decide the quantum of punishment.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that the item is to consider if the enquiry report be accepted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that do they know that the Syndicate is not empowered even to discuss the comma (,), full stop (.) of the enquiry report relating to the SDO. What are they doing? It is the Senate and if what is being recorded goes out in the public, they could not just punish this man. They are denying the Senate the independent application of mind while deciding to accept the report and while deciding on the quantum of punishment. The Syndicate is nobody to take the decision, it could take the decision only in the case of the J.E. But the discussion has been started for the SDO. He did not want to discuss anything about the SDO. Very pertinent issue has been raised as to why the XEN has not been charge sheeted. This fact has also been brought to the notice by Shri Prabhjot Singh that on the same M.B., XEN's signatures are also there. Then how he has been left. That could be cleared only if the Syndicate is provided the report submitted by the CVO who was assigned the duty to conduct an enquiry. How the CVO has left the XEN untouched who, in fact, is responsible for floating the tender and for signing the bills for payment and other things. How that man was spared and how on the basis of that Committee, only two persons have been issued the charge sheet? The Enquiry Officer is not at fault at all because he was given enquiry or charge sheeting only of two persons. But despite that the Enquiry Officer seems to have called the XEN and to his surprise he (XEN) has been called as the witness of the University to establish the charges against the charge sheeted officers, the one against whom they are alleging as to why he has been left untouched, he has come as prosecution witness or the witness of the management to establish. Then there is another witness of the Management, i.e., Finance and Development Officer (FDO) and the FDO has completely deposed, he did not want to talk about the merits of the enquiry report as he has said that it is not the prerogative of the Syndicate. No recommendation could be made by the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar. The report of the CVO on the basis of which the two officers have been charge sheeted, that should be supplied to the members of the Syndicate or as the Vice-Chancellor has suggested that a Committee would be constituted, then the picture would be clear. Another thing which needed to be looked into is that while the charge sheet has been issued on the basis of the Chapter relating to the University works which relates to Construction Department of the University and everybody understands what the University Works

mean. But the deposition of Finance and Development Officer before the Enquiry Officer is under a different Chapter, that is Procurement of Goods and Services. The job of Procurement of Goods and Services is not performed by the Construction Department. Construction Department is related only and only to the University works and the works which did not relate to Construction Department, how they were asked to float the tender. The Finance and Development Officer while depositing, according to him, nothing is written, he did not know whether it is inadvertently or consciously, in the Enquiry Report a rule has been mentioned under the Procurement of Goods and Services while the whole charge sheet is based on the M.B. and M.B. is not part of the Procurement of Goods and Services. M.B. is the part of the University Works. The charge sheet itself is not foolproof that the Enquiry Officer has also not gone into the details and the Enquiry Officer stopped short of saying that it is recommended that the XEN should also be booked. He has only said that if this would have been checked, the fault could have been detected. He did not know as to why the CVO has not talked about the XEN. He pointed out that a thing which is off the record is that everyone has a soft corner for the SDO. Why it is so, because as per the general knowledge of everybody that man happens to be the most sincere man in the University and he has been trapped in the technicalities. This is the belief. He is not vouching for anyone. The question is that when they have to charge sheet a person for some negligence, if it is proved, they have to see as Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has pointed out that if the integrity is doubtful, then they have to take it in different terms. If through negligence efficiency has been compromised then they have to take it in different terms. If the SDO is being booked only because he has signed, then why for the same fault, the XEN has been left untouched especially when the signatures of all the three are there on the same M.B. As far as the payment, the information which has been shared by the Registrar, is concerned, is the JE or the SDO responsible for getting the payment expedited. Who is the one who gets the payment expedited, it is the XEN. It is on the recommendation of the XEN only that the bills are raised by the accounts personnel working under him and then sends the same to the office of Finance and Development Officer or accounts whatever it is and then the bills are cleared from the main administrative office in which case neither the JE nor the SDO are nowhere in the picture. Surprisingly, people feel that how the Head of the Department who is overall responsible for everything and specifically mentioned that the SDO and the XEN both are to sign. The XEN has deposed before the Enquiry Officer saying that he is so much overburdened that he could not look into all these micro level things. Merely by saying that and could they accept, they could not accept it. If he did not believe, he could have written and why he has signed and recommending that the payment be made immediately. He could have requested the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar that these are micro level things and may be taken care of by the SDO or whatever. Why they could not take the decision right now, one is that it is not within the purview of the Syndicate. Second is to give fair opportunity to everybody. It is settled law irrespective of what is written in the rule book of the University that anybody who is charge sheeted is not allowed assistance of defence representative. However, if the Presenting Officer is a practising lawyer or a law qualified person, then he has to be given and the Enquiry Officer has to ask the person and if he does not want to be represented then there is no problem, but that is also missing. Unless and until the whole issue is looked into in its entirety, according to him, no decision should be taken in haste. They are not for the SDO, against the JE or

the XEN and they are for transparency and it should be looked as if they have taken the decision on merit after looking into all the detailed aspects of the enquiry report, the CVO report and what are the technicalities, whether they are competent to do this job, whether the University was wrong or right in assigning this job. The purchase of the almirahs is being done by different persons by adopting different method. If that was not the job of the Construction Department, why it was assigned to them. It is the job of the R&S branch. The reply to that would again be that it was going on as such for the last many years. Everybody has a right to become wiser every day. If they had been doing something wrong for so many years, then what is the sanctity of this Accounts Manual.

Professor Anita Kaushal suggested that they should start purchases from GeM (Government e-Market), it is a very nice portal which has come up.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a Committee be formed to look into the CVO reports and also see whether the scope of the enquiry could be expanded. The competence of this body is to deal with the case of JE not on the basis of this enquiry because they are postponing to after having all the details. But the Syndicate needs to know that since when he (JE) has been absenting himself from the duty and Registrar must be knowing it. What proceedings have been initiated against him till date? As far as the enquiry report is concerned, the Enquiry Officer seems to have sent the notices to the CO through registered post or so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would get the CVO reports.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that what about disciplinary proceedings against him (JE) for unauthorised absence. According to him, the absence is more than one year. Why a public notice has not been issued that if by such and such date the person does not report for duty, he would be automatically dismissed. If this information would have been provided that the person has already been terminated, then the matter would have ended here. Since they are competent to take the decision for the JE but the person is not available and for which they are not competent, they should not take a decision.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that there is a statement of the XEN, Mr. R.K. Rai that "I am also producing the original files of the purchase of material under reference of this enquiry, i.e. wooden bed boxes and steel almirahs which contain in each file,...Comparative statement of the quotation is copy M-8/11, approval of the lowest quotation by the Junior Purchase Committee". He enquired as to which is this Junior Purchase Committee. If they involve the XEN, then the enquiry would take a different direction and then it would be said that all this has been allowed by the Junior Purchase Committee. Why the Junior Purchase Committee has bifurcated the purchase?

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is additional thing that would get looked into. He said that that the report regarding three charges which have been proved is accepted. They are only deferring the further details. The Registrar has to check that if this guy (JE) is not coming, action should be taken against him. In view of the report, as they are not the punishing authority for the SDO, could they express

anguish and concern of the Syndicate that such things are happening in the University.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they could express the anguish.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could not do it and first look into all the things so that it goes to the Senate with complete details.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan suggested that an FIR should be registered against the supplier.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that on the one hand they are talking of registering an FIR against the supplier on the other they are not ready to issue a warning to the person.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that all are involved in this matter that is why the payment has been made so quickly.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if they do not have the power, then what could they recommend.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi suggested that the matter should be referred to the Senate.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that if they are not competent on the issue, then why the same has been placed before the Syndicate. He said that the Vice-Chancellor should have formed two enquiries – one against the JE and the other against the SDO.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the Registrar should have pointed out this thing at the start of the item that they could take the action only against the JE, what was the need to have so much discussion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is mentioned that the Syndicate is the competent authority for taking action against the JE.

It was informed (by the Registrar) whether the report is accepted or not, the Syndicate has to send it to the Senate.

Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested that before taking up the item, the Registrar should have mentioned that they have to take a decision on a particular part of the item. They are discussing the whole issue but later on Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that they could not do anything in the matter. Why they are discussing the issue for the last one hour? The part on which the action has to be taken should have been clearly mentioned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is the tragedy of the governing body of the University whose Syndicate changes every 12 months. By the time the members learn the process as to what is to be done and how is to be done, the term is over.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the administration is there for at least 15 years which could guide the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a member who has learnt the things, could guide. They could adopt the system of Parliament where the workshops for the newly elected Parliamentarians are organised.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the present case the charge sheet has been issued to both the persons simultaneously, the enquiry is going on and the enquiry report has been submitted of both the persons. The disciplinary authority in the case of one employee is the Syndicate while for the other is the Senate. He suggested that the charge sheet should always be issued individually and the Enquiry Officer should conduct the enquiry individually because it is possible that someone could take a defence and cross-examination is also to be done. The enquiry report should go to the competent authority. In this case, it should have been mentioned that in the case of JE the competent authority is the Syndicate and in the case of SDO the competent authority is the Senate. He suggested that joint enquiry should not be conducted so that they might not face problems.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there has to be operative part of it and they have to resolve it. In principle, do they accept the report relating to the charges which have been proved to which Dr. Subhash Sharma said, 'yes'.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that probably he has not been able to express well. They could neither accept nor reject because they are not competent to comment on this.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that they could do it for the JE.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could do nothing to the JE.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that at least the record would be complete in respect of the JE.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they accept the report in respect of the JE. This was endorsed by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Shri Ashok Goyal.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay. The remaining portion be forwarded to the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they accept the report in respect of the JE only. The enquiry has been conducted simultaneously of both the persons and the JE has not appeared before the Enquiry Committee, has not deposed, so they accept the report ex parte. If they accept the report in respect of the JE, what punishment would they impose upon him.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they are already talking of terminating the JE.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then why unnecessarily they are creating technical difficulties for themselves. That is why he had said that if the process had not been completed, first complete the process and terminate the JE. If a Committee needs to be formed that could be formed and all other things could be seen in depth and if there is a need to expand the scope of the enquiry, it should be expanded. This

should also be looked in the case of XEN if it is so and if it is not then it could be taken care of by the Senate as far as the SDO is concerned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that by default it would never reach the Senate. The way the report has come, let it go to the Senate. This is his recommendation.

Shri Prabhjot Singh and Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi endorsed this.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is also to be seen as to how to issue the charge sheet against the XEN.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they accept it and ask for an expanded enquiry and the CVO reports would also be placed next time and decide as to how to expand the enquiry. There should be some conclusion as they have spent a lot of time. There should be a message that they have taken cognisance of what was presented to them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is right. The scope of enquiry is expanded to include the works of hostels as also of Hoshiarpur.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine. Let somebody give him a note in this regard.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that at least in this particular case they conduct the enquiry against the XEN and charge sheet him.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier it was pointed out (regarding hostels and Hoshiarpur) but it has not been got checked. However, he would again give in writing.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay. As requested the CVO reports would be placed before the Syndicate and take a call how the scope of the enquiry is to be expanded in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the CVO has submitted more reports also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could consider all the CVO reports.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the enquiry report submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba, Inquiry Officer, **as per Appendix**, be accepted;
- (ii) the Registrar be directed to initiate disciplinary action against Er. Harmandeep Singh, J.E., Panjab University Construction Office;
- (iii) for taking a decision against Er. S.K. Sharma, SDE-II, Panjab University Construction Office, being 'A' class officer, the case be referred to the Senate;

- (iv) the scope of the enquiry be widened to enquire into the involvement of other persons including the XEN in the present case and for the purchases made for other hostels and regional campuses, etc.;
- (v) the CVO reports on the issue be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Audit objection on the compassionate appointment of Shri Harshdeep as Clerk

11. Considered if, the appointment of Shri Harshdeep S/o Late Rajinder Kumar, as clerk on compassionate grounds, already approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 10.12.2018 (Para 45) (**Appendix-XVI**), be treated as a special case, to meet with the audit objection:

NOTE: 1. The audit has made the following observation:

"The qualification for the post of clerk is graduation, whereas in this case the qualification has been relaxed by the P.U. and conditional appointment has been made. As per rule framed by P.U., for compassionate appointment no relaxation in academic qualification prescribed for the job can be given.

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

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that he has come to know for the first time that they have relaxed the qualification in compassionate case. The person should be given the job entitled as per his qualification.

Dr. Subhash Sharma enquired as to how the Committee has recommended the appointment.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that in case of compassionate appointment, if the dependent (son or daughter) of any other employee is appointed as a Sweeper or Peon, that person could also ask for relaxation in qualification. How it is possible? He enquired as to which is the Committee which has got such a power.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the deceased employee was a very hard working one as he performed his duties even while he was suffering from disease and that could be one of the reasons.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that in the Government sector, the job on compassionate grounds to the dependents of a deceased employee is given one step below the rank of the deceased employee. In such cases, if the dependent improves the qualification, only then he/she could be given the higher post.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that he is dealing with such cases in the Government sector. He cited an example that in the case of death of a Senior Laboratory Attendant, his daughter was having the qualifications required for a teacher, then she was appointed as a teacher. It is not a case that the dependent has to be appointed on a lower post but the appointment could be on a higher post also as per the qualification. In this case, his qualification is 10+2 and he is not

competent to be appointed as a Clerk. The Committee has recommended the appointment as a special case, he did not know as to what is the special in this case. Since the earlier appointments in such cases have been made as per their qualifications, tomorrow those dependents could also approach for relaxing the qualification and ask for appointment on higher post. He suggested that the person be appointed as per the qualifications.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that a window could have been given to the dependent that if he acquires the qualification required for appointment as Clerk within a specified, the appointment could be given.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that if the rules are clear, then it should not have been placed before the Syndicate and it could have been done at the office level. If such a case becomes a precedent, then it could create problems and lead to court cases. He pointed out that the Establishment branch of the University is very weak and needed to be improved.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the case is coming to them only after it has been objected to by the audit. This should have been put up as a special case earlier.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the case had been recommended by the Committee.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that if the dependent has been appointed as a Clerk by relaxing the qualification, he could have also been appointed as Assistant Professor and time could be given to acquire the qualifications.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee which made the recommendation consists of Dean of University Instruction (Chairperson), Principal R.S. Jhanji, Senator for so many years, Professor Rajat Sandhir, Senator and ex-President, PPUTA, Dr. Ajay Ranga, Dr. Manoj Sharma, Dr. Neeru Malik, Professor Navdeep Goyal, President, PUSA and Secretary to Vice-Chancellor. If the recommendation comes from such a high power Committee, what could the University do.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that since a Committee is formed on every issue, it means that the Syndicate and Senate did not want to take any decision. If any Committee has not performed its job well, then the same members should not be made part of the Committee.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the office must have rejected the case, that is why it is being placed as a special case.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the meeting it was pointed out by a member that it would create problems.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Professor Navdeep Goyal as to why the proceedings of the meeting have not been recorded whereas the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate are recorded and if there is anything wrong, that is reported in the newspapers.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the PUSA representative strongly pleaded this case, then the others members agreed to it.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired whether they have helped the person by doing this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was also discussed that the dependent be appointed as Peon as per his present qualification and whenever he acquires higher qualification, he could be considered for the post of Clerk. A couple of members favoured this option.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the recommendation of the Committee is that in case the dependent fails to complete his graduation, he will be posted in class 'C' after completing 5 years service.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should the recommendation be reversed. The dependent be appointed as per his qualification.

Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested that the system should work according to the framed rules. He pointed out that the agenda is so voluminous. They have not discussed anything which could take the University to new heights.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee was so experienced and it was fully conscious that what it is recommending is not correct. Even the recommendation is given and if the Vice-Chancellor is obstructing, he is termed as employees' unfriendly.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that the condition had already been imposed.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the matter did not come to their knowledge. He said that the qualifications could not be relaxed. He suggested that the person be appointed according to his present qualification which is 10+2.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that a condition could also be imposed that if he completes the qualification, then he could be considered for higher post.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that if an appointment has been made on compassionate grounds, then appointment on another post could not be made in such cases. He enquired that if the person acquires higher qualification, could they consider him for the post of Assistant Professor.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the appointment has been made.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that if the appointment has been made by the competent authority, then why it is to be done as a special case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let they revert the person and give him a post as if he is not doing the job of a Peon but in a section which is like a multitasking or a clerical work or so.

Shri Prabhjot Singh suggested that the person could be appointed in the Laboratory or Library.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan suggested that the person could be posted as a Driver which would be equivalent to Clerk.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that they should do whatever they could do as per the qualifications of the person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person could be posted in the Department of Evening Studies so that he could continue the studies.

RESOLVED: That the conditional appointment of Shri Harshdeep S/o Late Shri Rajinder Kumar, as Clerk on compassionate grounds, be converted to an entitled post as per his current qualifications. The Vice-Chancellor be authorised to assign him at a dignified post in the University.

**Request of Mr.
Amrendra Kumar
Ranjan, Ph.D.
Research Scholar for
condonation of
shortage of lectures**

12. Considered request dated 28.06.2017 (**Appendix-XVII**) of Mr. Amrendra Kumar Ranjan, Ph.D. research Scholar (Enrol. No.15/39 of the session 2015-16), Department of History, forwarded by the Chairperson, Department of History, with regard to condone the shortage of lectures on medical/humanitarian grounds and allow him to appear in Ph.D. Course work final examination to complete the ongoing research work, as a special case.

NOTE: The Chairperson, Department of History has written that the case of Amarendra Kumar Ranjan was discussed in Academic Committee on 18.12.2017 and it was resolved that his case may be forwarded to its concerned authority for relaxation (as an exceptional case) and for condoning shortage of attendance because no such rule exists in present UGC Regulations of 2009.

RESOLVED: That request dated 28.06.2017 of Mr. Amrendra Kumar Ranjan, Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of History, for condonation of shortage of lectures on medical/humanitarian grounds, **as per Appendix**, be accepted and he be allowed to appear in Ph.D. Course work final examination to complete the ongoing research work, as a special case.

**Condonation of delay
in submission of Ph.D.
thesis by Ms. Kamei
Khamguilu**

13. Considered if, delay of 3 years, 6 month and 23 days as on 16.04.2018 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Kamei Khamguilu, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies, be condoned w.e.f. 23.09.2014 and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision of the Syndicate, as she could not submit her Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons as mentioned in her request dated 16.02.2018 (**Appendix-XVIII**):

NOTE: 1. Ms. Kamei Khamguilu was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Arts on 24.09.2008. She was granted three years extension upto

23.09.2014 by the DUI for submission of her thesis.

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

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired as to how they could condone the delay of 3 years 6 months. If they condone the delay like this then what is the use of making the rules. Then they could make fresh rules.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that since the candidate was registered under the old regulations, the extension is permissible under those rules.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that there should be some limit to extension and by granting the extension like this, they are making a mockery of the education system.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that under the CSIR guidelines, the female students could be granted two years leave with pay. The case has been recommended by the Chairperson as well as Committee of the Department.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should not encourage such things.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that such cases are rare. He said that under the new guidelines also a total period of 8 years is allowed. In the case of girl students, an additional two years period is also allowed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that after the normal period of 6 years (3 years plus 3 years extension), this delay of 3 years 6 months comes to almost a total period of 10 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the approval by Joint Research Board was given on 23.12.2010.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired as to how long they would continue to condone the delays.

The Vice-Chancellor said that every alternate case is not like this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the candidate is ready to submit her thesis.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the candidate has completed her research work. If at the end a candidate has some problem which might be not known. He pointed out that the girl students have so many problems. He cited a case of a girl who had sought the permission to appear in the examination after a year as she was not in a position to pay the fee.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that in an earlier Syndicate, in the case of the M.E. candidate, the candidate had asked for extension of 6 months due to kidney transplant, but a very little time was granted.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that the candidate is working on domestic violence in Manipur and is having a very serious gynaecological problem and every off and on she has to be admitted in the hospital and undergoing the treatment.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the case has been recommended by the Committee and the Department.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are granting the extension up to 16.04.2018 but are they sure whether the candidate would complete the work. He suggested that the extension could be granted up to 30th April to which Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that it should be extended up to 15th May, 2018. He requested that a letter be written to the candidate immediately that the extension has been given up to 15th May, 2018 as a special case though she had requested up to 16th April and beyond 15th May, 2018 no extension would be given.

RESOLVED: That delay beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Kamei Khamguilu, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies, be condoned w.e.f. 23.09.2014 and she be allowed to submit her thesis by 15th May, 2018 as she could not submit her Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons as mentioned in her request dated 16.02.2018.

Withdrawn item

14. Considered if the following Non-NET Guest faculty appointed at P.U. Constituent Colleges, Karyal Dharamkot and Ferozepur, be paid the balance payment of honorarium of Rs. 5000/- per month as requested by them vide representation dated 01.11.2017, as a special case:

Sr. No.	Name and Subject	Date of Joining
P.U. Constituent College, Karyal, Dharamkot		
1.	Mr. Sandeep Kumar Sharma (English)	21.09.2016
2.	Ms. Navpreet Kaur (Computer Science)	23.09.2016
3.	Mr. Raja Singh (Physical Education)	23.09.2016
P.U. Constituent College, Ferozepur		
1.	Ms. Kirandeep Kaur (Computer Science)	26.09.2016

NOTE: 1. The above persons were appointed as Guest Faculty (Non-NET) at P.U. Constituent College, Dharamkot on an honorarium of Rs.1000/- per lecture, subject to the ceiling of Rs.25000/- p.m. w.e.f. the date they start/started work only for the first semester upto 31.12.2016 vide order No.9790/Estd.I dated 27.09.2016.

2. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 20.08.2017 (Para 2) while considering sub-item No.4, of Board of Finance with regard to appointment of Non-NET qualified persons as guest faculty at P.U. Constituent Colleges at Dharamkot and Ferozepur endorsed to Senate for approval that:

- (i) They be sanctioned an honorarium of Rs.800/- per lecture subject to the ceiling of Rs.20,000/- p.m, w.e.f. the date they started work upto 31.08.2017.
- (ii) For future, the notification issued by the U.T. Administration would be applicable.

The above recommendations were approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 10.09.2017 (Para II).

3. The above faculty members had been appointed prior to the decision of the BOF/Syndicate/Senate as mentioned under note 2 above, thus they should be paid the honorarium as mentioned at the time of their appointment.
4. An office note is enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there was a long discussion in the Board of Finance and it was clear that the salary to be paid to the NET qualified and non-NET candidates could not be the same. Initially, the appointment was made on a salary of Rs.25,000/- and there were some guidelines of the U.T. Administration according to which the non-NET candidates were to be paid a salary of Rs.15,000/- but after persuasion, it was agreed to pay a salary of Rs.20,000/-. If they go beyond that, it could create problems.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in view of the decision of the Board of Finance, let it be withdrawn.

RESOLVED: That in view of the decision of the Board of Finance, the item be treated as withdrawn.

Recruitment on contract basis in the BGJ Institute of Health

15. To advertise and conduct walk-in-interview for filling up the following posts, on contract basis, with the qualifications as per annexure-A, B, C & D (**Appendix-XIX**), BGJ Institute of Health, P.U., Chandigarh and allow to upload the same on P.U. website.

1. One (01) Full-Time Medical Officer, on fixed salary of Rs.45000/- p.m.
2. Three (03) Part-Time Medical Specialist, on fixed salary of Rs.20000/- p.m.
3. One (01) Part-Time Eye Specialist, on fixed salary of Rs.20000/- p.m.
4. One (01) Part-Time Yoga Instructor, on fixed salary of Rs.6500/- p.m.

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

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested that since there is no specialist of orthopaedics and the people face lot of orthopaedics problems, a part-time orthopaedic doctor should be appointed. He pointed out that at present 3 posts are lying vacant. He suggested that one post of Orthopaedics be also added to this.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine

RESOLVED: That the following posts, on contract basis, with the qualifications as per annexure-A, B, C & D (**Appendix-XIX**), BGJ Institute of Health, P.U., Chandigarh be allowed to be advertised, uploaded on P.U. website, and filled up through walk-in-interview:

1. One (01) Full-Time Medical Officer, on fixed salary of Rs.45000/- p.m.
2. Three (03) Part-Time Medical Specialist, on fixed salary of Rs.20000/- p.m.
3. One (01) Part-Time Eye Specialist, on fixed salary of Rs.20000/- p.m.
4. One (01) Part-Time Yoga Instructor, on fixed salary of Rs.6500/- p.m.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That in addition to the above, one Part-Time Medical Specialist (Orthopaedics), on fixed salary of Rs.20000/- p.m. be also engaged.

Leave cases of teaching staff

16. Considered minutes dated 15.02.2018 (**Appendix-XX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 15.02.2018 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff, **as per Appendix-**, be approved.

Minutes of the Committee dated 13.11.2017 to look into modalities for setting up a Social Impact Assessment Unit (SIA Unit)

17. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 13.11.2017 (**Appendix-XXI**) to look into modalities for setting up a Social Impact Assessment Unit (SIA Unit) at Panjab University and to develop a uniform policy for handling SIA project under CIIPP.

RESOLVED: That minutes of the Committee dated 13.11.2017 to look into modalities for setting up a Social Impact Assessment Unit (SIA Unit) at Panjab University and to develop a uniform policy for handling SIA project under CIIPP, **as per Appendix-**, be approved.

Implementation of Choice Based Credit System in Colleges

18. Considered minutes dated 25.01.2018 (**Appendix-XXII**) of the Core Committee (CBCS), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to consider recommendations of various Sub-Committees (CBCS) with regard to structure, Rules & Regulations, Evaluation etc. for B.A./B.Sc./B.Com. courses under CBCS to be implemented in affiliated Colleges from the session 2018-19.

NOTE: The Senate in its meeting dated 21.01.18/17.02.18 (Para C-6) (**Appendix-XXII**) considered the recommendation of the Syndicate dated 25.06.2017 (Para 35) has resolved that the recommendation dated 21.06.2017 of the Academic Council regarding introduction of Choice Based Credit System be approved in principle but its implementation from the session 2018-19 in the affiliated Colleges be kept in abeyance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is to be implemented from the session 2019-20.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the item says that it is to be implemented from the year 2018-19.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan clarified that the note below the items says that it be kept in abeyance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment the item be approved and it would be implemented from the session 2019-20.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 25.01.2018 of the Core Committee (CBCS), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to consider recommendations of various Sub-Committees (CBCS) with regard to structure, Rules & Regulations, Evaluation etc. for B.A./B.Sc./B.Com. courses under CBCS to be implemented in affiliated Colleges, **as per Appendix-**, be approved in principle and it be implemented from the session 2019-20.

When Item No. C-19 was taken up for consideration, the Vice-Chancellor abstained from the meeting. The members elected Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi to chair the meeting for this item.

Conferment designation of Honorary Professor on Professor Neera Grover

19. Considered if, the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Professor Neera Grover, Professor and Head of Department (Retd.), S.N.D.T. Women's University, Mumbai, in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

NOTE: 1. Section-18 of Panjab University Act appearing at page 8 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, reproduced below:

18. Honorary Professor: In addition to the whole-time paid teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and of the Syndicate confer on any distinguished teacher who has rendered eminent services to the clause of education, the designation of Honorary Professor of the Panjab

University who in such capacity will be expected to deliver a few lectures every year to the post-graduate classes.

2. Copy of C.V. of Professor Neera Grover is enclosed (**Appendix-XXIII**).

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that keeping in view the services being rendered by the Vice-Chancellor, it should be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal gave the background in view of the discussion held with Professor Meenakshi Malhotra (Dean of University Instruction). Recently, the interview of the guest faculty was held in the Department. There are only three faculty members in the Department out of whom only one is below the age of 60 years while the others are above 60 years. There are two streams of vocal and instrumental. So the Department requires lot of faculty as per the requirement. Earlier, there was a meeting of the Selection Committee to select guest faculty in which Professor Anita Kaushal was also there being the Dean of the Faculty. At that time, there was a candidate who had never taught PG classes but that candidate had to be selected as they need teachers to teach the students. Then the Department of Music sent a proposal that Professor Neera Grover be appointed as visiting faculty. For appointment of visiting faculty, there are some norms and payment has to be made. So, the Vice-Chancellor never wanted that if Mrs. Neera Grover works in the Department, she should not work on payment. So, that is the reason that he (Vice-Chancellor) wrote on the proposal that she (Dr. Neera Grover) would work without payment. So, Professor Meenakshi Malhotra thought that Dr. Neera Grover could be offered the Honorary Professorship whenever required her services would be utilised to which she also agreed without any payment or remuneration. So, according to him, they should approve it.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan and Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is approved.

Shri Sanjay Tandon enquired as to what is the role of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, being the Dean of University Instruction, is having the charge of Chairperson of the Department.

Shri Sanjay Tandon quoted a case that Dr. Yogesh Chawla was the Director of the PGIMER. He formed a Selection Committee in before which his daughter and son-in-law appeared and selected. When the case came up before the Board of Governors, according to him, the Health Minister was chairing that meeting. There the case was rejected and the reason given behind rejecting the selection was that the Selection Committee or the Examining Committee was formed by Dr. Yogesh Chawla. That was the reason of rejection even though the candidates were very competent as he knows them personally. Later on, the Examining Committee was formed by the Health Minister and the Committee selected the candidates who are now working. So he suggested that there should be no lacunae in the methodology so that they are not questioned.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan and Dr. Subhash Sharma said that Dr. Neera Grover has herself requested and the Syndicate has to take a call on it.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested Shri Ashok Goyal to explain whether any qualification has been prescribed for Honorary Professor.

Shri Ashok Goyal replied that the answer is 'yes' and 'no' because it is more than the qualification. He hoped that nobody misunderstands the point which has been touched by Shri Sanjay Tandon. In fact, it needs very serious attention because in some case they wanted to help somebody but they have harmed him. So, they do not want to embarrass the Vice-Chancellor because she happens to be the wife of the sitting Vice-Chancellor. Even at the cost of misunderstanding, they have to call a spade a spade. It is not only the qualification, in addition to the whole time paid teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and of the Syndicate confer on any distinguished teacher who has rendered eminent services to the cause of education, the designation of Honorary Professor of the Panjab University who in such capacity will be expected to deliver a few lectures every year to the post-graduate classes. The qualification is that the person should be a distinguished teacher and must have rendered eminent services to the cause of education which means everything and which means nothing also. But here, though he was telling earlier in a lighter vein, it is not in violation of the rules of the University, not only in violation of regulations of the University, it is in sheer violation of the Act because under the Act nobody other than the Vice-Chancellor has got the power to make this recommendation and after the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor, it is to be recommended by the Syndicate and after it is recommended by the Syndicate, the Chancellor has to approve it. There is no scope or they could not take over the powers which are not given to them under the Act that that because she happens to be the wife of the Vice-Chancellor and Professor Meenakshi Malhotra has recommended it. No, she could not. She has recommended because there is no question of the Chairperson recommending.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired as to what they have done in the case of other Honorary Professors appointed in the University so far.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is always on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor as per the provisions of Section 18 of the Act.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired whether they have followed it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have no alternative except to follow it unless and until the name is recommended by the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Sanjay Tandon drew the attention of the members to page 292 where it is written that in addition to the whole time paid teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and of the Syndicate confer on any distinguished teacher the designation of Honorary Professor. In the present case, the Vice-Chancellor is not in a position to

recommend. However, could the Syndicate do it without the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor. If they could take a decision, they recommend it and their recommendation be sent straightaway to the Chancellor with a letter from the Vice-Chancellor that since the case belonged to him personally, he is not able to give his recommendation *per se* because of the relationship. However, the Syndicate has recommended and the Chancellor may kindly take a decision. They could recommend it in order to avoid the harassment to the Vice-Chancellor or the University. This would be crystal clear.

Professor Ronki Ram referred to clause 2.4 of the guidelines for empanelment of Adjunct Faculty in Universities and Colleges (page 379), which states as under:

“to enable higher educational institutions to access the eminent teachers and researchers who have completed their formal association with the University/college, to participate in teaching, to collaborate and to stimulate research activities for quality research at M.Phil. and Ph.D. levels; and to play mentoring and inspirational role.”

So, there is a facility. They could take the steps as suggested by Shri Sanjay Tandon.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that it would give credence to the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate for having taken this issue in all earnest. At the same time, the Chancellor would not even look beyond a point otherwise the Chancellor may not start other investigation as to how it has happened.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that some more documents have been provided later. There was a recommendation from the Coordinator to allow her to take the classes on which the Vice-Chancellor has written that no payment to be made to Professor Neera Grover as an Honorary Professor.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it means that on record it is within the knowledge of the Vice-Chancellor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that besides Honorary Professor they could also appoint her as an Adjunct Faculty but there is also a problem that an Adjunct Faculty is allowed Rs.4000/- a day as honorarium with a maximum limit of Rs.80,000/-. Neither Professor Neera Grover nor the Vice-Chancellor are interested that the payment be made. So, they would neither prefer to appoint her as Adjunct Faculty nor as Visiting Faculty because payment is also involved. There is no payment for Honorary Professor. Keeping in view all these things and also stated by Shri Sanjay Tandon, they could recommend for Honorary Professorship. There is no specified payment.

Shri Ashok Goyal supplemented what Professor Navdeep Goyal has said. Whether it is the position of Adjunct Professor or Visiting Professor or of any Chair or any Honorary Professorship or for that matter under any nomenclature, there is no such compulsion that the person has to take the payment. The rates are mentioned in some cases while in others not. There is nothing such that if one is to be appointed as Visiting Professor, then the person would not accept the payment. What is written here is that no payment to be received. It

could be written as Visiting Professor or Adjunct Professor also. In the present case, it is not she (Professor Neera Grover) who has said that she would not take any payment. It is the Vice-Chancellor who has written that without any payment.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired that since it is to be done on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate, could they take the Vice-Chancellor out the equation and only the Syndicate could make the recommendation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that legally it is 'no'. As far as the legal provision is concerned, they could not take the Vice-Chancellor out.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired whether without the application of a candidate they could recommend the name.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is no need of application because many times they have recommended the names without application.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that one thing is very important which perhaps inadvertently has been missed out in this case, the bio-data which has been forwarded by Professor Meenakshi Malhotra. Who would vouch for it because the Syndicate is doing. Why the provision is there otherwise there was no need for the Vice-Chancellor also. Why the Vice-Chancellor could not be taken out, since the Vice-Chancellor happens to be the Chairman of the Syndicate, so he is in a position and would bring the recommendation and is in a position to clear any doubt, if any. If there is no doubt, no problem. But in the instant case, whatever recommendation of the Syndicate they send, how do they vouch for what they are sending is verified. The letter is signed by Professor Meenakshi Malhotra but the annexures which have been sent are not signed by anybody.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the bio-data is attached but she has not authenticated it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when he tries to point out something with a view to help somebody, he is generally misunderstood. At the cost of repetition, he is saying that this view should also not be misunderstood. As he is saying for authentication or verification to which Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has agreed but somebody should not question it. Since it is the Syndicate which is sending something, it has to be satisfied on the basis of some authentication by the competent authority and by chance the Vice-Chancellor is not in a position to authenticate it.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan suggested that the Registrar could authenticate it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that anybody could do so. He said that Shri Sanjay Tandon has given a good suggestion that they could take out the Vice-Chancellor from this case but it is not so because there are two notes of the Vice-Chancellor. One note is that Dr. Neera Grover would not charge any payment and the second one is a request to the Dean of University Instruction to follow up with the Registrar. Would it amount to recommendation or not?

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the Vice-Chancellor has just marked it to the Dean of University Instruction to follow up and has not commented and has not given any value addition.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the Dean of University Instruction and the Chairperson is the same person.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Chairperson has written to the Vice-Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor has marked it to the Dean of University Instruction. The point which Shri Sanjay Tandon wanted to attach to the case which happened in PGI, if this document is taken into consideration, it would amount to the same. If Professor Navdeep Goyal would have been consulted on the issue before placing it before the Syndicate, such thing would not have happened.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that if a person is ready to render her services for 10-12 days in a year, it is beneficial for the University and no payment is to be made. The person is also an eminent artist.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that as Syndicate they recommend it and the bio-data could be got attested.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the bio-data could be verified by the Chairperson of the Music Department and attested by the Registrar. The consent also could be taken.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that if the appointment letter is issued, only then the person would be willing to serve.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that nobody stops the person concerned to verify or attest her own bio-data and then to be verified by the Chairperson, Registrar or the Dean of University Instruction. If she signs and it could be given in the form of consent also or in the form of writing on the top of the bio-data for Honorary Professor. Then it would serve the purpose.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi while summing up the discussion said that the Syndicate is in agreement with Dr. Neera Grover should be appointed as Honorary Professor. He enquired whether there is any dissenting person on it to which the members said, 'no'. It meant that they all agree to it. But the two things which are missing – one is the consent of the person concerned and the second is the authentication of the bio-data – these two things should be done and then the Syndicate would make a recommendation to the Chancellor. They make a recommendation now but these two things should be done. That is their consensus.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in an earlier case, there was only bio-data and there was a recommendation from the Department and accordingly they recommended it.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that it was the case of Dr. Deepak Manmohan Singh who had written application. They did not want her (Dr. Neera Grover) to apply. They simply want in one form or the other the consent which could be like that 'I give hereby my consent for appointment as Honorary Professor'. Let her sign the bio-data to be countersigned by one of the officials, the Dean of University Instruction or the Registrar because the Syndicate wanted it. That

should be circulated amongst the members of the Syndicate before sending it to the Chancellor so that they know what they are doing. The resolved part should be that the Syndicate recommends Professor Neera Grover to be appointed as Honorary Professor under section 18 of the Panjab University Act. The second note be that the office would get the consent from Professor Neera Grover and also signature to the effect that she has given the bio-data to be countersigned by the Dean of University Instruction or the Registrar and before sending it to the Chancellor that should be circulated amongst the Syndicate members.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the third note should be that since Professor Neera Grover happens to be the wife of Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice-Chancellor, the case is sent to the Chancellor by the Syndicate

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Professor Neera Grover in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh, after obtaining willingness from Professor Neera Grover and having her Bio-Data attested.

After conclusion of the discussion on the item, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi vacated the chair and the Vice-Chancellor rejoined to chair the meeting.

General Discussion

1. Professor Ronki Ram said that since a golden chance has been given to the students under the semester system, he requested that this chance should be given to the other students also.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that the file is under process.

2. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the child care leave has been approved by the Regulations Committee for the University employees. He requested that the same should be applicable to the affiliated Colleges also and a circular in this regard be issued.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a directive of the Central Government and has to be implemented for all. He directed the Dean College Development Council to issue a circular in this regard and to announce the same in the meeting of the College Development Council also.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the University leave rules apply to the Colleges.

Professor Anita Kaushal said that there are separate rules for the Government Colleges.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said when the circular is issued by the University, the same has also to be got approved from the DHE.

3. Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that there is some confusion on the rules. For example, there are leave rules for the non-teaching staff that they are paid 30 days earned leave. But they use to come

during the vacations and avail the earned leave during the working days for which there is no rule. It is clearly mentioned that they could avail earned leave for 30 days after 12 months during vacations and it should be made clear. If they avail this leave after the vacations, it would be deducted from their accumulated earned leave of 300 days. Same rules also prevail in Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar and Punjabi University, Patiala but confusion persists only in Panjab University.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether it is related with leave encashment.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the rule is that the staff says that he/she has 600 leaves whereas it is 300 saying that they have attended the College during vacations and avail the leave during working days. There is no such rule.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is a rule that the leave could not be accumulated beyond specified days. Then how it could happen?

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the staff says that they have attended the College during the vacations and they should be given the leave during working days.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the Principal has to sanction the leave(s).

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he is not sanctioning the leaves. But a wrong rule prevails in the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no such rule. It is a compensatory leave.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that compensatory leave is a separate thing. The earned leave means that if an employee has attended the office, only then the earned leave becomes due. The employees avail the leave during working days out of 300 leaves which they could not avail.

It was clarified (by the Dean College Development Council) that the non-teaching staff is non-vacation staff. For them vacation or non-vacation does not make any difference.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it is written in the rules that half of the summer vacation is to be availed by the non-teaching staff.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that it is not so for the non-vacation staff but for the teachers.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he is talking about the non-teaching staff. There are rules in Panjab University and GNDU also that the non-teaching staff could avail half of the summer vacation.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that why they are talking about the GNDU.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that in the Panjab University rules, it is mentioned the summer vacation could be availed for one month. On the basis of that, the employees would be granted earned leave of 300 days.

Shri Prabhjot Singh clarified the maximum earned leave could be accumulated up to 300 days.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the employees attend the College during the vacation period and then they say that they have leave up to 600 days and would keep 300 leaves and would avail the balance during working days whereas there is no such rule.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to who is granting leaves in this way.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan pointed out that it is happening at a College in Malout.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that it is wrong both on the part of the employee who is availing leave in such a way as also the sanctioning authority.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University could not give any such direction

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it is not clear from the Panjab University Calendar.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the rules are clear that the leaves could not be accumulated more than 300 days.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that whatever he has pointed out is being followed by the Colleges in the Malwa region like at Muktsar, Malout, Abohar, etc.

4. Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the approvals of about 100 teachers of the Colleges of Chandigarh are pending for last about one year. He had pointed out this earlier also.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu requested that the approvals should be granted because the teachers have a fear in their mind.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Special Secretary Finance has called him to set up a meeting with the Secretary Finance to discuss the issue of Ph.D. increments. He would take up this issue of Chandigarh Colleges and then they would take a call. He wanted an assurance from the U.T. Administration to direct the Colleges in U.T. to pay the salary as per rules.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the problem started that the Punjab Government had imposed a ban on recruitment whereas there is no such ban in the U.T. Some persons approached the Court and the Court directed to fill up 1925 posts by spreading the same to 3 years. The Punjab Government is paying a salary of Rs.21,600/- only for these 1925 posts.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the Court has not asked to fill up the posts by spreading in three years.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the Government's policy for payment of a salary of Rs.21,600/- is for 1925 posts. But for other posts in the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University and other universities, there is no decision of the Government for which they have to apply the UGC guidelines according to which the full salary is to be paid. Therefore, the Managements should pay the full salary to those teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is what he is pleading with the Punjab Government. The Punjab Government also issued a directive to the Panjab University not to pay the full salary even in the University because it is committed to follow Punjab Government. When he took up this matter with the U.T. Finance Secretary, he also said that they follow the Punjab Government because it amounts to saving the money. When he asserted with them, then it was agreed that the contractual teachers of Chandigarh Colleges would be paid a consolidated salary of Rs.50,000/p.m.-.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this payment is being made not from the Government exchequer but from the Amalgamated Fund.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would find it out. The salary of Rs.50,000/- to the contractual teachers was calculated by Shri Rakesh Popli, DHE, UT which amounts to basic pay + grade pay + DA @120% whereas now the DA has increased to 142%. He requested the DHE to give a directive to all the affiliated Colleges to at least pay a salary of Rs.50,000/- to the non-aided posts. He would again plead it with the Finance Secretary on this issue and if he fails in pleading, then he would grant the approvals. He also wanted to bring this to the notice of the Court at the time of hearing, but due to shortage of time, it could not be done so. He also told the Colleges teachers to become a party in the PIL. He would take up the matter with the Finance Secretary and then take a call on granting the approvals.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue of payment of salary from the Amalgamated Fund should also be got checked.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would get it checked.

Professor Anita Kaushal clarified that some of the resource persons are being paid the salary from the Amalgamated Fund.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the salary to the contractual teachers is paid against the sanctioned posts from the Salary Fund of the UT, he would impress upon them to force the other Colleges also to pay the salary from the same fund. He would grant the approval and take up the matter with the U.T.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that some of the teachers of Chandigarh who had been appointed on 3-years contract have approached the Court and some of them have been confirmed after a period of one year while others are being confirmed after three years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the next date of hearing in the Court is on 17th April and those teachers could also be present in the Court. In the meantime, the approvals would be granted.

5. On the issue of grant of Ph.D. increments, the Vice-Chancellor said that if 3 and 5 increments are not to be given, at least 2 and 4 increments should be given. The U.T. Administration had agreed that it is wrong to deny this set of people anything whereas the benefit is being given to those appointed before and after the issuance of the guidelines.

Professor Anita Kaushal said that the U.T. Administration has done a good thing that the CAS promotions have been granted to the teachers of aided Colleges. She had chaired the meeting on this issue.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu requested Professor Anita Kaushal to get the promotions from stage-1 to stage-2 and stage-2 to stage-3 as per the 4th amendments.

Professor Anita Kaushal assured that she would take up the issue. The arrears for CAS promotions have been given.

6. Professor Keshav Malhotra thanked the Vice-Chancellor for having cleared the CAS promotions. He pointed out that some of the Departments do not forward the cases of promotions.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra to send a message to the teachers that they could send an e-mail to him on this issue. He takes personal interest so that the matters of stoppage of salary and difficulty in processing of CAS promotions are cleared.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the work at the level of the Vice-Chancellor is fast but the Departments do not fix the meeting of the Screening Committee(s). He said that he would identify the case with in consultation with PPUTA, and send to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would consider all such cases.

7. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu pointed out the R&S branch of the University has declared 2 students of Gurusar Sadhar College as ineligible for admission to the M.P.Ed. as the students have passed the B.P.E. course which is a lateral entry one from Punjabi University, Patiala whereas the students of LPU who take direct admission under lateral entry have been allowed. He requested to consider such cases.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would get it checked.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to how the equivalence has been given to LPU courses and not Punjabi University courses.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the case is held up for the reason that the R&S branch sends the case to the General Branch which in turn sends to a Committee of the Department for advice. He said that if the LPU students are being admitted, then why the students of Punjabi University should suffer.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it could not be such a case. If the equivalence to the degrees of LPU has been given, then the admissions could not be denied. But if it is being said that since the equivalence has been given to the LPU, the same be granted to the Punjabi University degrees also, it could not be done.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu requested that since the case is pending for a year now, it should be expedited as it involves the career of students.

8. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that there is a possibility that from the session 2018-19, the centralised admission process for PG courses in the Chandigarh Colleges could be adopted. He pointed out that in some of the courses of M.Sc. the merit list is displayed according to the convenience of the Colleges. The students belonging to far off places like Himachal Pradesh and Jammu and Kashmir after enquiring about the status of merit list, get disheartened as they could not visit the Colleges frequently. He requested that the merit list for admission should be displayed on the website.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu to write a note to Dr. Dalip Kumar and it would be taken up in the State Higher Education Council meeting.

Professor Anita Kaushal clarified that she is the Chairman of the Admission Committee. The admission to M.A. and M.Sc. courses would be made by the respective Colleges. The admission to M.Com. would be centralised and the list would be displayed on the website.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Anita Kaushal to give a directive to the Colleges to provide the merit list to the SHEC which would be displayed on its website.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu pointed out that in the year 2017-18, 5 students who had qualified the CET were denied the admission because the College did not display the merit list and waited for the condition of having qualified the CET test to be waived off and thereafter they admitted the students who had not qualified the CET. Such an action on the part of the Colleges is playing with the future of the students.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu to give a note in this regard which would be taken up with the SHEC.

9. Professor Keshav Malhotra said that earlier centralised admission to B.Com. in the Department of Evening Studies was made. He has come to know that this time, the DHE, UT is making the admission through SD College. He requested that the Department of Evening Studies should also be included in the list of institutions for centralised admission to B.Com.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be taken care of.

Professor Anita Kaushal said that they are making centralised admission to B.Com. only for Government and Government aided Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra to send a note which would be put up before the SHEC.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Department of Evening Studies be included in the list of institutions for centralised admission to B.Com. and the precaution needs to be taken is that the reservation policy of Panjab University be followed.

10. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu pointed out that the academic calendar for the year 2018-19 has not been placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

It was informed (by the Dean College Development Council) that the Syndicate in its meeting held on 24th February, 2018 had authorised the Vice-Chancellor and the file has been sent for approval and it would be communicated.

11. Professor Anita Kaushal pointed out that the fee structure of the Colleges for the sessions 2018-19 has not been approved. The fee structure is required to be mentioned in the prospectuses.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that such items should be taken up early in the meetings.

Professor Anita Kaushal said that the prospectus have to be brought out in the month of May.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that then this item could be taken up in the next meeting to be held on 21st April, 2018.

12. The Vice-Chancellor informed that he has received a proposal that the name of the Department of Evening Studies be changed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the name has been proposed as Department of Multidisciplinary Studies and Research.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if it is Department of Evening Studies, then what is the meaning of evening studies and what type of studies could be done. He gave some background about the Department.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Evening College was started at the behest of S. Partap Singh Kairon, the then Chief Minister particularly for the employees of the Secretariat. It was converted to a Department for the rotation of Chairpersonship as the Evening College used to have the post of Principal. Similarly, the Correspondence Courses was also made a Department.

13. Principal S.S. Sangha said there is some confusion regarding 5% relaxation in qualifications to the OBC category in appointments because it is there in NCTE rules, but it is not in the University. So, a confusion arises at the time of selection.

14. Principal S.S. Sangha said that last year in the science subjects, practicals were conducted semester-wise. That created a lot of problem and the Principals have to take a letter from the Controller of Examinations as the results of the students were detained last year. He requested that it should be made clear to

the fee section so that there should be no problem on this account.

15. On a point raised earlier by Professor Keshav Malhotra regarding renaming the Department of Evening Studies – Multi-Disciplinary Research Centre, the Vice Chancellor said that they may retain it as department or it may be named as an Institute or as Institute of Undergraduate and Postgraduate Studies: Multi-Disciplinary Research Centre.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is a condition because it is meant for working and self-employed persons.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no need to change the conditions as it is mentioned in the hand book that the teaching for such and such courses would be undertaken in this department.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said the proposed name does not look nice if they add Undergraduate or Postgraduate words. This would look like a college.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the colleges which run undergraduate classes, they only write Postgraduate College such Postgraduate Government Colleges, Sector-11.

The Vice Chancellor said that but in DES, more students are enrolled in undergraduate classes than the postgraduate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the name could be Multi-Disciplinary Postgraduate Department, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it could be Department of Multi-Disciplinary Studies and Research.

16. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu pointed out that in Punjabi University, Patiala and also in other universities, mother's name is also mentioned on the Ph.D. degree, whereas this is not done in Panjab University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if mother's name is started to be mentioned in the degrees now, it is ok, otherwise they should start to mention it now.

17. Dr. Amit Joshi wanted to know whether the Ph.D. course work examination for S.D. College has been conducted or not.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) they have sorted out the issue but they have further enquire into it. The issue which he (Dr.Amit Joshi) was saying that was some other issue and they have sorted it. He has talked to Mr. Naveen Batra. The candidate could not come due to the death of someone.

18. Professor Ronki Ram raised the issue regarding putting the security staff under Category 'B'. He said that they should ask for information regarding this from PGI also. They cannot regularise their services. Their duty is very tough. Moreover, they are not provided uniform, shoes etc. If they are put under Category 'B',

they would get some more pay. He requested that with this they would be able to at least take care of their children in a proper way.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they want to do it, they should do it in a proper way because financial liability is also involved in it.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are two ways of looking into it. One, financial liability and the other is, what is the quantum of this financial liability vis-a-vis the total financial liability. They are in the lower category and they can argue it in the Board of Finance. They will plead that it would involve a very small enhancement in the total liability, but it would give more satisfaction to these employees.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know the pay being paid to the security persons engaged by outsourcing and in what category they fall. It was informed that they are paid on DC rate.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to find out from the PGI the information with regard to the security persons.

19. Shri Ashok Goyal said that the approval of teachers was not sent pending because of some technical difficulty. Correspondence is being exchanged between the college and the University. In the meantime the teacher got confirmed. The College should have extended the probation till the approval is received. After the confirmation of the teacher, the University says that they cannot approve the appointment. Thus the teacher has a strong case that after his confirmation, how they can send him back. So, as a special case, they have to grant approval because as far as qualification, eligibility and the teachers is concerned. He said that he would talk with him (Vice Chancellor) about it and requested to look into it so that there might not be any litigation.

(G.S. Chadha)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR
PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Saturday, 21st April 2018 at 10.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

- | | | |
|---|-----|----------------|
| 1. Professor A.K. Grover
Vice Chancellor | ... | (in the Chair) |
| 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 | | |

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

Condolence Resolution

Before the agenda could be taken, Dr. Satish Kumar informed about the sad demise of Justice Rajinder Sachar, former Chief Justice of Delhi High Court and former Fellow of Panjab University, Chandigarh on 20th April, 2018.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of former Chief Justice Rajinder Sachar 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 family.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the last meeting held on 30th March, 2018, they could take up only 19 items of the agenda and today they would start from Item No. C-20.

Before taking up the agenda, Shri Prabhjot Singh raised the issue of the submission of an affidavit in the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court by the Vice-Chancellor about which a news had appeared in the newspapers. It is very strange that how this affidavit has been filed against the members of the Syndicate and Senate which states that there is groupism in the Syndicate and Senate. Particularly he is talking about himself, and is very much disturbed over it. He does not know as to which group he belongs to, and why he is sitting here. As has been stated, there might be groupism but all the members are not members of particular group(s). They are not against the improvement which the Vice-Chancellor wanted to bring in the case of the Deans. That is no problem and they are also in favour of that. If the Vice-Chancellor wanted that the term of the Deans and the Syndicate should be of 2 years, they have no problem in it. But the accusation that the members from the Graduate Constituency come just by securing about 2000 or 3000 votes, it is not their fault. It is neither the fault of the Graduate Constituency nor the members who contested the election successfully or unsuccessfully. Regarding the Deans it has been written that the senior Professors are not allowed to contest, but from the annexures it is clear that many senior Professors such as Professor Pam Rajput, Professor Ronki Ram and Professor B.S. Ghuman had been the Deans of the Faculty of Arts against whom it has been written. Late G.K. Chatrath, Shri Satya Pal Jain, Mrs. Anu Chatrath and Dr. K.K. Talwar had been the Deans of various Faculties. When they cast their vote to elect the Deans, he is particularly talking about himself, they cast it taking into consideration the capability of the candidate. He is very much shocked to see this affidavit as to why it has been filed and

what was the need. He is not against the improvement. He attends the meeting by ignoring his family just for the sake of the University. He asked the Vice-Chancellor whether he has come to him for any personal work during the last 1½ years or to make him a member of any Committee. If some members approach him for any favour, he might give an affidavit worse than this one, he has no objection to it. But there are members like Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, Ambassador I.S. Chadha and Shri V.K. Sibal are in the Senate and it is being said for all of them that they create groupism. Moreover, 36 members have been nominated by the Chancellor, it means they have also become a part of groupism, it means that there exists some administrative problem. If so, first they should discuss this issue. It is very shabby under what circumstances the Vice-Chancellor has filed this affidavit.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they talk about the governance reforms, of course, it is an old system and needs some reforms. In fact, when they talk about the Syndicate and Senate, they are aware of it. That was the reason that the President, PUTA gave certain suggestions and based on these suggestions, it was decided in the Syndicate that the Committees be formed. Therefore, 3 Committees were formed - one for the Act, one for the Regulations and one for the Rules. He was also a member of one of the Committees and the Committees worked but unfortunately these Committees have not submitted their reports. In fact, if they go through the affidavit, most of the reforms which have been suggested relate to the Regulations. For amendment in the Regulations, there is a procedure in the University. It was discussed in the Syndicate and Senate where people agreed that there should be certain reforms and those reforms could have been taken care of by the procedure which is already prescribed in the Act and the Regulations. He believed that they have not followed that and straightway an affidavit has been filed in the Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has done his duty and his term ends on July 23 and they would be continuing and could change the regulations and bring whatever they wish to do.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan asked as to why this affidavit has been filed. Does the Vice-Chancellor have any problem with them?

Shri Prabhjit Singh while replying to Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the problem is not with them. Very eminent educationists are elected as Deans but some of them may lose the contest by 1 or 2 votes, it did not mean that he/she has no contribution. Everyone has his/her contribution in the Faculty. If they have a look on the data, they could see that there are eminent doctors in the Faculty of Medical Sciences. What the society would say? If Dr. Amod Gupta or Dr. Talwar had become Deans, did they become the Deans because of groupism? What is the meaning of this affidavit? Does it mean that a person becomes the Dean because of the groupism and not on merits? Many times there is a consensus and particularly in Faculty of Medical Sciences, the Deans are elected by consensus. This is a democratic process and the members approach for support. It might be considered as an opposition or groupism, but it is a part of democracy. All of them wanted reforms. The term of the Syndicate could be enhanced to 2 years or even 4 years, there is no problem in it. There is also no problem in appointing the Deans for a term of 2 years. But if the Vice-Chancellor says that nothing could be done without groupism here, this is not proper. It is not in this affidavit,

but they have been supporting the Vice-Chancellor everywhere. Whereas in a seminar, the Vice-Chancellor had spoken against the Senators. Some Senators might not be good, but he is talking about himself. The Chancellor has nominated 36 members and it might be possible that he must have been consulted, if not all, then at least 50% must have been nominated with consultation (with Vice-Chancellor). The members got nominated with the Vice-Chancellor's consultation, and nominated by the Chancellor, about which it is being said that they belong to a group. Thirty six (nominated) members are sufficient enough to cast votes to get a resolution passed. It means that it depends upon the Vice-Chancellor only to get anyone elected or defeated. Even then the Vice-Chancellor is saying that groupism is being created. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not going to withdraw. The NAAC (National Assessment and Accreditation Council) had asked for certain things. He was asked by the Court to come and respond.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that if the Court had asked the Vice-Chancellor to respond, then he should have discussed it in the Syndicate that he is submitting this affidavit against them. It is the power of the Syndicate which the Vice-Chancellor is using against them and against the members of the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not filed any affidavit against any individual member.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that are they all (Syndicate and Senate) wrong.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not going to answer any more. If the members wanted to put something in the Court, they could go and file as an individual or they want the University to file another paper on their behalf, the Registrar could file it on their behalf, they could give him whatever they wish to.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu asked the Vice-Chancellor as to why he has filed the affidavit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has already told them that he was asked by the Court to respond when he responded to the Court on 20th October, 2016. The matter has already there. It was taken up with the Court recently that the governance reforms also have to take place.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked as to what he had been asked to respond.

Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor said that as stated by the NAAC, the governance reforms had to take place and he had submitted the NAAC report to the Court. So, he asked the Court that the governance reforms are also needed. The Court's view was that first the financial problems be sorted out and then they could go for governance reforms. So, in the month of February, 2018 he asked the Court again. The Court said that first the University should make arrangements for finances and make sure that the University has sufficient money to pay (salaries). Once that part was over and they knew that Punjab Government would release the money whatever it was to be released. Then in the last hearing in the Court in March, 2018 he asked whether he could place some affidavit in support of

whatever was stated on 20th October, 2016. The Court said, okay, he could bring it. He has submitted his assessment as to why certain recommendations which were forwarded to the Court on 20th October, while that is there. He has given his assessment of this. As a Vice-Chancellor, his term gets over in next 3 months. The members are all here to continue and they have to make their individual assessment(s) and give it to Registrar, who would file it with the help of SLO (Senior Law Officer). If the members wanted a separate Advocate to defend their view, a separate Advocate could be appointed. If they want to make their individual assessments to the Court, the University should assist the members. If they want collectively to be put in the Court, the University should assist them.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that they collectively say to withdraw this affidavit and drew the attention of the Vice-Chancellor to para 7 of the affidavit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not going to withdraw. They could bring any item for discussion and he would put it in the agenda of 29th meeting.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Vice-Chancellor did not bring this issue on the agenda.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Dr. Amit Joshi to submit what he wanted to discuss. He is not allowing any discussion as they have lot of agenda items to discuss.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that this issue is more important than the agenda.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the reputation of the University is at stake as they have been labelled as ‘thugs’.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not said so.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Vice-Chancellor has said it.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that in the affidavit it is written that the Graduate Constituency which elects 15 members in the Senate has reached such a stage that one needs only 2000 or 3000 votes. He challenged the Vice-Chancellor to contest the election from the Graduate Constituency. He just wanted to ask a question as to what the Vice-Chancellor has done in 6 years to improve the voter list of this constituency.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not answering any such thing. He requested the members to first attend to the agenda.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that this issue is more important than the agenda.

The Vice-Chancellor said, ‘no’. The members could bring it as an agenda and submit to him and he would put it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Vice-Chancellor should have brought it to the notice of the members.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he is also posing a question as Dr. Amit Joshi is asking so that the Vice-Chancellor could reply the questions together. Before arrival of some of the members, Shri Prabhjot Singh had said that today they have to discuss a very important issue relating to the affidavit filed by the Vice-Chancellor in the Court. Shri Prabhjot Singh had said that there might be groups but he is not a member of any group. So, thereby they should not put everyone in the group. The groups might be there. This issue had been in circulation sometime aggressively, sometime mildly, sometime in the form of talk(s) of the campus that reforms are needed. Nobody from them was saying that the reforms are not required. The issue was also raised at the time of Professor M.M. Puri. Anyhow when the NAAC Committee came, it also put on record that their governing body needs reforms. After that, there were some issues relating to the functioning of the Syndicate and Senate. There was some sort of bitterness and it was reported in the newspapers, some allegations and counter allegations, bitter language, the Court took suo moto notice. The Court had invited Vice-Chancellor, when there was a question of the University being stopped and closed because of finances. Then it happened that the University went to the Court. At that time, when they were discussing in different ways, two issues were involved. As the Vice-Chancellor has said right now that the Court had said that let first the financial crisis issue be taken up and the governance reforms to be taken up later. In October, 2016, when the case was already in the Court, PUTA had made a representation in the Syndicate, and some of the present members were also members of Syndicate at that time. They discussed the issue, a Committee was formed for reforms like the tenure of the Deans, tenure of Syndicate, etc. Minimum reforms were decided. No doubt, it was already there in the discussion. Now the affidavit has been submitted. If something has gone beyond that which they have discussed and the wording was like that which he has read over website and e-mail that the issues in the Senate are decided on the basis of group affiliations and technicalities often have been taken into consideration while making resolution of the issues. This has been said, whether this issue has been raised because Shri Prabhjot Singh has stated that the elections are held and few votes are there. So, this is the issue. It has been raised by the Vice-Chancellor as his perception and at this moment should they discuss it and if they discuss it, they could also tell to the Court that this is not the reality. They could also tell the Court whether the assessment by the Vice-Chancellor is in consonance with the Syndicate, it is his (Vice-Chancellor) assessment. The issues should be discussed rather than making it a point as to why he did this and would have to withdraw it. This would unnecessarily make their own case as if they are in the habit of doing this that they are discussing everything here in the camera, the Court might ask what steps they are taking. They as a governing body have a right to discuss in the right spirit definitely if the groupism is not there. They should not be taken as such now as the Vice-Chancellor has filed his observation because he felt this and they are asking him as to why he did that and how would this help them in that way or how it would help the University as the Vice-Chancellor has himself told that he is leaving the University after 4 months. But the University is there, system would care.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that then the Vice-Chancellor should have waited for 4 months.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he would ask this question now from the Vice-Chancellor. He asked the Vice-Chancellor whether those observations are of him or of the Syndicate.

Shri Prabhjot Singh asked that whenever the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar files any affidavit on behalf of the University, it is submitted on behalf of the Syndicate and Senate. If he has engaged an Advocate, would he talk against him, this is the position here. If the Vice-Chancellor has to submit any affidavit, it has to be submitted on behalf of the Syndicate/Senate. The affidavit is against all the members of the Senate, it means that they are all thieves. Since Professor Ronki Ram had been a Dean for about 3 years, was it not his duty that an affidavit has been filed. Why he (Professor Ronki Ram) had contested the election? The Vice-Chancellor did not like the work done by the Deans including Professor Ronki Ram. He is disappointed that such an affidavit stating that all are thieves, all the Deans are thieves. His opinion is that a Professor who does not contest the election/he is not confident to serve. He pointed out that if serious allegations such as rape or molestation are levelled against the senior most Professor, would they appoint such a person as a Dean. He asked as to what does it mean. But according to this affidavit, the senior most Professor would become a Dean (even if there are charges of rape or molestation). They have to think over it seriously and let the agenda be set aside "*agenda nu goli maro*" and asked what they have to do with the agenda? It is a question of the reputation of the University. Pointing to Dr. Satish Kumar, Director, he said that he has also been elected from the Registered Graduate Constituency and it has been stated in the affidavit that he has just come by getting 2-3 thousand votes. For example, Mrs. Anu Chatrath contested the election from Graduate Constituency. One of the Presidents of the BJP had lost election to the Graduate Constituency. Shri Ashok Goyal and he himself are from Graduate Constituency. Three Principals including Dr. R.K. Mahajan have also come through the Graduate Constituency about whom it has been said that he had prepared some bogus votes on his own.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the election of the Graduate Constituency is the toughest one.

Shri Prabhjot Singh asked the Vice-Chancellor to contest the election under Registered Graduate Constituency. He appreciated the efforts of the Registrar for getting the videography of the election process and no bogus voting had taken place in the recent Senate election. They should remove the shortcomings in the system. But the Vice-Chancellor has submitted that the entry through Registered Graduate Constituency is not proper. He informed that 4 Principals and 1 Director of DAV Management and some persons from the political arena have been elected and contributed to the University. If no amendment has been made by the University in the voter list, whose fault is this. He pointed out that the percentage of polling is on lower side as the voter list contains the names of the person who do not exist and the voter list has not updated.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan pointed out that 50% of the persons in the voter list are already dead.

Shri Prabhjot Singh enquired as to whether it is the job of an elected member.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he could submit a record of it (dead voters).

Shri Prabhjot Singh enquired as what improvement has been made by the Vice-Chancellor in the voters' lists during the last 6 years.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that only they know as to how much efforts they have to put in to contest the election.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that as the Vice-Chancellor is asking the members to submit their own affidavit, does it mean that the Vice-Chancellor would like to tread on a different path other than the Syndicate and Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal asked as to who are the parties in the case.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that as per the affidavit Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University is the party. Further, the Vice-Chancellor is the Chairman of the Syndicate.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that it is a very serious matter. He sarcastically remarked that the whole agenda as wished by the Vice-Chancellor is passed and there is no need of any discussion.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they are not having any problem as the Vice-Chancellor is asking them to file individual affidavit. That means the Vice-Chancellor could take any decision and then force the members to knock the doors of the Court. The Vice-Chancellor could have filed the affidavit in his own capacity as Professor Arun Kumar Grover an individual and not as Vice-Chancellor. But when the affidavit is being filed by the Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University, then it made it look like as if, but he would not like to use the word but they are same as termed by the Vice-Chancellor and the members have accepted it. The Vice-Chancellor should think by taking an objective and holistic view whether it is right, when an affidavit is being filed by the Chairman of the Syndicate which is being filed by the Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University, his name does not matter, the Court is accepting the affidavit from the Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University. Then what is the fun of all of them sitting here if the Vice-Chancellor cast aspersions on the methodology by which they have been selected, if the Vice-Chancellor has aspersions on their capabilities and if the Vice-Chancellor has the aspersions whether the decisions which they would be taking in this House, are not in consonance with the University Act or the Regulations and he is being forced to accept those decisions, then they should not be sitting here in the first place itself. They should not wash their dirty laundry in the public. The Vice-Chancellor should have brought the issue in the Syndicate and they would have taken cognisance of it. He pointed out that after deliberation and discussions which issues have not been accepted. He said that he is a novice in the Syndicate as compared to the other senior members. According to him, no decision has ever been taken without his (Vice-Chancellor) consent and he was a party to it. Each and every decision has been taken by taking him (Vice-Chancellor) into confidence. He is a witness to this that no decision has been taken without the consent of the Vice-Chancellor and they are here to strengthen his position. But the submission of affidavit of

this kind by the Vice-Chancellor is not correct and now he is stating that the members should defend themselves in the Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not said this.

Continuing, Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Vice-Chancellor is the Chairman of the Syndicate and they could not give individual suggestion in the Court. If the Court has to run the University, then they should wait for the decision of the Court. But the submission of such an affidavit by the Vice-Chancellor directly affects the honour and status of the Syndicate. He would like to ask him being the Chairman of the Syndicate as to where they stand. They do not ask the Vice-Chancellor under what provision of the Act, the affidavit has been filed. After submission of the affidavit by the Vice-Chancellor, where they stand and if they take any decision today what would be the importance of that decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would contain the same importance as earlier.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the Vice-Chancellor has put a very big question mark. As the Vice-Chancellor is talking about the governance reforms, when he took over as Vice-Chancellor, on the very first day he appeared before the Search or Selection Committee, he was aware of the Calendar also and the constitution of all those things which he today is saying about groupism, this or that, he was aware of that. Suddenly, after 5 years and 9 months, this idea propelled in his mind that everything is done on the basis of groupism. This is a very big question on their individuality as well as on part of the Syndicate also. Since the Vice-Chancellor has put a question mark on them, they would discuss on groupism basis and let the agenda be put aside. First of all, they should decide whether actually the things are happening like this. The Vice-Chancellor has put a question mark on them. But the Vice-Chancellor has taken up only that part of governance reforms which suits him and he (Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu) is not aware which force is working behind him (Vice-Chancellor) to ruin the basic structure, culture and beauty of the Panjab University. The beauty of Panjab University lies in the democratic set up of Syndicate and Senate. The difference between Panjab University and Punjabi University, Patiala is not only of an alphabet (i), both are universities of Punjab but the beauty lies in the democratic set up. If Professor B.S. Ghuman (Vice-Chancellor of Punjabi University) says that there is groupism in the Syndicate of Punjabi University that could be accepted because it consists of political persons but the same thing could not be accepted for Panjab University. Neither he nor his learned friends or anybody could digest it. They do not come here just to claim the TA/DA or other things and they do not have spare time for this. He represents the teachers as well the graduates. They are not the culprit and do not have any hidden agenda. They belong to very good families and have good stature in the society. It is not for the first time that he has been elected to any elected/democratic body. He was even nominated by the Chief Minister on a highest post in the Punjab School Education Board and has worked on various high positions. But the beauty lies in the fact that he has been elected to Panjab University Senate but the Vice-Chancellor has put a question mark on that. He enquired whether the governance reforms relate only to the election of Deans and some other things which he could not read. Has the Vice-Chancellor ever thought of bringing governance reforms for the

officers who are working under him as to what the Hon'ble Registrar is doing, what the other officers are doing. Whether the Vice-Chancellor has ever thought of plugging in the lacunae as no officer is ready to pay respect. What a shit thing had happened in the lecture of Dr. Manmohan Singh?

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want to listen such words and left the House to which Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that he (Vice-Chancellor) did not want to listen anything, then he (Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu) would also walk out.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that he (Vice-Chancellor) should not come again now.

The Vice-Chancellor again came back and said that he (Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu) should not use such words.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that it was done in the lecture of Dr. Manmohan Singh. The members of the Syndicate and Senate were insulted and humiliated.

The Vice-Chancellor again left the House.

In the absence of the Vice-Chancellor, the members continued talking loudly and one of the Syndicate members was persuaded to occupy the chair of the Syndicate.

After about 3 minutes, the Vice-Chancellor entered the House once again and adjourned the meeting.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
Vice-Chancellor

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

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

PRESENT

- | | | |
|---|-----|----------------|
| 1. Professor A.K. Grover
Vice Chancellor | ... | (in the Chair) |
| 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 Prabhjot 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.

The Vice-Chancellor's statement, withdrawal of delegated powers and the issue relating to resolved parts was discussed in the beginning of the meeting. That discussion has been made a part of the proceedings of the regular meeting of the month of April, 2018 (29th April).

Thereafter, the left out items of the meeting held on 30th March, 2018, i.e., from C-20 to C-50 and items for Ratification and Information (No. 51 and 52 respectively) were taken up first in the meeting held on 29th April, 2018 and thereafter the items of the regular meeting were taken up, the proceedings for which have been prepared separately.

**Minutes dated
27.11.2017 of the
Standing Committee in
terms of UGC letter
No.F.7-1/2004 (NEF-II)
dated 01.07.2004**

20. Considered minutes dated 27.11.2017 (**Appendix-XXIV**) of the Standing Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of UGC letter No.F.7-1/2004 (NEF-II) dated 01.07.2004 to (i) oversee the effective implementation of policies and programmes of Government of India, U.G.C. and State Government for Schedule Caste and Schedule Tribes, and (ii) to suggest follow-up measures for achieving the objectives and targets laid down in respect of these reserved categories.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said, is it actually related with affiliated colleges? If they dictate this to the colleges, is this fall under their authority. The letter which they received from the UGC says that it be sent to the colleges. But they are dictating that their roster etc. has to be checked.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the D.R. (SC/ST Cell) has quoted in his note at page 301 of the agenda papers which states "It has been resolved that in order to ensure the implementation of reservation policy in these PU affiliated colleges, it is important to check at the time of renewal of their affiliation with Panjab University. During renewal process, reservation policy of each college particularly reservation roster has to be checked, failing which no renewal should be made." He said that it is very serious, such a thing is not even done by the Government. If they withdraw the affiliation of any college, where the teachers of that college would go, what would happen to the students. So, they have to check all this. Moreover, in Item No. 3 of the agenda, they have already decided that as per the new policy of the Government of India, as per the decision of the Supreme Court, new roster has to be prepared. How they could implement this until the roster is prepared.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have asked to circulate the letter consisting of five pages.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he wondered why the letter which they have received has been placed before the Syndicate. If the letter is to be circulated, then get it circulated.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee was formed and in the minutes of the Committee, the recommendation No. 6 regarding reservation policy is available at page 303 of the agenda papers. The Vice Chancellor read out some portion of point No. 6 which states "Implementation of reservation policy and recommendation National Commission for SC/ST in PU affiliated colleges of Panjab University: Prof. Kumar informed the members that UGC has sent a letter to Panjab University wherein MHRD directed the UGC to follow the recommendation of National Commission for Schedule Caste. According to the recommendation, Panjab University and its affiliated colleges/regional centres will follow the reservation policy of Govt. of India."

At this stage Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi intervened to say that he remembers, perhaps, the Government of India is going in for appeal in the Court against this.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that what Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi ji is saying, it is regarding reservation in promotion.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is different. That is regarding appointment and the roster has to be prepared department-wise. There are so many directives from the government.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they should not devote so much time on one letter and they should simply forward this letter because the UGC has only written to circulate the letter to the constituent and affiliated colleges and a compliance report point wise may be sent to the UGC within one month. He requested to shorten the work. So, he requested to forward it to the colleges just by attaching a forwarding letter, that is all. This was also supported by Shri Prabhjot Singh.

Shri Surinder Singh Sangha said that he wanted to have one clarification that as there is a relaxation of 5% marks for eligibility of SC candidates, is the same criteria applicable to the OBC category candidates in the appointments and admissions. He requested to make it clear as they face problem while making admissions.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that this is not available in the new regulation.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha requested that if it is so, then a circular be issued to the colleges as there was a confusion earlier.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the appointments and admissions have to be done as per the UGC guidelines.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that it would be better if it is made clear to the colleges so that there is no confusion.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that such a relaxation was being given at some colleges. Such relaxation was being given by the NCTE.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that there are two types of reservation policies, one is the policy of the State and the other is reservation policy of Central Government. When they have to implement the reservation policy in the University, they will have to implement the

policy of Central Government. But when they have to implement this policy in the colleges, they have to implement the reservation policy of the State Government. As stated by Shri Sanjay Tandon ji, the letter which they have received should be circulated to the College. On being asked by Principal Surinder Singh Sangha as what the State Policy says in this regard, Shri Prabhjot Singh said that there is no reservation for OBC and BC categories in selections and admissions. The reservation is only for SC category.

RESOLVED: That UGC letter No.F.1-5/2006 (SCT) dated 12.06.2017 along with annexed communication dated 09.11.2016 be forwarded to the affiliated and Constituent Colleges of Panjab University.

Arising out of the discussion, Principal Surinder Singh Sangha requested that a circular be issued to the Colleges clarifying whether 5% relaxation to OBC category candidates in admission and selection is to be given or not.

Fee structure of Constituent Colleges for 2018-19

21. Considered minutes dated 20.11.2017 (**Appendix-XXV**) of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to work out a road map for rationalization and revision of fee structure, and all other charges (**Appendix-XXV**) for the session 2018-19 to achieve the task of augmenting the resources for constituent colleges of Panjab University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that the charges are different in the University, but the charges which are mentioned in the agenda item are different. He said that the charges for holiday home for constituent colleges are Rs. 60/- for the session 2018-18 whereas the charges for the same for P.U. Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres are Rs. 70/-. He, therefore, requested that the charges for holiday home should be the same. He said that there is difference in some other charges also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if there are differences, then Shri Vikram Nayyar, Finance & Development Officer and Professor Keshav Malhotra should be authorised to look into it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to be with them to which Professor Navdeep Goyal agreed.

Dr. Amit Joshi pointed out that the self-financing courses which are running in the colleges, those teachers are not paid full salary, this is a very big issue. Secondly, now the 7th Pay Commission Recommendations are also coming which would put more burden on the colleges as they would have to pay more salary to the teachers which they would extract from the income of the self-financing courses. Therefore, he requested to delink the self-financing courses from the normal courses. The teachers of self-financing courses are already getting less salary which needs to be increased. Thus such courses become non-viable and do not run smoothly.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this fee item relates to constituent colleges to which Dr. Amit Joshi said, it is okay. Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there are many differences in sports fee and other funds which need to be rationalized.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 20.11.2017 of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to work out a road map for rationalization and revision of fee structure, and all other charges for the session 2018-19 to achieve the task of augmenting the resources for constituent colleges of Panjab University, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Professor Keshav Malhotra, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Finance and Development Officer be authorised on behalf of the Syndicate to look into and rationalise the students holiday home fund and other similar charges with that of the charges to be paid by the University students and the same be incorporated in the fee structure.

Fee structure of Panjab University Teaching Departments and Regional Centres for 2018-19

22. Considered minutes dated 30.01.2018 (**Appendix-XXVI**) of the Committee of the certain Syndics, in terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 10.12.2017/19.12.2017 (Para 32) regarding rationalization and revision of fee structure, examination fee and all other charges for P.U. Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres, for the session 2018-19 to achieve the task of augmenting the resources for P.U.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.12.2017 (Para 32) (**Appendix-XXVI**) had considered the minutes dated 07.11.2017 for working out a road map for rationalization and revision of fee structure, examination fee and all other charges for P.U. Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres, for the session 2018-19, to achieve the task of augmenting the resources for P.U. and resolved that the Syndicate reiterated its earlier decision taken in its meeting held on 10.12.2017 (**Appendix-XXVI**) and specially requested Dr. Subhash Sharma to help in sorting out the issue of rationalization of fee.
 2. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).

Dr. Subhash Sharma informed that in the last meeting they had decided that there is need to rationalize the fees as those were increased out of proportion. Then after holding a meeting they reduced it to a great extent and rationalized it and the fees are at par with each other. He requested the Finance & Development Officer to explain whether the fee was increased to the tune of 5%.

The Finance & Development Officer while explaining about it said that in the new admissions the increase in fee is 10% and for the ongoing classes the increase is 5%.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 30.01.2018 of the Committee of the certain Syndics, in terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 10.12.2017/19.12.2017 (Para 32) regarding rationalization and revision of fee structure, examination fee and all other charges for P.U. Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres, for the session

2018-19 to achieve the task of augmenting the resources for P.U., **as per Appendix**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Professor Keshav Malhotra, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Finance and Development Officer be authorised on behalf of the Syndicate to look into and rationalise the students holiday home fund and other similar charges with that of the charges to be paid by the students of Constituent Colleges and the same be incorporated in the fee structure.

**Letter dated
14.12.2017 of
Chairperson,
University Institute of
Pharmaceutical
Sciences regarding
reduction of fee for
two self finance
courses**

23. Considered letter dated 14.12.2017 (**Appendix-XXVII**) of Chairperson, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences that fee structure of two M.Pharm. self finance courses i.e. Pharmaceutical Analysis and Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance, be reduced from Rs.2,92,237/- to Rs.1,50,000/- per annum (i.e. Tuition fee Rs.1,40,540/- Maintenance Users Charges Rs.4735/- and contribution Funds Rs.4725/-):

- NOTE:**
1. A copy of letter dated 20.11.2017 of the Chairperson, UIPS, containing the fee structure prevailing in the different Universities in the region for M. Pharma course/s is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVII**).
 2. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVII**).

RESOLVED: That the fee structure of two M.Pharm. self finance courses, i.e., Pharmaceutical Analysis and Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance, as requested by the Chairperson, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences vide letter dated 14.12.2017, be reduced from Rs.2,92,237/- to Rs.1,50,000/- per annum (i.e. Tuition fee Rs.1,40,540/- Maintenance Users Charges Rs.4735/- and contribution Funds Rs.4725/-).

**Issue relating to
examination fee of
Constituent Colleges**

24. Considered the recommendation (Item 4(b)) of the Standing Committee dated 27.11.2017 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to Examination fee of the PU Constituent Colleges affiliated to Panjab University.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the same problem is being faced by the affiliated colleges. In the case of SC students, the examination fee and the University fee comes to Rs. 7000/-. It has increased from what it was earlier. There is total fee of Rs. 16000/- and after deducting the fee of Rs. 7000/-, the left out fee is not received from the government. He also pointed out that the economically weaker section students whose total income is upto to 2 lacs. they should be remitted to pay the fee. As regards the SC students, the same thing be adopted for the affiliated colleges as has to be adopted for the constituent colleges. It could be decided that the fee be refunded to the SC students only when it is received from the government or some relaxation should be given to them. He said that if there are 100 students, the fee of the students comes to Rs. 7 lacs for which the College has to wait quite a long time, in some cases the fee from the government is not received for 3-4 years. He further said that the University has enhanced the examination fee enormously to collect Rs. 32 Crores to which the Vice Chancellor said where from the

income of the University would come. Continuing, Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that should be for one time, but now it has been made a regular feature. Now the semester system has been introduced. Earlier, a student has to pay Rs. 2000/-, but now he has to pay Rs. 7000/- which is very difficult to afford for the genuine students.

The Vice Chancellor said that the government has to pay a fixed amount. The colleges have to see for their income, otherwise they have to stop DA etc. as the University has no income.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that if they can do this for the SC students of constituent colleges, then they could do it for the affiliated colleges.

The Vice Chancellor asked the F.D.O. as to what has been done in the constituent colleges.

The F.D.O. said that in the constituent colleges they have to put a claim to the government and then they will receive that to which the Vice Chancellor said that the Government has to pay the money and it would add to the income of the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they are to do away with the University's income, then they have to do away with the DA payment to the staff also.

Professor Ronki Ram said that by doing so their overall budget would decrease.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to take a conscious decision that for one year they would watch what would be the University's income. The University's income is on the decline, the Centre government is not willing to give more money than the 6% increase. The Punjab Government is also not willing to give money more than 6%. Either somebody should study it. Let the Syndicate sub-Committee study the income of the University and before the next instalment of D.A. is released a conscious decision should be taken whether the D.A. has to be frozen to 1st January, 2018.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he has a proposal. A Committee consisting of the Vice Chancellor, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Keshav Malhotra and the Finance & Development Officer may be made to make the assessment of University income.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that there is no need of any Committee. The F.D.O. should be asked to prepare the statement of income and expenditure etc.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that in the case of SC students of constituent colleges, it has been said that the examination fee of these students would be submitted to the University only when it is received from the government.

On being asked by Shri Sanjay Tandon, it was informed (by the Finance & Development Officer) that in case they accept this proposal that they should wait till the Punjab Government releases the grant on to respective colleges, they are not going to ask for examination fee, it has serious financial repercussions to the

University to which Shri Tandon said that they agree with him. Continuing, the F.D.O. said that it is the responsibility of the concerned college to have liaison with the government and get the grant at appropriate time, but they cannot wait till the government releases the grant to the constituent college.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that they had increased the fee from Rs. 1200/- to Rs. 2500/- to enhance the income of the University. The colleges where no aid is given by the government, they take Rs. 18000/- from a student, out of which Rs. 7000/- is to be given to the University. They have to pay the salaries to the teachers and staff. When the fee was increased, it was for one time because the University was in need of Rs. 32-35 Crores. He said it meant that the University could do anything, where from the colleges would get their income. The University had increased the fee hundred percent, how the student belonging to labour class would pay that fee.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that there is a policy of the government to remit the fee of the SC students and it is being implemented by all the colleges. But the reimbursement is to be made by the government for 4-5 years. When this reimbursement is not made, the unaided private colleges face problem in paying the salary to their staff. This is the problem and they have to address this problem.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that first they have to see whether they are having adequate funds. They could save the others only if they are themselves safe. So, they should not only think to save the colleges, but also think to save the University.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they cannot put extra financial burden on the University.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that two years back the fee was Rs. 1200/- and it was increased to Rs. 2500/-.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the point is valid, but they do not have its solution.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that if it could be done for the constituent colleges, then why not for the affiliated colleges.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he (Principal Surinder Singh Sangha) should get the figures both for the constituent colleges and affiliated colleges.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that could have experiment for one year. It is very difficult for them as they did not receive Rs. 2 crores from the government.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked the F.D.O. as to how much burden would be there if the amount is not paid for one year.

It was informed (by the F.D.O.) that on an average they receive claims from the four constitute colleges to the tune of Rs. 60-70 lacs per year. If they do it for all the colleges, it would be about hundred of crores in two three years.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this is the problem and if it is done, the University would collapse.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the fee was increased three years ago. The number of students who are availing the facility is only 5-10%. He is talking about those students only who are economically weaker.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that when this fee was increased, there was annual system at that time, but now the semester system has been introduced and the increased fee is charged in both the semesters. So, in this way the increase has been two hundred percent.

Shri Sanjay Tandon asked the F.D.O. if there is any solution to this problem.

It was informed (by the F.D.O.) that there is no solution at the level of the University. The only thing is that the colleges are not getting grant from the government on time.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that if the University relaxes the condition of depositing the examination fee of SC students for one year, what would be revenue loss to the University.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested the members not to put financial burden on the University.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the examination fee was Rs. 1200/- per year but it was increased to Rs. 2500/-. But with the introduction of semester system the examination fee of Rs. 2500/- was started to be charged for each semester.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that as stated by the F.D.O., if they have to bear the burden of Rs. 2 crores only for four constituent colleges, taking this into account, if they include all the colleges, the figure would go increase much more. He, therefore, requested the members to tell a solution of the problem.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that in Guru Harsahai college, 90% students belong to SC category. In other colleges the number of SC students is between 10-25%.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that they could remit the fee of those SC candidates whose annual income is less than 2 lacs.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said why the University should take financial burden of the private colleges.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the University cannot make such an enormous increase to the tune of 250%. The increased examination fee is to be paid by the students and not by the college. The University increased the fee without giving any proper thought. In addition to the enormous increase of examination fee by the University, there is practical fee of Rs. 500/- for one paper and Rs. 1000/- if there are two practical papers.

When Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is not like this, Principal Surinder Singh Sangha clarified that the examination fee for one semester is Rs. 2500/- and Rs. 3000/- if there is practical.

Shri Sanjay Tandon asked Dr. R.K. Mahajan if he has any solution to this problem without putting any financial burden on the University.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that when the University was in need of Rs. 32 Crores, they increased the fee. So, he requested that now the fee should be decreased.

Dr. Subhash Sahrma said that since the money is to be given by the Punjab Government, since one of the Ministers has become a member of the Senate, so they should approach him to expedite the matter.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the practical fee should not be charged from the Colleges as the practicals are being held by the Colleges on their own.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the Colleges could resolve their issues at their own level and the University would not be able to take up the same.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that a Committee be formed to reconsider the examination fee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Committee could be formed to look into the cases of poor students.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that along with the SC students, the students belonging to economically weaker sections having income up to Rs.2 lac p.a. should also be considered for fee exemption.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that a Committee formed to examine the fee concession to be given to the poor students.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they have to define the criteria of poor students.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the issue of fee is a very serious one as they have to face the parents of the students.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Committee already constituted under the Chairmanship of Dr. Subhash Sharma would look into the issue of EWS students.

RESOLVED: That recommendation (Item 4(b)) of the Standing Committee dated 27.11.2017 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to Examination fee of the PU Constituent Colleges, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Arising out of it, the issue regarding grant of concession/exemption of examination fee to the poor students as in the case of SC students be referred to the Committee already constituted under the Chairmanship of Dr. Subhash Sharma to look into the issue of rationalisation of fee structure.

**Review of room rent of
Panjab University
Guest House**

25. Considered proposal dated 22.02.2018 (**Appendix-XXIX**) with regard to review room rent of Panjab University Guest House in respect of following categories pursuant to discussion held in the meeting of the Board of Finance dated 13.02.2018.

PARTICULARS		PRESENT RATES FOR SUITE
A.	Members of various University Academic bodies/Class 'A' Officers of Universities, Principals (Class-I) of Affiliated Colleges and Officers of Govt. of India/UGC on private visit	Rs. 1000/-
B.	Private visit of persons other than Panjab University Fellows/Ex-Fellows, members of various academic bodies/Class A officers of Universities, Principals of Affiliated Colleges and Officers of Govt. of India/UGC/Punjab/Haryana (Private booking would be made maximum 03 days. For overstay beyond three days double the amount of the room rent shall be charged).	Rs.1500/-
C.	Persons coming for Seminar, Projects & Workshops	Rs.1200/-
D.	The Vice-Chancellor, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Serving as also retired) of any University in Punjab/Haryana/Himachal Pradesh on Private visit	Rs.1000/-

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that when the rent exceeds more than Rs.1,000/-, GST would be applicable on the whole amount. So, according to him, all the rents should be below Rs.1,000/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the GST is the law of the land and its income would go to the Government.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if a room rent of Rs.750/- is charged, there is no GST applicable on that. But if the rent of a suite is Rs.1,500/-, then the GST would be charged for the rooms also which is a loss of revenue to the University.

It was clarified (by the Finance and Development Officer) that the effective rent of those rooms which is less than Rs.1,000/- that would also get enhanced by 18%. They have to recover 18% GST over and above the rent.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that a rent of Rs.2,200/- being charged for U.T. Guest House is comparatively higher than the University Guest House which is Rs.1,200/-. So, why they want to reduce it? If they are not able to sustain the basic expenses, what is the problem if GST is charged.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are having 7 suites in the Guest House and the rent is a little more than Rs.1,000/- which has been fixed for private persons and now such persons are not availing the facility of suite but asking for the rooms. The GST is to be charged because the rates have been mentioned in the rent structure.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should not do it just to avoid the GST as this has to go the Government.

Professor Ronki Ram pointed out that the rent of the Guest House of Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar is Rs.1,500/- and that of Punjabi University is Rs.1,200/-. So they could not keep their rents so low and have to increase the rent.

The Vice-Chancellor said that GST has to be charged from everybody.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that the Fellows should also be included under the 'A' category appearing at page 363 of the agenda.

Shri Sanjay Tandon requested the Finance and Development Officer to adjust the reduction in rent to be charged from the existing Fellows.

It was informed (by the Finance and Development Officer) that the rates decided by the Syndicate are already very less. In the last meeting of the Board of Finance, it was discussed that if the rent of a room is more than Rs.1,000/- then GST would be applicable for all the rooms meaning thereby that if the rent of some other room is Rs.200/-, then 18% GST would be charged for such rooms also. However, the rates for the Fellows are already very less. The approval of the Syndicate is required to charge the GST.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu requested the Finance and Development Officer to provide a copy of the letter.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that there are people who are getting guests in connection with some work of the University and they could not afford to keep them at their places. They have to make them stay at the Guest House and have to pay the money from their own pocket. It is not simple to compare the rates of the U.T. Guest House and the University. Are they (Senators) getting any single penny from the University for serving the University and that they make the payment of the persons staying in the University Guest House coming for the work of the University.

Dr. Amit Joshi pointed out that at one time he had to pay an amount of Rs.8,000/- from his own pocket for the expenses of the Ph.D. viva-voce examiner of his wife as the examiner had travelled by some other airline. All this cost him Rs.10,000/-.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that usually his guests do not stay in the Panjab University Guest House but whoever has stayed, he has not made any guest to pay the rent from his pocket but made the payment from his own pocket.

Professor Ronki Ram said that as pointed out by Dr. Amit Joshi if a person travels by Air India, the expenses would be borne by the University. If someone does not travel by Air India, for that MHRD permission is to be sought. Regarding the accommodation, if a Fellow stays in the Guest House, the charges should be on the lower side. But if a guest of a Fellow stays, then the charges should be higher but cheaper than other guest houses which would enhance the income for the University but should not be at a level which could be half of that. At least, the rates should be genuine.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he agrees with it. But whenever such an item is placed before the Syndicate, they should have the supporting data so that they could take decision keeping in view what the University is losing and what the University is gaining.

Dr. Amit Joshi enquired as to what is the amount of the rent being paid by the examiners coming for the Ph.D. viva-voce.

Professor Ronki Ram clarified that no rent is charged from such examiners.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is the recommendation which is in the best interest of the University.

It was clarified (by the Finance and Development Officer) that except these four categories, in all cases the room rent in the University is less than Rs.1,000/- . Now, because of these four categories, the whole tariff plan would become taxable under GST. In that case, supposing one room category rent is Rs.750/- per day. So, if they keep the room rent as proposed, they would have to recover the GST @ 18% in addition to the rent of Rs.750/- . So, either they should approve that 18% GST be charged in addition to the room rents already approved by the Syndicate or they have to review these rates. In the last meeting of the Board of Finance, after the meeting concluded, this matter was discussed that instead of collecting 18% GST over and above from other rooms which may discourage and demotivate the concerned beneficiaries to take the rooms, they should review these four categories. This was discussed in the last meeting of the Board of Finance. In the light of that, this agenda item was put up to which an office note is attached.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that had there been data available with them relating to these four categories as to how much they are generating as revenue against these categories and in case they reduce the rates below Rs.1,000/- how much revenue they would be losing. In the absence of that data, they do not whether the University would go to losses if they take this decision, let they not touch it and let they collect 18% GST from others also. What the Finance and Development Officer is saying that in case they have to collect 18% GST from others also, may be the revenue from that category also reduce. The revenue which they are not getting from this category and as a result that revenue is reduced, are they talking in the interest of the University. They must ensure first that the University does not suffer as far as the revenue is concerned.

Shri Sanjay Tandon requested the Finance and Development Officer to provide such a data and place the matter again before the Syndicate. If the data about the revenue collection is provided, they could take a decision within 5 minutes.

RESOLVED: That the rent of the Suite in the Guest House shall be the same as earlier and the Fellows be also included in Category 'A'.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That in order to look into the issue of GST, the Finance and Development Officer be directed to provide the supporting data.

Revision of rent of auditoria, seminar halls, lawns and other venues

26. Considered minutes dated 07.12.2017 (**Appendix-XXX**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding revision of rent of Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues at P.U. Sector-14 & South Campus Sector-25, and framing guidelines for booking etc.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that most of the time the auditorium of English and Evening Studies are allowed free of cost to everyone. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to look into it and if at all it has to be given, it should be given through a Committee otherwise it is a loss to the University.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired as to who allows the free booking.

The Vice-Chancellor informed that everyone including the students' leaders, Deans Student Welfare, Chairpersons of the Departments want the auditoriums for free.

Shri Prabhjit Singh proposed that no free booking of the auditoriums should be done and it be conveyed to the Dean Student Welfare and all concerned.

Most of the members agreed to it.

However, Dr. Amit Joshi pointed out that if some Departments are not having the funds but are working very well like the Department of Hindi under the Chairmanship of Dr. Gurmeet Singh, they could be allowed the free booking.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that no booking for outsiders be done free of cost.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that some outside agencies take the help of the Departments in getting the bookings done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is a big problem and he knows it very well being a former Dean Student Welfare.

The Vice-Chancellor said that every student leader is attached with some system and thus get the bookings done free of cost through some leader or Chairperson.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that there should be no free of cost booking.

Professor Ronki Ram informed that the ICSSR never gives its seminar halls/rooms free of cost.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if a Department wanted to organise farewell function, could they charge Rs.5,000/- from such a Department. This was also supported by Principal Surinder Singh Sangha.

Professor Navdeep Goyal cited the example of Department of Physics that sometimes when the auditorium is booked, the auditorium is left in a bad condition. The electricity and other charges are borne by the Department as the air conditioners are also used.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when Punjab Sahitya Academy in partnership with the Department of Punjabi organises a function which is attended by whole spectrum of well known personalities. They get the auditorium booked free of charge and the Vice-Chancellor has also to attend the function. He would not use his discretion for allowing the free booking.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 07.12.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding revision of rent of Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues at P.U. Sector-14 & South Campus Sector-25, and framing guidelines for booking etc., **as per Appendix**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That free of cost booking of the Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues at P.U. Sector-14 & South Campus Sector-25, be stopped forthwith.

**Extension of E.O.L.
(without pay) to Dr.
Ajay Guleria w.e.f.
7.3.2018 to 6.3.2019**

27. Considered if:-

- (i) Dr. Ajay Guleria, System Administrator, Computer Centre, P.U. be granted extension in E.O.L. (without pay) for one-year more w.e.f. 7.3.2018 to 6.3.2019 (as recommended by the Director, Computer Centre, P.U.) and also allow him to retain lien in his substantive post of 'System Administrator' computer Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (ii) Dr. Guleria be informed that he may request to his present employer at I.I.T. Delhi for sending his CPF contribution to Panjab University during his said leave period

NOTE: 1. Dr. Ajay Guleria System Administrator, Computer Centre, P.U. was granted EOL (with pay) for a period of one year i.e. 7.3.2017 to 06.03.2018 to enable him to join as Senior System Programmer/Manager in Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi which was ratified by the Senate in its meeting dated 26.3.2017 (Para XXXIX(R-13)).

- 2. Request dated 16.01.2018 (**Appendix-XXXI**) of Dr. Guleria for extension in EOL for one more year.
- 3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXI**).

RESOLVED: That -

- (i) Dr. Ajay Guleria, System Administrator, Computer Centre, P.U. be granted extension in E.O.L. (without pay) for one-year more w.e.f. 7.3.2018 to 6.3.2019 (as recommended by the Director, Computer Centre, P.U.) and also allow him to retain lien in his substantive post of System Administrator, Computer Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh;
- (ii) Dr. Ajay Guleria be informed that he may request his present employer at I.I.T. Delhi for sending his CPF contribution to Panjab University during the period of leave.

**Guidelines regarding
empanelment of
Adjunct Faculty**

28. Considered request dated 16.03.2018 of Director, Research Promotion Cell, P.U. that the guidelines provided by the UGC for empanelment of Adjunct Faculty in University and Colleges, be adopted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a directive of the UGC which is to be implemented.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that a Committee has already been constituted for this purpose and it was supposed to look into two aspects – one for the Adjunct Faculty from the campus itself and it has already recommended that as far as campus is concerned and decided further that the other aspect would be considered by the same Committee in its next meeting. When that is already pending he wondered as to why the matter has been brought here. So, it should be sent to that Committee and the Committee should submit its recommendations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it be referred to the Committee. It is a directive of the UGC and they are expected to implement it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to see as to how it has to be implemented practically as it has implications of closing the door for fresh people.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the Adjunct Faculty does not mean that the existing positions would not be filled up.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee already constituted for the purpose to look into the feasibility.

After Lunch, before taking up any item Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said the Syndicate is a governing body and the discussions are supposed to be confidential. Sometimes there are heated discussions. He was of the opinion that they should not record these proceedings and requested that the video recording should be stopped. He said that he would like to put this resolution to voting by the members.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Senate has directed to have the video recording.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that for Senate proceedings, it is okay and let the Senate proceeding be continued.

The Vice Chancellor informed that the recording was stopped once earlier also, but then the Senate said it should be recorded.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the recording should be there.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that to his mind it is just wastage of efforts and it actually spoils the discussion and people speak for the sake of record.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said, 'no' nobody speaks for that.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not an item on the agenda.

At this stage, the Finance and Development Officer acted as Secretary in the absence of the Controller of Examinations for the Items C-29, C-30 and C-31.

Appointment of House Allotment Committees-I & II

29. To appoint the House Allotment Committees I and II for the term from 01.04.2018 to 31.03.2020, under Rule 1 at page 52 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016

NOTE: 1. The term of both the Committees is going to expire on 31.3.2018.

2. Rule 1 at page 52 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016 reads as under:

"The Syndicate may appoint two House Allotment Committees, i.e. one for houses up to 'D' type categories and the other for houses above 'D' type categories i.e. 'E' and above categories. The term of the Committee shall be for 2 years, beginning from April 1."

3. An office note containing the list of members of HAC-I and HAC-II for the term 01.04.2016 to 31.03.2018 is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXII**).

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested to include the local Syndicate members in the House Allotment Committees.

The Vice Chancellor said that let it remain like this. If the new Vice Chancellor wants to take a call on it he can do to which Professor Keshav Malhotra said some other members said okay.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested to include the name of Dr. Jagtar Singh, Department of Biotechnology in the House Allotment Committee-I.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the clause of 'habitable' was included on experimental basis which means that first the house should be made habitable and then allot. Earlier the houses were allotted to the person immediately after it is vacated and the house was got renovated by the allottee himself.

The Vice Chancellor asked him (Professor Malhotra) to take it to the Committee.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it was a very long process. He further pointed out that only one category has been made for T-1 flats and T-1 houses.

The Vice Chancellor asked him (Professor Malhotra) to take it to the Committee.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi while endorsing the view point of the Vice Chancellor said, let it go to the Committee as they did not know anything about T-1 or T-2 type flats. How they can decide.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested that it should be noted that there should be two separate categories for T-1 flats and T-1 houses.

RESOLVED: That HAC-I and HAC-II constituted for the term 01.04.2016 to 31.03.2018 shall remain the same for the term from 01.04.2018 to 31.03.2020, under Rule 1 at page 52 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016 with the addition of Dr. Jagtar Singh, Department of Biotechnology as a member of HAC-I.

Recommendations dated 02.02.2018 of Executive Committee of PUSC

30. Considered recommendations dated 02.02.2018 (Item No. 3, 4, 13, 19, 20, 23 & 24- enlisted under Sr. No.1 to 7) (**Appendix-XXXIII**) of the Executive Committee of PUSC.

RESOLVED: That recommendations dated 02.02.2018 (Item No. 3, 4, 13, 19, 20, 23 & 24- enlisted under Sr. No.1 to 7) of the Executive Committee of PUSC, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Appeal of Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh

31. Considered appeal vide email dated 17.01.2018 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) of Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh, Assistant Professor, PURC, Sri Muktsar Sahib for pardon and minimum harm.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.08.2017 (Para 10) (**Appendix-XXXIV**) had considered the reply dated 14.07.2017, 15.07.2017, 17.07.2017 and 18.07.2018 of Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh, in response to Memorandum issued vide No.4800/Estt.I dated 10.07.2017 and resolved that 'censure' be imposed on Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh and accordingly a red entry be made in his service book for proceeding on leave without prior permission of the competent authority and a warning be issued to him not to repeat this and to be careful in future. However, this will not affect the retirement benefits of Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh. The recommendations of the Syndicate was approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 10/24.09.2017 (Para XXVI) (**Appendix-XXXIV**).

Accordingly, the above said decision was conveyed to Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh vide

No.6595-96/Estd.I dated 18.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) and the red entry in this regard has been made in his service book.

2. Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh has filed CWP No.27055 of 2017 for transfer from Sri Muktsar to Chandigarh on account of his ailments and the fact that he requires treatment in the Tricity.
3. Several e-mails one dated 17.01.2018, one dated 18.01.2018 and three dated 15.02.2018 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) have been received from Dr. D.K. Singh, wherein he has apologised and also expressing his concerns. In the e-mail dated 17.01.2018 he has written as under:

"I was under stress. Some genuine issues E-mailed to Hon'ble Chancellor during last 12 hours. Kindly pardon me. Kindly do minimum harm. I sincerely deeply, strongly apologise. I shall never do this in future".

4. A detailed office note is enclosed (**Appendix -XXXIV**).

The Vice Chancellor while briefing about the case said that Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh was censured for but he continuously keeps on putting applications that he should be pardoned.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the punishment awarded to him is not a much bigger punishment, so let this punishment continue.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said though it is not related to the item, he has got an information that the roll numbers of the students of P.U.R.C., Muktsar have been withheld. He requested the Vice Chancellor to get it cross checked.

RESOLVED: That since minor punishment of censure is the minimum one, hence the appeal made by Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh, Assistant Professor, PURC, Sri Muktsar Sahib vide email dated 17.01.2018 for pardon and minimum harm, **as per Appendix**, be not accepted.

At this stage, the Controller of Examinations again joined to act as Secretary.

Re-employment of Dr. Devinder Dhawan, CMO

32. Considered request (**Appendix-XXXV**) of Dr. Devinder Dhawan, Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaia Ji Institute of Health, P.U. for extension in service of two years, on attaining the age of sixty years, under Regulation 17.4 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Dr. Devinder Dhawan, CMO, P.U. Health Centre is going to attain the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years on

31.05.2018, his date of birth being 14.05.1958.

2. Regulation 17.4 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

"A whole-time Medical Officer of the University shall retire on reaching the age of sixty years; provided that extension may be granted for a period up to two years in special cases, on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor".

3. Dr. Harish Khanna and Dr. (Mrs.) S. Arora both the former CMO's were granted extension beyond the age of 60 years.
4. Dr. (Mrs.) Pragya Kumar, former CMO requested for extension beyond the age of superannuation. Her request was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 28.02.2009 (Para 7) (**Appendix-XXXV**) and it was resolved that Dr. (Mrs.) Pragya Kumar, Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanayia Ji Health Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be re-employed for one year after superannuation with one day's break on contract basis, on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years as was being done in the case of teachers re-employed after superannuation. Salary for the purpose means pay plus allowances excluding H.R.A. During the period of re-employment, no administrative job be assigned to her.
5. The above recommendations of the Syndicate were placed before the Senate in its meeting dated 28.03.2009 (Para V) (**Appendix-XXXV**) and it was resolved that the case of Dr. (Mrs.) Pragya Kumar, Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanayia Ji Health Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for granting her extension in service after attaining the age of superannuation, be referred back to the Syndicate for reconsideration.
6. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.04.2009 (Para 11)

(Appendix-XXXV) re-considered its decision dated 28.02.2009 (Para 7) and approved the following action taken by the Vice-Chancellor:

(i) xxx xxx xxx

(ii) accepted the request of Dr. (Mrs.) Pragya Kumar, Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanayia Ji Health Centre, Panjab University, to withdraw her request for extension in service after her retirement i.e. May 31st 2009 which was earlier approved by the Syndicate vide Para 7 dated 28.2.2009.

The Vice Chancellor said that the similar option has not been given to the previous medical officers.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as per the present position, the Government has increased the age of superannuation of medical officers to 65 years. So, the extension should be given for two years.

The Vice Chancellor said that they do not have not a regular medical officers, so now it should be only one time exception him. It should not be taken that such an extension would be given to everybody. If they have a full contingent of medical officers in the University, if they have a string of medical officers in the University, then to give extension to someone (as CMO) would mean to deprive someone on the line.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked even now, why they are doing it. They are giving extension of two years to the Chief Medical Officer. He said that the next eligible person should be appointed Chief Medical Officer.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said there is no eligible person.

Dr. Amit Joshi said one eligible lady doctor is there and if she is eligible then she should be appointed as C.M.O. They could give extension in service, but not in designation.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that earlier also it was being done.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi wanted to know as to many vacancies are there in the Health Centre.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that whatever may be the number of vacant positions, but they should allow the next eligible person to act as C.M.O.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as per the present position, he should be allowed to go upto the age of 65 years.

Dr. Amit Joshi said then why they recommending the extension only upto 62 years, it should be upto 65 years.

The Vice Chancellor said that enhancement in age upto 65 years has not even been done in the Government Medical College & Hospital, though it is the desire of the Central Government to extend it to 65 years. But the Central Government allows it somewhere and denies somewhere else.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that it has been done in the P.G.I.

The Vice Chancellor said that P.G.I. is a different institution.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they are also a different institution.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that still the age of doctors has not been enhanced to 65 years, so how they could give him (C.M.O.) extension in service.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Dr. Harish Khanna ji was given extension beyond 60 years. Dr. Pragya Kumar had written that she is not interested in extension. He further said that the present lady doctor would become C.M.O. after two years.

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Pragya Kumar was offered extension for one year and that is why she refused. The Vice Chancellor said that they should give extension to the present C.M.O. for one year and let the new Vice Chancellor come and decide.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he agrees with Dr. Amit Joshi that in the absence of rules they cannot make him a designated C.M.O. The cannot give him extension beyond the age of 60 years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is regulation in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor drew the attention of the members to page 409 of the agenda papers and read out some portion which states "That Dr. (Mrs.) Pragya Kumar, Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanayia Ji Health Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be re-employed for one year after superannuation with one day's break on contract basis, on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years as was being done in the case of teachers re-employed after superannuation. Salary for the purpose means pay plus allowances excluding H.R.A. During the period of re-employment, no administrative job be assigned to her." In that background, she withdrew her application.

Shri Gurjot Malhi said that whatever is written, that is viable, make him C.M.O., they cannot give him two years' extension. He could be given one year's extension without administrative powers.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has told them that this was done in the case of two persons.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they are already not having doctors.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that this is not an excuse.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they can give him extension, but not the designation of C.M.O.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said they cannot make him C.M.O.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that his post is of Medical Officer and his designation is C.M.O.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi wanted to know if they can appoint a person as Chairman of a Department after the age of 60 years. If not, then how they can make him C.M.O.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Librarians were also appointed after the age of 60 years. They were granted stay by the Court.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said if something wrong has been done earlier, it does not mean that they should do it now also. He said that he does not agree with him (Professor Keshav Malhotra).

The Vice Chancellor read out Regulation 17.4 mentioned at page 406 of the agenda papers which states, "A whole-time Medical Officer of the University shall retire on reaching the age of sixty years, provided that extension may be granted for a period upto two years in special cases, on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor". The Vice Chancellor further said that he has not given any recommendation as he does not have power to do so.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he (C.M.O) is a very good doctor having M.D. degree.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said, let they should have a vote on this issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said why they are depriving the next person in the seniority.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he should be given two years extension.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they cannot appoint him for two years, however they could recruit more doctors. They should recruit him for one year.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the recruitment has been stopped by the Ministry of Human Resource Development.

The Vice Chancellor said that the MHRD has said that all doctors could continue upto 65 years, but they have not been given any directive by the MHRD.

Dr. Amit Joshi wanted to know as to what they would like to do.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they would like to give him extension for two years as C.M.O.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they should go by the regulations.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the regulation was approved by the Syndicate but it could be placed before the Senate as the Senate meeting is being extended and they could not reach to that item. Then it would go to the Government and after its approval it would be made applicable.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that Regulation 17.4 clearly says that the age of retirement for doctors is 60 years. The Vice Chancellor has already said that his recommendation is not there.

The Vice Chancellor said that as of today he could not make any recommendation, he is neutral.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he could be given one year's extension without the designation of C.M.O.

Shri Sanjay Tandon requested Professor Keshav Malhotra not to speak so much on each appointment, they should do whatever they want.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he should be given extension.

Dr. Amit Joshi said it is wrong to give him extension in such a way when the next eligible person is there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they live in the University, they have a good doctor and his services should be utilized, otherwise he would also leave.

Dr. Amit Joshi said though he would not like to say it, but if he says that he is not a good doctor, but the others are good, then what would happen.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he daily used to go to the doctor and knows about his competency.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they are not talking about the competence of doctors, but they are talking about the rules and regulations.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he has also been going there since 1994.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they are not talking about the competence of a doctor but about the extension only. The doctors could be more competent. They are saying that the extension for one year could be given and during that time they could look for other doctors.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that when they argue here on the competence of anybody, then they undermine themselves as two persons would say that particular person is very competent while other two would say that the person is not competent. Why should they do that? It is not a question for them to decide as to who is competent. He has no objection to either of the proposals whichever

they decide. But they should not discuss about the competence of a person during the whole of his/her career. If the video recording is shown to the person, what would he/she think. So, all doctors are competent.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they could grant the extension in this case on the lines of extension granted to Dr. Khullar.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that why they are neither giving the two years' extension nor the designation.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that a retired Professor could not remain as Chairperson.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Chairpersonship is a different issue. Let Dr. Dhawan remain as CMO.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that a Chief Secretary could be given the extension but that person could not be appointed as Chief Secretary.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if a person is getting a chance on equality then why that person should be deprived of it.

Professor Ronki Ram said that until the new CMO joins, the charge could be given to the next person.

Shri Sanjay Tandon and Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the extension could be given for one year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no post of CMO. The doctors were given the designation of CMO and while giving the designation in 2003, it was informed that the post of CMO is at the district level and the post of SMO is divisional level. It meant that the Medical Officers of Panjab University could never become the SMO or CMO. So, it was decided that they be granted the designation but the post of SMO or CMO was not created. If in the past they have been giving the extension to the Addl. CMO, the designation of Addl. CMO was given because there could not be more than one CMO, they all are Medical Officers. They are being given the extension as in the case of the Professors, they all are Lecturers and have been promoted under CAS. When the re-employment or extension or the stay which has been granted, that has been granted as Professors but not as Lecturers. As far as administrative posts are concerned, there is a specific rule that nobody would be given the administrative charge or the charge of the Head of Department in the case of teachers beyond the age of 60 years. So, the extension should be given otherwise it would look that while the others are being given the extension but the extension is not being given in this case.

Dr. Amit Joshi pointed out that in the case of Dr. Pragya Kumar, it was written that no administrative job would be given.

Professor Ronki Ram said that under Note No.4, it is mentioned that "Dr. (Mrs.) Pragya Kumar, former CMO requested for extension beyond the age of superannuation. Her request was placed before the Syndicate in the meeting dated 28.02.2009 (Para 7) (Appendix XXVIX-page 409) and it was resolved that Dr. (Mrs.) Pragya

Kumar, Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanayia Ji Health Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be re-employed for one year after superannuation with one day's break on contract basis, on fixed emoluments." So, the present case could also be considered on the same lines.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi also said that the same formula be adopted in the present case.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the extension in the present case could also be given as has been done in the case of Dr. Lal and Dr. Khullar.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let they not reopen the case of Dr. Pragya Kumar, then he would have to remind the background in which that decision was taken.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the extension could be given on the same pattern as given to Dr. Lal and Dr. Khullar and they should not create a new precedent.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that proper background of the cases of Dr. Lal and Dr. Khullar should have been provided otherwise how could they take a decision.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the extension could be given under Regulation 17.4 on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor who has refused.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Vice-Chancellor has refused, then how the item has been placed before the Syndicate. Any item which comes to the Syndicate, it comes on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they could give the extension without the designation of CMO.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that how could it be so.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that under the regulation, the extension could be given on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice-Chancellor has given his recommendation.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Vice-Chancellor has not given his recommendation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor is saying that he is neutral.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that those who have become Professors are on the substantive post of Lecturer. Similarly, Dr. Dhawan has not become the CMO against the post of CMO but against the substantive post of Medical Officer. There is no post of CMO.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi is right. The item be placed again with all the information and till that he be allowed to continue.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that Dr. Dhawan could be allowed to continue but without the designation of CMO as after the retirement, he could not hold the designation of CMO.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that there is no substantive post of CMO in the University.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that then the designation of CMO should not be mentioned and the extension should be given.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are also saying the same thing.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that then he is okay with it and there is no objection.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he (Dr. Dhawan) himself is saying that "I am willing to continue in this capacity as Chief Medical Officer".

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they should read the discussion of the Syndicate dated 28th February, 2009 in the case of Dr. Pragya Kumar where it is stated that "the members were of the unanimous view that Dr. (Mrs.) Pragya Kumar, Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanayia Ji Health Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be re-employed for one year only instead of granting extension in service to her and she be not assigned any administrative job during the period of re-employment".

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he (Dr. Dhawan) has further written that as in the case of teachers re-employed after superannuation. The teachers are not getting any designation after superannuation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever designation the teachers have earned in their personal capacity during service, they are re-employed in the same capacity.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that since Dr. Dhawan is a Medical Officer, the extension could be given in the same capacity.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in this case also, the CMO or SMO have earned that designation during the course of service in their personal capacity but not on substantive post.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that what Shri Ashok Goyal is saying is absolutely right. Let they take the example of Army or Police. Suppose a DIG or IG retires, the person could be given the extension but not the charge of DIG or IG. Similar is the case with the CMO. He could be given the extension as a doctor. The IG could also be given the extension but could not be given the charge of a Range. So, the extension could be given as a doctor, he has no problem with that. Saying that there is a shortage of doctors, enough doctors are not available and the University would suffer, they should not give the extension beyond one year. In the meanwhile, they

should make the recruitment. They could give the extension but not the designation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that still have one more month. The case of Dr. Pragya Kumar was considered in two meetings of the Syndicate held on 28.02.2009 and 18.04.2009. The matter would be brought back and the members form a small Committee amongst themselves to bring some proposal.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested that the other documents related with the case of Dr. Khullar and other cases should also be attached.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Finance and Development Officer to provide all the related documents.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever Vice-Chancellor has proposed is okay.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the next senior doctor could become the CMO and would also do a good service. Let her get a chance. The designation of CMO is not earned but given by seniority to which Professor Keshav Malhotra said, 'no'. If all the persons are given the designation on the basis of seniority, then why in this case it is being stopped.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not a case that the designation of CMO would be granted whenever the post falls vacant.

Dr. Amit Joshi enquired whether there is no doctor who could become CMO.

Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Keshav Malhotra and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is no other doctor.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if the designation of CMO is not given, then there is no other doctor who could become CMO.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it should be got enquired whether there is any other doctor eligible to become the CMO.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever the Vice-Chancellor has proposed is right that all the information be brought.

Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested that the extension be given for one year to which most of the members agreed.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that Dr. Devinder Dhawan, Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghaniya Ji Institute of Health, P.U. be given extension in service for a period of one year.

**Minutes dated
08.01.2018 of the
Committee,
constituted by the
Syndicate to look into
the resolution
proposed by Shri
Deepak Kaushik,
President, PUSA and
Fellow**

33. Considered minutes dated 08.01.2018 (**Appendix-XXXVI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.12.2017 (Para 20) (**Appendix-XXXVI**), to look into the resolution proposed by Shri Deepak Kaushik, President, PUSA and Fellow, regarding the issue of the posts of Deputy Registrar.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 01/15/28 & 29.05.2016 (Para 52) (**Appendix-XXXVI**) has approved the recommendations of JCM dated 29.12.2015 with the modification that the ratio of filling up the posts of Deputy Registrars by open selection and seniority-cum-merit be 50:50. 25% of the 50% of the promotional posts be filled through seniority-cum-merit and the remaining 25% through selection but only from amongst the internal candidates.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 21) (**Appendix-XXXVI**) considered the issue of advertising the posts of Deputy Registrar and resolved that the item be withdrawn and it be placed before the Syndicate with complete details in chronological order of events. Accordingly, the decision was sent to A.R. (Estt.) vide No. ST 2453 dated 06.03.2018, but the office note is awaited.

It was further resolved that the minutes of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate on the issue be placed before the Syndicate.

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

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment they are supposed to have 25% of the posts of Deputy Registrars by seniority and 75% by open advertisement. Then, there was a demand that 50% posts should be filled through promotion and 50% through open selection. Then they said okay, out of the 50% posts for promotion, half of the posts would be filled through promotion and the other half would be filled from amongst the internal employees through competition so that half of the Deputy Registrar should be from within the internal employees. In the open category, the internal candidates could also compete. So, in this way out of total 25% by seniority and 25% by competition from amongst the internal employees and the rest of 50% posts would be filled through open selection. But at present the proposal is that 75% posts should be filled from amongst the internal candidates and 25% from open advertisement.

At this stage some members said that it should be okay which a Committee headed by Dr. Subhash Sharma has done.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not so easy to do.

Dr. Subhash Sharma clarified that 50% posts would be filled through promotion and out of the remaining 50% posts, half of the posts would be filled through competition from amongst internal employees. He further clarified that the percentage of posts to be

filled through promotion shall remain 50%, but in this way, 75% posts would go to the internal employees.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that out of the remaining 50% posts for open advertisement, the internal employees should be allowed to compete, but no quota should be fixed for them so that better candidates could come. He further said that they cannot fix a quota within a quota which is wrong.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they had called data from other Universities also. In some Universities the promotion is 100% and at some others it is 75%.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the candidates who come from outside, would be very young and they would not retire for the next 20-30 years. The employees who are due for promotion, they think that they would stagnate with the joining of young persons. A Committee was constituted for this purpose where he was also a member and the other members include Dr. Subhash Sharma and Professor Navdeep Goyal. The employees organization had given a logic for this and they also called for data from other Universities. In many Universities, there was 100% promotion from the post of Assistant Registrar to Deputy Registrar. The Committee had recommended that 50% of the posts would be filled through promotion and out of the remaining 50% half of the posts would be filled from the existing employees through competition amongst themselves. For example, if an Assistant Registrar is competent, let him come through competition, what is the problem to them.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that somebody has appeared in the examination, but he might not be found suitable. But if quota is fixed then there is no need to consider the merit.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said, then let it be hundred percent by promotion.

Professor Keshav Malhotra while endorsing the view point of Shri Prabhjot Singh said that their experience has not been good.

Dr. Subhash Sharma clarified that the opinion of Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi to have 50% through promotion and 50% through open advertisement is quite okay, but the problem is that the fresh candidate would be more sharp and they would be able to qualify the test easily. But the internal candidates who is in the system for 15 years or so, he has experience, but his experience would not considered anywhere.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked, do they want a sharper person or a dull person?

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should also take into account the experience of a person.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan asked that a person who is working as Assistant Registrar since long, does he not have the right to become Deputy Registrar?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that 50% posts are already fixed for promotion from internal candidates.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that there would not be any problem if 25% more posts are reserved for the internal candidates.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this is a very good scheme and they should adopt it.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have not given the data of those Central Universities where the said system of filling up the posts is being followed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that data was called for from other Universities, but he does not know why it has not been attached here.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not correct to have almost 75% senior level officer from amongst the existing employees.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they cannot fix a quota 75% quota, it is not possible and the University would suffer in the long run.

The Vice Chancellor said that earlier the ratio was 75% through open advertisement and 25% from the internal candidates, but now it has been reversed.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that 50:50 was okay. He also said that they younger people should also be allowed to compete. They cannot fix a quota for the internal employees.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that ultimately what is happening now is that if they see the record for years together, because of one litigation or the other, the positions are not being filled with the result that the persons are designated as Deputy Registrars. They get all benefits but no new recruitment is taking place. There are 8 positions of Deputy Registrars. Except one person, all the other persons are promotees. So, the moment they would approve this, the process would become easy.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that in the interest of the University, they want the best people to come to the system. But if they do it just because the posts are not being advertised, they should change the system, it is not correct. If there is adhocism and adhoc people are made Deputy Registrars, it is perfectly fine. But as soon as they are able to get better people from the market, they must be taken.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is no definition of better people. The internal and external people have their own values. The experience should be given appropriate weightage which is not being given.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the existing employees do not like the external candidate to enter in the system whereas the external candidates want to enter into the system. So, in such a situation they need to take a pragmatic view. To his mind, the decision of 50:50 is

reasonable one. If there is a smarter employee, he could come in the system even then through competition. They should not complicate the system by further categorisation. Instead of forming committees, they should take some decision.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the internal candidate could be given weightage for experience instead of fixing a quota.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi suggested to make a committee to determine the criteria for giving weightage.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it depends on the person as to how the work is to be got done from his juniors.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the present proposal is a good one. He had seen that some internal person perform a very good job, but the same is negated by the new entrants which de-motivates the existing employees. It poses a problem for them as their good work is not recognised. In order to motivate the existing employees, the present criteria was fixed.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan suggested that the recommendation of the Committee be accepted. This was also endorsed by Professor Keshav Malhotra.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it would be wrong if they accept it.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the Committee was constituted with purpose of solving this issue and now they should accept its recommendations. If a person is serving for more than 15 years, how he would accept it if he is made junior to a new appointee.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if they give him an affidavit that they would accept the recommendation of all the Committee, he would accept it also. He said that he is not against any particular person.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that majority of the Deputy Registrars do come from internal system.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that a person should compete only at the lower level and for the higher level the post should be filled through hundred percent promotion.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the P.U. Calendar, the ratio mentioned for promotion and direct appointment is 25:75. The framers of the Calendar were also worried about the University because good officers are needed for running the University. The situation is that for the last 20-25 years, no post of Deputy Registrar is filled up through open advertisement after H.L. Sharma. Once an advertisement was given and lot of complaints were received against it. Once the qualifications were not approved and they could not succeed in the Court case. They should see the history of the appointment of the Deputy Registrars. He requested to leave it to the next Vice Chancellor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said, 'no' why it be left to the next Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said, let the next Vice Chancellor do it, he is not recommending this proposal.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he is also not recommending it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members could take a decision by majority.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that majority of the members are in favour of the recommendation of the Committee and whosoever is against it, he should give his dissent.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to go by majority decision to which Shri Prabhjot Singh said that they agree to it.

The Vice Chancellor said it is passed but he is dissenting on it.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi also got his strong dissent recorded.

RESOLVED: That the minutes dated 08.01.2018 of the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.12.2017 (Para 20) (**Appendix-XXXVI**), to look into the resolution proposed by Shri Deepak Kaushik, President, PUSA and Fellow, regarding the issue of the posts of Deputy Registrar, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor and Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi recorded their dissent.

Confirmation of Shri Dharamvir Sharma, Assistant Architect

34. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that Shri Dharamvir Sharma, Assistant Architect, Architect Office, P.U., be confirmed as such in his post w.e.f. 01.02.2011.

NOTE:

- 1. Shri Dharamvir Sharma was promoted as Assistant Architect in the P.U. Architect office w.e.f. 1.2.2010 as per his seniority against the vacant post of Architect vacated by Shri M.K. Kashyap after his retirement on 31.10.2010.
- 2. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVII**).

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that Shri Dharamvir Sharma, Assistant Architect, Architect Office, P.U., be confirmed as such in his post w.e.f. 01.02.2011.

Appointment of Dean of University Instruction

35. Considered if, Professor Shankarji Jha, Department of Sanskrit, be appointed as Dean of University Instruction, w.e.f. 01.05.2018, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, University Business School, Panjab University, was appointed Dean of University Instruction w.e.f. 07.06.2017, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 by the Senate in its meeting dated 10/24.09.2017 (Para X) (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) and her term of appointment as DUI will come to end on 30.04.2018.

2. Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U., Calendar, Volume I, 2007 reads as under:

"The Senate, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, may, from time to time appoint one of the University Professors to hold the office of the Dean of University Instruction. The term of appointment shall be for one year which may be renewed for one year more. "The amount and nature of the allowance to be granted to the Dean of University Instruction for performing the duties attached to this office shall be as determined by the Syndicate at the time of appointment".

3. The Vice-Chancellor has recommended that Professor Shankarji Jha to be the next DUI, as per norms of seniority.
4. An office note along with master seniority list of Professor upto 31.12.2005 is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVIII**).

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that Professor Shankarji Jha, Department of Sanskrit be appointed as the Dean of University Instruction for a period of one year w.e.f. the date he joins, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the appointment letter be issued in anticipation of approval of Senate.

Promotion of Dr. Dazy Zarabi, Department of Community Education and Disability Studies

36. Considered deferred Item No.3 of the Syndicate meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 3) (**Appendix-XXXIX**) relating to promotion of Dr. Dazy Zarabi, Assistant Professor, Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), w.e.f. 01.01.2009, under UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs. 8,000/- as proposed by the Professor Navdeep Goyal.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 3) considered the issue of promotion of Dr. Dazy Zarabi Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, Panjab

University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/- and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred and the Establishment Branch be directed to prepare a chronological note of comparative events of the case along with other similar cases to be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

2. A copy of comparative events in the case of Dr. Dazy Zarabi, Assistant Professor (designated) Department of Community Education and Disability Studies and other persons of the same Department who have also been designated as teachers is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIX**)

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that his proposal was placed last time before the Syndicate but this time it is a note to that proposal and according to him, it is right and the members could opine on it.

Professor Ronki Ram said that a person has to fulfil all the requirements of promotion at all the stages. If all the qualifications are fulfilled in this case, then there is no problem.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that all the qualifications are fulfilled in the present case.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Dazy Zarabi, Assistant Professor, Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), w.e.f. 01.01.2009, under UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs. 8,000/-.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letter of promotion to the person be issued in anticipation of approval of Senate.

Grant of extension in term of appointment to Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mishra as Honorary Director, Panjab University Rural Centre, Kauni

37. Considered request dated 16.03.2018 (**Appendix-XL**) of Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mishra, Hony. Director, P.U. Rural Centre Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, with regard to grant of extension in term of his appointment as Hony. Director, for further three years:

NOTE: A detailed office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XL**)

The Vice chancellor said that nobody was ready to go there and it is only after persuading, he was sent there that is too for one year on experimental basis and he has become familiar with the site and now he wants that he be given three years.

This was supported by the members.

RESOLVED: That as per the request dated 16.03.2018 (**Appendix _**), the term of appointment of Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mishra,

as Hony. Director, P.U. Rural Centre Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, be extended up to 03.01.2021.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letter of extension to the person be issued in anticipation of approval of Senate.

**Confirmation of Dr.
(Ms.) Ramandeep
Kaur, Associate
Professor**

38. Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that Dr. (Ms.) Ramandeep Kaur, Associate Professor, Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies & Research, be confirmed as such in her post w.e.f. the due date i.e. 25.02.2017 after completion of her probation period of one year on 24.02.2017.

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

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that Dr. (Ms.) Ramandeep Kaur, Associate Professor, Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies & Research, be confirmed as such in her post w.e.f. the due date i.e. 25.02.2017 after completion of probation period of one year on 24.02.2017.

**Extension in leave
without pay of
Professor Gurmail
Singh, Department of
Economics**

39. Considered if, Professor Gurmail Singh, (Re-employed), Department of Economics be granted extension in Leave without pay upto 1.5.2019 i.e. date of completion of his re-employment up to the age of 65 years, as requested by him vide application dated 05.03.2018 (**Appendix-XLII**), to enable him to continue as Vice-Chancellor of Akal University Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda, Punjab.

NOTE: 1. Professor Gurmail Singh, (Re-employed), Department of Economics was granted extension in Leave without pay for one more year, w.e.f. 05.05.2017, as requested by him vide request dated 17.04.2017 to enable him to continue as Vice-Chancellor of Akal University Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda, Punjab by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 28.5.2017 (Para 5) (**Appendix-XLII**).

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

RESOLVED: That Professor Gurmail Singh, (Re-employed), Department of Economics be granted extension in Leave without pay upto 1.5.2019 i.e. date of completion of his re-employment up to the age of 65 years, as requested by him vide application dated 05.03.2018 (**Appendix-XLII**), to enable him to continue as Vice-Chancellor of Akal University Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda, Punjab.

**Minutes dated
27.02.2018 of the
Committee for
financial assistance to
SC/ST students**

40. Considered minutes dated 27.02.2018 (**Appendix-XLIII**) of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to provide financial assistance to SC/ST students to Teaching Departments from the financial year 2018-2019.

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

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the minutes dated 27.02.2018 of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to provide financial assistance to SC/ST students of Teaching Departments, **as per Appendix**, be approved;
- (ii) the enhancement of the annual family income from Rs.2.5 lacs to Rs. 3 lacs for financial assistance be mentioned in the Handbook of Information, 2018 and be made applicable from the financial year 2018-2019.

**Request of students of
MBA of UBS for
generation of
resources to improve
academic facilities**

41. Considered request (**Appendix-XLIV**) of students of MBA, University Business School, P.U., regarding generation of resources to improve academic facilities at UBS.

NOTE: 1. The Academic Committee in its meeting dated 14.12.2017 (**Appendix-XLIV**) had noted the request of the students for generation of resources at UBS (Sr. No.10).

- 2. The DUI has passed orders that “FDO, please see the feasibility of the proposal sent by students”.

Accordingly, FDO has observed that the proposal of the student is worth consideration with modification that instead of creation of a fund, the fee may be enhanced suitably and thereafter appropriate budget provisions shall be sanctioned to the Department for various activities and facilities mentioned in the representation.

- 3. A copy of letter No.4440/BS dated 01.02.2018 of the Chairman, University Business School, is enclosed (**Appendix-XLIV**).

That Vice Chancellor said that the UBS students are saying that the facilities are not there and they are ready to pay the enhanced tuition fee of Rs.50000/- per year if they are provided with some more facilities.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that undoubtedly this should be done but one thing should be taken into consideration that when this would be done the whole amount so realized would be solely at the disposal of the department to provide the facilities required by the students.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the fee is increased instantly when such a proposal comes to fore but, what they are actually supposed to provide, that will have to be chalked out completely as to what facilities would be provided. The budgeting shall have to be done. It is not like that the fee gets increased and other things are not taken into consideration. For this a comprehensive proposal about how much additional fee will be generated and what facilities will be provided and will be made to be given to the students.

The Vice Chancellor said that from this year, it cannot be possible.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is right that this cannot be possible from this year. He meant to say that from whatever session it is implemented, it should firstly be comprehensively planned.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that it is a two years course. We just want that in principle it be accepted. The students of first year, let they be charged the enhanced fee in second year. If we accept it in principle, it would be implemented from the session 2019-20.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the fee will not be charged of the students who have given their consent. That is why he is saying that it should be through a comprehensive proposal.

The Vice Chancellor said that everybody has not signed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that point of accepting the scheme in principle is right.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that things are such that actually there is no need of any such proposal. This has been discussed a number of times in the last ten years that how to improve the facilities being given in UBS and to bring them at par so that the increase in fee is justified. The students who have given this in written, it will not be applicable on them and we claim that it is a very good proposal. He said that they could take it at their own level and take it usually that they would increase this and that facilities and let the faculty of the UBS also contribute, let the studies verily be compared to IIM. After that a fee structure shall also have to be increased and what would happen in this process of increasing the fee, whatever has been coming here is that let the fee be increased and budget would be given as and when the demands would be poured in. They would say that they had given in writing, later on who will care as to who had given and to whom it was given in written that the fee once gets increased, the other things would go into pipeline and that is why he is saying that a comprehensive plan should be chalked out. It should be clear that as much as money would be given to the UBS and UBS should have the knowledge as to which kind of facilities they would be expected of to render to the students. He finally said that things would not be dealt with in such a casual way, a systematic comprehensive proposal should be brought.

The Vice Chancellor said that for comprehensive plan, someone shall have to take responsibility.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the UBS would take the responsibility.

The Vice Chancellor said that what may happen if the Chairman of the UBS changes.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that is why he has been emphasizing on a comprehensive plan so that it should not vary from Chairman to Chairman. The proposal should not be confined to the notions of a specific Chairman.

Professor Naveep Goyal said that the things should come forward through a committee from the Department.

Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that under such a circumstance, the consent of the students has become irrelevant.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that all this leads to the apprehension that the Syndicate has not been rejecting the proposal, it is accepting it. The Department could start the process.

The Vice Chancellor said that the scheme cannot be made effective from the session 2018-19.

Professor Naveep Goyal said that let the UBS department make the scheme and it would be considered when it comes up.

The Vice Chancellor said that even if for its introduction from the session 2019-20, the scheme should come well in time so that when the budget estimates of the next year goes to BOF, there should be somewhat mention of the scheme. When the revised budget estimates relating to the next year budget are sent, all relating to the scheme should come to fore before the preparation of the revised estimates of the next session of 2019-20.

Professor Navdeep Goyal it should be clear as to what would come and what would be got by the UBS.

The Vice Chancellor said that a deadline should be given to the UBS that by first of August, so that as to when the Board of Finance meets for the revised estimates of 2018-19 and when the budget estimates of the next year will be sent, in that income statement of the University, the proposal would find a mention.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his proposal is that all the UBS faculty should be involved in this proposal.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the request of students of MBA, University Business School, P.U., regarding generation of resources to improve academic facilities at UBS, **as per Appendix**, be approved in principle to be implemented from the session 2019-20;
- (ii) the Chairperson, University Business School in consultation with the faculty be requested to prepare a detailed proposal in this regard by 1st August, 2018 so that the same could be placed before the Board of Finance.

Case of Ms. Gurdeep Kaur, former student of M.Sc. Human Genomics with regard to grant of grace marks

42. To re-consider the case of Ms. Gurdeep Kaur, former student of M.Sc. Human Genomics with regard to issue of grant of grace marks to reach the aggregate of 50% in the third semester of M.Sc. Human Genome, pursuant to the orders dated 14.03.2018 (**Appendix-XLV**) passed by Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 3124 of 2013.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 20) (**Appendix-XLV**) considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that Ms. Gurdeep Kaur (former student of Human Genomics) to be awarded 13 marks to reach the aggregate of 50% in the third semester of M.Sc. Human Genomics and it was resolved That recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor, in pursuant to order dated 17.05.2017 in CWP No. 11623 of 2009, Gurdeep Kaur v/s Panjab University & Others, that Ms. Gurdeep Kaur (former student of Human Genomics) to be awarded 13 marks to reach the aggregate of 50% in the third semester of M.Sc. Human Genomics, **as per Appendix**, be not accepted and a special chance be given to her at normal fee.
2. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XLV**).

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that it cannot be passed. He said that if 13 marks are to be given to her, to make 50% aggregate, what about those whose marks were less to the proportion of 10, 6 or 5. The Syndicate has earlier rejected it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he agrees to the members but wants to add a little. He said that in the instant case, the High Court has asked for reconsideration. He said that under such a situation a proper wording should be there.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that speaking order should be issued. There are so many people above her.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is not saying that it should be done. But he is saying that a reply from here should go in a proper way. He said that normally in undergraduate courses, the minimum pass percentage is 40% and situation in this case is a slightly different. Individually one can pass with 40% but in aggregate in should be 50%. So the regulation is slightly different than all others. The thing is that it is a part of regulation and Syndicate is not competent to take a decision if it is part of regulation which is an important thing. The Syndicate in itself is not competent. It is due to that fact that earlier it was also sent back that even if they have to consider that they shall have to change the regulation and for that there is a process.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that in the instance case, only speaking orders are to be passed, that is the only the case.

Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that nevertheless they cannot say that it should not be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the wording 'should not be done' is a strange oration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there a not a matter of like that of 'should not be done'. The case has already dealt with on 3rd of

September 2017. It is again that the girl went to the court and the resolved part was that the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor be not accepted and a special chance be given, it was the decision. Now what Professor Naveep Goyal is saying that the court wants it. The court has been given the impression as if it is the discretion of the Syndicate to accede to the request or not to accede to the request. So they need to add another line that as per the regulations, neither the Vice Chancellor nor the Syndicate nor the Senate is competent to grant any such relax. Hence the request cannot be acceded to. He further said that the candidate has not asked for special chance.

RESOLVED: That as per the regulations, the Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate or the Senate is not competent to grant any such grace marks, hence the request be not acceded to.

Request of Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu for reconsideration of Syndicate decision dated 15.4.13/25.4.13

43. Considered request dated 09.03.2018 (**Appendix-XLVI**) of Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu, Syndic, for reconsideration of the Syndicate decision dated 15.04.2013/25.04.2013 (Para 21) with regard to debarring Shri Balwinder Singh, Associate Professor, G.K.S.M. Government College, Tanda Urmal (Hoshiarpur) to perform University examination duties.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 15.04.2013/25.04.2013 (Para 21) considered Report of Fact Finding Committee, constituted under the Chairpersonship of Professor Rajesh Gill, Fellow, and resolved that-

(1) xxx xxx xxx

(2) xxx xxx xxx

(3) the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor in debarring Shri Balwinder Singh, Government College, Tanda Urmal, for all kinds of University work, for future, be ratified and information about this be sent to Director, Higher Education, Punjab.

It was further resolved that G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur, be not made examination centre for University examinations and a centre for its students be created at J.C.D.A.V. College, Dasuya.

2. Shri Balwinder Singh, Associate Professor has made a request against his debarring from University duties.
3. An office note is enclosed.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him say the background of this item. This is an item which is a request from one of the Syndicate members that there was a Superintendent who was debarred for 5 years because of his very serious misconduct. The complaint had come sometime in the month of December. The complaint was referred to the DCDC and the DCDC had sent a person and by that person the accused was exonerated of the misconduct. The matter was then referred to the Syndicate for investigation and a Committee had gone to the college and the report of the Committee is a huge report and is available after page number 135. This matter was in the newspapers many-many times. For so many months, the matter continued and at the end, the University decided that such a misconduct should not be acceptable. So he was debarred. It was also said that the case should be pursued etc. etc. The matter has been pursued or not pursued, it is not known. The girl or set of girls involved had gone to the Australia and she never came back during the time the matter was investigated by the Police. So, now for want of evidence, the person has been exonerated by the police. The exonerated details now need not to be gone through. Now, the issue is whether we should start to reinstate such a person? The person who indulges in this kind of very serious things, should they take a risk on the person that the debar imposed on him should be removed and he be taken back in to examination system. He further said that he is not in favour of taking such a risk at all. He said that he is personally really anguished that the matter is being brought have that such a person should be taken back.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the person might be a teacher in the college. He asked as to what kind of works he has been debarred of and if he is debarred to whom the University is paying money to do the work. They might not send him to duty but who is suffering, the University is not suffering. Examination work is the part of the duty.

The Vice-Chancellor said that examination is not part of duty but he is paid for it.

Dr. Amit Joshi, Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the person is to be paid for the examination work.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that his purpose is that there is no question mark on any committee. The Committee whatsoever it was, might have applied best mind before concluding finally. He said that he was the teacher in a Government College, it was not the private, aided, or unaided college. In such a case, the matter would have stopped there. The DPI (Colleges) has reported it, enquired it and whatever teams have been constituted. The team of the DPI (Colleges), on behalf of the Principal Secretary, and the report thereof, has exonerated him. He said that matter should be viewed in that context. He said that he is not pleading that he was innocent. He further said that a lot has been faced by him and a stigma has been imposed upon him and six years have already gone. He further said the once the stigma has already been imposed upon him and even that has been proved. But simultaneously there are enquiry reports which are in his favour. I do not want to indulge in the argument that he is innocent. The balance of reports has been going up and down with the addition or the deletion of the one or the other report. He does not want to put a question on that thing. It is his submission that the teacher has already experienced the punishment

to what extent he has committed the mistake. The stigma has already inflicted him. After all he is Professor in the Government College. So at least, looking at all the circumstances and viewing all the reports, now he should be given a chance and even if after this chance, he commits the same mistake, then they can do anything.

The Vice Chancellor said that the University must not take such a risk.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu again reiterated that he is Professor in a Government College.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not recommending it, the decision could be taken by majority. He further stated that he appeals and urges each one of them not to take any decision in this case and read from page No. 135 to page No. 163.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the Vice Chancellor should not bias the matter, all of them come here after reading the report. He said that it is his submission.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu again stated that the persons has already faced six years debar.

Dr. Amit Joshi enquired whether the Syndicate is competent to review its own earlier decision.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they are not reviewing the decision of the Syndicate which has already been taken and now they are considering to give him a chance because 6 years have lapsed since his debarring. We are not reviewing the old decision.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that he is having one solution to it. He suggested that he could be debarred from doing examination duty in the colleges, he could be put on duty in University or regional centres. He is a government employee and he is taking salary. It may be the case that if they exonerate him and the University does not assign him any duty. The question of Dr.IPS Sidhu is about the removal of his stigma, and now they can removed his stigma with the rider that he should not be appointed in a college, he be given assignment in Regional Centre of the University, if the University wishes to do so.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that how they could remove someone's stigma. He further said that the punishment has been given by the Senate. Whether they could review it?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if it is given by the Senate, then the Syndicate cannot review it.

It was explained by the COE that the Senate has marked the enquiry as usual and the report had been sent to the Senate. It is the decision of the Syndicate endorsed by the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that let it first be seen as to whether the Syndicate or the Senate had debarred him. The matter could be taken up in the next meeting and till then the matter be deferred. He further said the people should act responsibly and nobody should

make proposal of this kind. It is not becoming of a member of the Governing Council of P.U. to promote such a candidate in the background of such a heinous report.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that then the Vice Chancellor might not have read the report of the other agencies, government agencies. He is not indulging in that question. He did not want to say. He further said that letter of the Controller of Examination vide which he has joined the examination should be read and it is on the basis of Syndicate. The debarring has been issued on the basis of the Syndicate, appearing on page 134.

The Vice Chancellor said that these papers are not here and let these papers should be brought first.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the Vice Chancellor is doing injustice.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are forcing the University.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that he is not doing such thing rather he is stopping the Vice Chancellor from committing another wrong deed.

The Vice Chancellor said that one of the Syndicate members has accused him of sexual harassment twice and nobody cared about it. It is said that the man who is presiding the Syndicate, is an accused person.

Dr. Amit Joshi urged the Vice Chancellor that he should not talk in this way. All the members are standing alongwith him.

The Vice Chancellor further said that he is suffering to the most on this account for the last three years. He said that while searching the google, it could always be seen that the PU Vice Chancellor is accused of sexual harassment. Why, because a sitting Syndicate member, somebody who is a responsible member, has accused the Vice Chancellor of sexual harassment case. It is for the last three years, he has not been made free from the allegation.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that on page No. 134, the letter of the Controller of the Examination should be read.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not going to read it unless it is confirmed whether the case was confirmed in the Senate or not.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that in the second para on page 134, it is clearly written that it be placed in the next Syndicate meeting.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that to save the institute, they shall have to take the tough call. Let us not become subjective here, they are fighting for each person because they are friends or known to someone. He further said that he is not talking about this particular subject only, he has just noticed that in the last three four discussions that have taken place, is because somebody knows somebody that he is very good. Is it the work of the Syndicate to talk on the efficiency or to give clearance of this kind? If there is a report

that this person has done this kind of thing, we should not look at this type of discussion, why should we allow this kind of extra responsibility of doing examination duty. Just because he has already passed through huge stigma, now the whole matter, does it account for us to debate for thirty minutes, No. It needs only two minutes, five minutes. Once on the issue the members have given their view, if everyone feels, okay he personally feels that such kind of cases should not be discussed at all and within one minute, it should be resolved and such people should not come. Every paper is reporting that things are going bad on the sexual harassment or something of this kind, why should we deal with this thing.

Professor Ronki Ram said that a lot of discussion took place in the Senate on this issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that it will have to be enquired because the noting says that he will not be given any duty on behalf of Panjab University without explicit approval of the Senate. Let this go to the Syndicate meeting and then to the Senate.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that on page 134 there is a letter which says that the report submitted by the Committee is under assessment and it will be placed in the next Syndicate meeting and in anticipation of the Syndicate decision, Sh. Balwinder Singh has been debarred from any examination duty.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let a detailed note be prepared giving the history of the case. The note is incomplete and it is upto 12.9.2017, after that whatsoever happened, it is not known to me.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that a self contained note be prepared.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the person has been exonerated by four agencies of the Government.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the girl who had complained is not coming forward.

The Vice-Chancellor said that how a girl could come forward.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that he agrees with the suggestion of Shri Prabhjot Singh that the person should be assigned the duty in Regional Centres.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as an outgoing Vice-Chancellor, he would not do it.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the Vice-Chancellor is doing such a thing under pressure and he is not letting them to take a decision.

The Vice Chancellor said he is not working under the pressure of any lobby.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that a Committee of the University has given its report and they should read it as to who are the members,

what is the nature of serious allegations. The Syndicate and Senate have taken the decision.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they are not forgiving the punishment.

The Vice-Chancellor enumerated the names of the members of the committee from the University side as, Professor Rajesh Gill, Dr. Jagwant Singh, Principal C.K.Sohi, Dr. Dinesh Kumar, Fellow and D.R. Mr. Dhiman.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they are admitting it and they are never saying such, he could be given Boys college but asking for chance by this time by putting a rider.

The Vice Chancellor said that this matter should have been gone to the Senate. He said that he is not aware as to whether the matter has gone to the Senate or not. If not gone to the Senate, why not gone to the Senate. Who have kept the matter pending. Let him find out who have sidelined the matter that it has not reached the Senate.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the matter be placed in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

On query by Dr. IPS Sidhu as to what has been resolved in the matter, the Vice Chancellor said that it will be found out while it has been written in the file that it should have been gone to the Senate, whether it had gone to the Senate or not, if not sent to the Senate, why not sent to the Senate. It should have been gone to the Senate and all their discussions, if the matter has not been put up before the Senate till the time, would be put together for submission to the Senate.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the decision has been taken by the Syndicate, then why the Vice-Chancellor is mixing up the matter and requested to place the matter in the next Syndicate meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would not place it before the Syndicate. He is not doing any injustice but stopping the wrong things.

RESOLVED: That as ordered by the Vice-Chancellor, the 2014 matter pertaining to Shri Balwinder Singh should have been placed before the Senate. Therefore, he would find out the reasons as to why the same was not placed before the Senate and thereafter, the matter along with the request of Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu dated 9.3.2018 would then be placed before the Senate.

**Modifications/
amendments/
addition(s) in the
guidelines of “Smt.
Prem Lata and
Professor Jain
Research Foundation”**

44. Considered recommendation of the joint meeting dated 20.12.2017 (**Appendix-XLVII**) of the Academic and Administrative Committees, that the following minor modifications/ amendments/ addition(s) be made in the guidelines of “Smt. Prem Lata and Professor Jain Research Foundation” for its smooth functioning.

Existing Rule/Guidelines	Proposed Rule/Guideline
A) 4. Best Researcher Award d. The amount is Rs. 30000/- and it will be <u>given during Professor R.C. Paul National Conference of the department</u> . The awardee must give an oral presentation after receiving the award.	A) 4.Best Researcher Award d. The amount is Rs. 30000/- and it will be given during Professor R.C. Paul National Conference of the department . The awardee must give an oral presentation after receiving the award.
	A new research award, namely Smt. Prem Lata Best Researcher Award for the second-best researcher is introduced with award amount of Rs. 15,000/-

NOTE: A copy of the letter No. 1761/chem. Dated 21.03.2018 of the Chairperson, Department of Chemistry is enclosed (**Appendix-XLVII**).

RESOLVED: That as per the recommendation of the joint meeting dated 20.12.2017 (**Appendix-XLVII**) of the Academic and Administrative Committees, the following minor modifications/amendments/ addition(s) be made in the guidelines of “Smt. Prem Lata and Professor Jain Research Foundation” for its smooth functioning:

Existing Rule/Guidelines	Proposed Rule/Guideline
A) 4. Best Researcher Award d. The amount is Rs. 30000/- and it will be <u>given during Professor R.C. Paul National Conference of the department</u> . The awardee must give an oral presentation after receiving the award.	A) 4.Best Researcher Award d. The amount is Rs. 30000/- and it will be given during Professor R.C. Paul National Conference of the department . The awardee must give an oral presentation after receiving the award.
	A new research award, namely Smt. Prem Lata Best Researcher Award for the second-best researcher is introduced with award amount of Rs. 15,000/-

Letter dated 27.02.2018 received from Under Secretary, Government of India, MHRD, New Delhi, regarding the complaint made by Shri Satyavir Singh

45. Considered letter dated 27.02.2018 (**Appendix-XLVIII**) received from Under Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education, New Delhi, in respect of complaint of Shri Satyavir Singh regarding corruption/Caste-Based discrimination/prejudice/harassment etc. in P.U., Chandigarh.

NOTE: 1. Shri Satyavir Singh had worked in the Department of Defence & National Security Studies, P.U. as Lecturer. He remained absent from duty for a long period, w.e.f. 03.01.2008 without intimation to the Department. He was given enough opportunities to redress his grievances.

But, the post of Lecturer held by him was declared vacant w.e.f. 03.01.2008, under Regulation 11.9, page 120, P.U. Cal. Volume-I, 2005 vide letter No. 9165/Estd.I dated 25.09.2008 and Estt./10/8762 dated 10.12.2010.

2. An office note containing summary on redressal of the complaint of Shri Satyavir Singh is enclosed (**Appendix-XLVIII**).

The Vice Chancellor said that this is that Satyavir Singh to whom my predecessor had penalized and removed from service. It is for about six years that he daily dispatches ten letters anywhere.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that he also sends letters to them also and he is mentally upset.

The Vice Chancellor asked, what should he do. He has been directed to give him the reply. Whatever speaking order is to be sent to him, let it be given in written, it would be sent to him.

Shri Prabhjot Singh suggested that from the legal retainer, the reply should be got prepared that he is mentally not fit and time and again disturbs the members and the authority.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Shri Satyavir Singh has himself admitted that he happened to remain admitted in hospital.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it could be written that the appeal has already been dealt with.

RESOLVED: That since the appeal of Shri Satyavir Singh has already been dealt with, the case be treated as closed and no action is required in the matter.

**Request dated
27.02.2018 of Mrs.
Jalaja S Nair,
Stenographer, UMC
Branch, P.U. for
voluntary retirement
w.e.f. 31.05.2018**

46. Considered if, request dated 27.02.2018 (**Appendix-XLIX**) of Mrs. Jalaja S Nair, Stenographer, UMC Branch, P.U. for voluntary retirement w.e.f. 31.05.2018, be accepted, by treating her application as three months mandatory notice period. If so, the following retirement benefits, be also granted to her:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
- (iii) she may be issued letter of appreciation for the service rendered by her in the Panjab University, as per decision of the Syndicate dated 15.05.2004 (Para 55)

NOTE: 1. As per Regulation 17.5 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume1, 2007, three month's notice period is required for voluntary/ premature retirement.

2. An office note is enclosed.

RESOLVED: That request dated 27.02.2018 of Mrs. Jalaja S Nair, Stenographer, UMC Branch, P.U. for voluntary retirement w.e.f. 31.05.2018, be accepted, by treating her application as three months mandatory notice period and the following retirement benefits, be also granted to her:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
- (iii) she may be issued letter of appreciation for the service rendered by her in the Panjab University, as per decision of the Syndicate dated 15.05.2004 (Para 55).

Appointment of Dean International Students

47. Considered if, Professor Promila Pathak, Department of Botany, be appointed as Dean of International Students w.e.f. 01.04.2018, till further orders, under Regulation 1 at page 108 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies was appointed as a Dean of International Students, w.e.f. 12.11.2015 till further orders and the same was ratified by the Senate in its meeting dated 5.12.2015 (Para XLI (R-15)). The Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.11.2017 (Para 30) considered the issue of extension in the term of appointment of Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies, as Dean of International Students, for one more year w.e.f. 20.11.2017 and resolved that it be recommended to the Senate that the term of appointment of Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies, as Dean of International Students, be extended for one more year w.e.f. 20.11.2017.

- 2. The Vice-Chancellor has discussed with Professor Deepti Gupta, the issue of appointment of new person to serve as Dean of International Students, in view of her taking over as Chairperson of the Department of English and Cultural Studies w.e.f. 12.01.2018 for a period of three years.
- 3. Professor Deepti Gupta had agreed to handover the charge to new person to be appointed as Dean of International Students.

4. The Vice-Chancellor has proposed to appoint Professor Promila Pathak as Dean of International Students w.e.f. 1.4.2018, subject to acceptance of this proposal by the Syndicate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked Vice Chancellor to give the background of the case.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Deepti Gupta is the current Dean of International Students. She had to be appointed the Chairman of Evening Studies because the chairman of the DES resigned before the completion of three years term. Then he spoke to Deepti Ji and told her that she will have to leave the position of Dean International Students. She said okay. She recommended that such and such person could be appointed as DIS whereas he had decided to designate somebody else as Dean International Students. But the term of the Dean International Student has already been approved till a definite date. After a brief discussion, the members unanimously agreed to the following.

RESOLVED: That the issue relating to appointment of Professor Promila Pathak, Department of Botany as Dean International Students be treated as closed and Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies would continue as Dean of International Students up to 19.11.2018, as already approved by the Syndicate.

||

When this item was taken up for consideration, the Controller of Examinations acting as Secretary, currently holding the additional charge of Dean College Development Council, abstained from the meeting and the Finance and Development Officer acted as Secretary for this item only.

**Additional charge of
Dean College
Development Council**

48. Considered if the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to name another person to hold the additional charge for the post of DCDC with effect from first week of April 2018.

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

The Vice Chancellor said that there has been voices raised that COE is a person who is having too much of the work and all kinds of inadvertent things have happened. So, new person should be given the charge of the DCDC. When he wanted to search for someone to be given this charge, then he found that all this happened in the background of the advertisements having gone through and that one such and such date interview will be there and it was hoped that they will have new DCDC. When the office order was drawn, it was found written in it that the charge be given to Professor Parvinder Singh, till the new person is appointed. But till the new person is appointed, it was not his intent. But the office order was issued and it was ratified in the Syndicate. So the current situation is that if the charge of the DCDC is to be given to someone else, the Syndicate can give him the authority. Now no authority is with me and all the authority is with them. So it is now upto them to decide whether the current DCDC shall have to continue till the new person is appointed and if

somebody else is to be appointed then they should have a meeting among themselves and come up with a name otherwise the default position is that as per the decision which was intended to be something else but under the circumstances, the current situation in the file is that he will continue as DCDC till the new appointment.

Dr. R.K.Mahajan said that it was decided on 24th February, 2018 that a committee would be constituted. It must be told who had to form the Committee and why it was not made, otherwise by this time after the advertisement, the new DCDC would have been appointed.

The Vice Chancellor said that the papers do not come back to him and he is unable to expedite the matter.

Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested that let the present DCDC should continue till July 31st, 2018 and simultaneously the advertisement for appointing DCDC should also be issued.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is why he has placed the matter before them.

On the members asking for advertisement, the Vice Chancellor said that output was not coming to him.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that in case the old committee does not give report within week, then the new Committee should be constituted by removing the old one. The matter should not get delayed. For the time being, the present DCDC may be allowed to continue and within two months the post be filled.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have no other option but to continue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the examination is involved in it. Many results of the examinations are lying pending, and how many papers are not being conducted. He further said that they could pick any of the newspapers of the last year of any day randomly, the news of non reaching of the question papers on the centres would be common. It is the very sacred duty of the Controller of Examination. He said that he is not saying that he is something like inefficient. He cited an example that even a paper was conducted in an X centre, which was not to be conducted on that day, because the date sheet happened to be there. The same paper is being conducted in another centre. The papers are sent on e-mails. The same are got Photostat in the market. He said that whatever happens is either to be the responsibility of the Controller of examination or that of the Dean, College Development Council. Now the August is reaching again. He said that he is telling about latest three cases. The Paper of Ph.D. has been going on. Although the Controller had promised him when all were sitting here, till date the paper has not been taken. The datesheet of B.Voc. papers has not been issued till today.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that let the post be filled at the earliest.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they go to college and when they are made to face the students, it is more embarrassing. He suggested that the charge could be given to Professor Navdeep Goyal.

Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan said that the DCDC is the post of colleges, it is not the post of the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that any retired Principal of the college who happens to reside in Chandigarh could be asked as to if he is ready to work as DCDC for a period of six months. He would not issue the advertisement otherwise he would be blamed.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha suggested that the charge could be given either to Professor Navdeep Goyal or Professor Karamjeet Singh.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that this is a post for the Colleges and not for the University. He further said that last time when the interview was held, there was no stay given to Dr. Naval Kishore, at that time why no selection was made. He said that he himself was the candidate at that time. He suggested that the advertisement should be made to fill the post.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the charge could be given to Dr. R.K. Mahajan.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the advertisement should be issued.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that even after discussing the issue for about half an hour, they would decide to issue the advertisement.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the advertisement should be issued by 7th May.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the advertisement needs the approval of the Syndicate. Last time, the same problem surfaced. The qualifications were modified in the Syndicate because that was the resolved part of the Syndicate, that is why the case collapsed.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they could take the same decision as has been taken in the case of Dr. Deepti Gupta in one of the previous items.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it would take 5-6 months to advertise and select the new person and why they are destroying the examination system.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that unless and until there is a consensus amongst themselves, they could not give the charge to a new person and have a consensus till the next meeting.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that the charge could be given to Professor Karamjeet Singh or Professor Navdeep Goyal.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that why the charge should be given.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Syndicate had not taken that decision and whatever has happened, it has happened inadvertently.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that majority of the members want that the charge should not be withdrawn from the present person. It is the duty of the Vice-Chancellor to see that the work does not suffer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is just responding to repeated complaints in the Syndicate that a person has so many works because of which there is too much of work and mistakes are happening.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the Syndicate has also so much work and most of the issues should have been handled by the Establishment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a person prepares the note and all other persons just sign and send all the files to him. They have no officers who could take the decisions.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they are talking of promoting the persons on 50% of the posts if the persons are so incompetent.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the public has another opinion. He would suggest something and the House could accept which suits them. The first proposal is that let the charge continue with the present DCDC and the advertisement should be issued as early as possible. If they think that the charge is to be taken, then it could be given to Professor Karamjeet Singh.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that if the charge is to be given, he is ready for it.

Professor Ronki Ram and Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu favoured that the charge be given to Dr. R.K. Mahajan.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that let him seek the permission from the management. As an alternative, the advertisement should be given and why the right of the Colleges is being snatched away.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that since there seems to be no consensus, let the present person continue.

Dr. Amit Joshi enquired as to what they would do if the examinations are affected due to this. They could appoint a Joint Controller of Examinations for the examinations.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that neither the advertisement is being cleared as it is to be approved by the Syndicate or they should authorise the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not ready to take any authorisation.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the Vice-Chancellor is not ready for the authorisation, the Syndicate could authorise 4 members.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that a Committee of Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Prabhjot Singh, Dr. Subhash Sharma and Professor Navdeep Goyal be formed and authorised on behalf of the Syndicate to frame the advertisement and other details.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi suggested that the advertisement should be issued by 15th May.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it should be time bound and they should take the seriousness of the office of the Controller of Examinations. He got a letter to submit the date sheet which was rejected by the University and another date was fixed, then how the students could be informed about the postponement. He is unable to understand as to why the conduct of examinations is the last priority for the members. He pointed out that in one of the subjects the paper setter is not approved by the Board of Studies.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Controller of Examinations is under severe and serial attack. When a Committee is formed on the issue, Dr. Amit Joshi did not appear before the Committee for a year.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that instead of him, Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu did not appear.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if an officer is not working properly and if any report is submitted against that person, only the higher officer could be asked to take action. But if accusations are levelled against a senior officer of the University, the video recording of the meetings is done and the people take the recordings and the minutes are uploaded on the website. When a Committee is formed, nobody appears before that. When the Syndicate took a decision that it expresses its anguish against a member of the governing body for not appearing before the Committee, that member takes no cognisance of that. If a person is a member of the governing body, he/she could do anything.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that there is a whatsapp group of the Controller of Examinations and about 40 Principals have appreciated the Controller of Examinations for conducting the examinations which could be verified from the record.

RESOLVED: That the additional charge of Dean College Development Council shall remain with the Controller of Examinations.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Committee consisting of Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma be constituted and authorised on behalf of the Syndicate to finalise the qualifications and other modalities so that the advertisement could be given by 15th May, 2018 to fill up the post of Dean College Development Council.

49. Considered proposal dated 23.01.2018 along with the minutes of the Estimate Committee dated 20/21.9.2017 of President PUTA that an allocation of Rs. 5 crore out of UIAMS Examination Fund be sanctioned for the infrastructure development (i.e. Computers, Laptops, Printers and Computer Accessories, apart from other electronic and other equipments) of Social Sciences, Humanities and

Allocation of Rs.5 crore out of UIAMS Examination Fund for infrastructure development

Languages Department including USOL and DES for promotion of Academic activities.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 24.2./5.3.2013 Para 23 has amended the following rules pertaining to the utilization of surplus funds generated by the UIAMS (Examination Wing):

Existing Rules as approved by the Vice-Chancellor	Proposed Rules
<p>Funds generated out of the outside assignments (All outside institutional recruitment/ promotional/ admission test/ examinations) i.e. for NVS or Pb. Govt./ Centre Govt.(Pvt./Public sector) will be used for construction of UIAMS Building. CIIPP rules will apply.</p>	<p>The surplus generated/balance left after meeting all the expenditure for smooth conduct of examination/recruitment test shall be utilized on the following purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Strengthening of infrastructure of UIAMS/ UIAMS Exam. Wing. (ii) Any other expenditure for promotion of academic activities and social/welfare activities of staff of Panjab University as approved by the Vice-Chancellor. For rest CIIPP rules will apply.

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

The Vice-Chancellor said that the infrastructure is very poor and they have no money. Some of the money out of the Higher Education Fund should preferentially be spent on infrastructure.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that this money is to be used out of the UIAMS funds.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is okay with it.

RESOLVED: That proposal dated 23.01.2018 along with the minutes of the Estimate Committee dated 20/21.9.2017 of President PPUTA that an allocation of Rs. 5 crore out of UIAMS Examination Fund be sanctioned for the infrastructure development (i.e. Computers, Laptops, Printers and Computer Accessories, apart from other electronic and other equipments) of Social Sciences, Humanities and Languages Department including USOL and DES for promotion of Academic activities, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Constitution of
Affiliation Committee
for 2018-19**

50. Considered recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the following Affiliation Committee for the session 2018-19 be constituted regarding affiliation of colleges pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9) (**Appendix-LII**):

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Dr. Satish Sharma, Fellow |Chairperson |
| 2. DCDC | |
| 3. Shri Subhash Sharma | |
| 4. Principal Anita Kaushal | |
| 5. Principal S.S. Sangha | |
| 6. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan | |
| 7. Professor Ameer Sultana | |
| D.R. (Colleges) |Convener |

NOTE: office note is enclosed (**Appendix-LII**).

Professor Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested the inclusion of name of Dr. Amit Joshi.

Professor Keshav Malhotra also suggested the name of Shri Ashok Goyal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the earlier name proposed by Professor Navdeep Goyal has been included in it.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that it is for the first time and does not know under what circumstances the proposal of the Dean College Development Council or whosoever, it has been proposed to the Vice-Chancellor that he may constitute the Affiliation Committee. There is no such provision. Actually, the reports are to be considered by the Syndicate. Since sometimes the reports come in bulk, in one of the Syndicates, it was pointed out that it is not possible to examine all the reports, a Sub-Committee may be made. Thereafter, next year also, a Committee was made, thereafter in the third year also, a Committee was made. But here a note has been put up to the Vice-Chancellor whether he would like to form an Affiliation Committee as if it is provided for in the Panjab University Calendar. It is the duty of the Syndicate. If the Syndicate is not able to take care of all the inspection reports, then in its wisdom, it could make a Committee. But there is no report of any Inspection Committee before the Syndicate and the Affiliation Committee has been made. There is no problem but it should be noted that it should not be considered as a continuous process as if it has been taken out of the purview of the Syndicate and the reports would be taken care of by the Affiliation Committee only. Secondly, they have to be very careful that they are already entering into the month of May and they are going to form the Affiliation Committee to consider the inspection reports of the Colleges to which they were supposed to intimate by 31st March whether the affiliation is to be granted or not. Why he is saying, though he has been saying this earlier also that let them be wiser some day that complete the process so that they are to be communicate by 31st March.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that last time, it was decided that Affiliation Committee be formed and the reason behind it was that some things needed to be amended and for that the Committee was formed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was a separate issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the duties which are to be performed by the Syndicate, a calendar of those duties be prepared.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is already there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the same be reiterated so that the members of the new Syndicate could know about the same.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that an orientation of the Syndicate members should be conducted.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested the name of Shri Ashok Goyal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the first meeting the Syndicate, the calendar of activities to be performed should be made known to the members.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested the name of Dr. Amit Joshi for the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the calendar of activities should be prepared so that the members could know about it in advance and not learn it as the process goes on. By the time the members learn the process, the month of December would approach.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan suggested that a Committee be formed for this purpose. He suggested Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal to take up this task.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is for the members to constitute a committee amongst themselves.

RESOLVED: That following Affiliation Committee for the session 2018-19 be constituted regarding affiliation of colleges pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9) (**Appendix-LII**):

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. | Dr. Satish Sharma, Fellow |Chairperson |
| 2. | DCDC | |
| 3. | Shri Subhash Sharma | |
| 4. | Principal Anita Kaushal | |
| 5. | Principal S.S. Sangha | |
| 6. | Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan | |
| 7. | Professor Ameer Sultana | |
| 8. | Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu | |
| 9. | Dr. Amit Joshi | |
| 10. | Shri Ashok Goyal
D.R. (Colleges) |Convener |

The discussion on the items for ratification took place after the consideration of Items C-1 to C-6 of regular meeting of the month, i.e., held on 29th April, 2018.

Routine and formal matters

51. The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(xv)** on the agenda was read out, i.e.—

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has appointed Professor Promila Pathak, Department of Botany, as Dean of International Students w.e.f. 01.04.2018, till further orders, under Regulation 1 at page 108 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed afresh Dr. Ramandeep Kaur Saluja, Associate Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on temporary basis, w.e.f. 05.02.2018 for 11 months i.e. upto 04.01.2019 with break on 03.02.2018 (Break Day) and 04.02.2018 (Sunday) 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 she was working earlier.
- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Mrs. Harpreet Kaur, Assistant Professor in Commerce (Temporary), Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, Distt. Nawanshehar, w.e.f. 9.01.2018 (A.N.) and due amount of summer vacation salary paid to her after deduction of one month salary in lieu of one month notice period, under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

NOTE: 1. Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, reads as under:

“The service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

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

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has appointed Professor Paramjit Kaur, University Business School, Panjab University as Honorary Director of Centre for IAS & Other Competitive Examinations, P.U. (additional charge) for a period of two year w.e.f. 01.04.2018.
- (v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved:

(i) the minutes dated 08.01.2018
(**Appendix-LIV**) of the Committee with

regard to review the eligibility criteria for admission to Undergraduate and Postgraduate courses under NRI quota for the academic session 2018-2019.

- (ii) the minutes dated 04.01.2018 (**Appendix-LIV**) of the Committee to formulate a policy for re-appear/failure of ICCR students.
- (iii) the request dated 24.01.2018 (**Appendix-LIV**) of Chairperson, Department of Anthropology, to name the Museum in the Department of Anthropology, P.U. as "S.R.K. Chopra Museum of Man".
- (iv) the minutes dated 16.01.2018 (**Appendix-LIV**) of the Committee to consider various issues regarding on line admissions for the academic session 2018-2019.
- (v) the minutes dated 16.11.2017 (**Appendix-LIV**) of the Board of Control in Physics, regarding admission in M.Tech. (Nanoscience & Nanotechnology) course.
- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the recommendations dated 19.02.2018 (**Appendix-LV**) of the Board of Control in Department of Geology to conduct the Entrance Test from upcoming session i.e. 2018-2019, for M.Sc. (Hons.) for the seats remaining vacant in B.Sc. III year.
- NOTE:** A copy of letter No.329/G dated 21.02.2018 is enclosed (**Appendix-LV**).
- (vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has authorised each head of the Department/ Institute/ Centre of the University to issue certificate at the time of supply of goods to the concerned supplier certifying that the goods under supply are required for research purpose only, on behalf of Registrar, Panjab University, for the purposes of notification No.47/2017 dated 14.11.2017 under GST Act 2017.
- NOTE:** A copy of order No.1621-1820 dated 07.03.2018 along with office note is enclosed (**Appendix-LVI**).
- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the following eligibility criteria for admission to M.A. Psychology 2018 as recommended by Board of control dated 15.12.2017 (**Appendix-LVII**), to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information:

Existing Eligibility	Proposed Eligibility
Passed one of the following	Passed one of the following

examinations from a recognized University: Bachelor's Degree obtaining 45% marks in Psychology or 50% marks in aggregate from a recognized University OR B.A. (Hons.) with Psychology OR B.Sc. (Hons. School) OR Master's degree in any other discipline.	examinations from a recognized University: Bachelor's Degree obtaining 45% marks in Psychology or 50% marks in aggregate from a recognized University OR B.A. (Hons.) with Psychology.
---	--

(ix) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology dated 19.12.2017 (Para 7) (**Appendix-LVIII**) and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has nominated following three experts as members of the Research Board in Engineering & Technology for the term 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2019, under Regulation 3(d) at page 445 of P.U. Cal. Vol. II, 2007:

1. Professor Navdeep Goyal
Department of Physics,
P.U., Chandigarh.
2. Professor S.K. Mehta
Department of Chemistry,
P.U., Chandigarh.
3. Professor R.C. Katiyal
Chandigarh Group of Colleges
Gharuan, Kharar (Pb).

(x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has extended the validity of Advertisement No.2/2016 for the two posts of Assistant Registrar (1 for PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur and 1 for P.U.R.C. Ludhiana) upto 31.05.2018 so that the interview for the said post could be conducted.

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

(xi) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the minutes dated 08.02.2018 (**Appendix-LX**) of the Committee, constituted him to review guidelines/rules for condonation of lectures for attendance, to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information, 2018.

(xii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of existing panel of Legal Retainers/Advocates of Panjab University, for a period of three years i.e. w.e.f. 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2020.

NOTE: The panel of Retainers/Advocates for the term w.e.f. 01.01.2015 to 31.12.2017 was approved by the Syndicate in its meetings dated 19.07.2015 Para 52(x) and 29.05.2016 Para 33 (R-vi) respectively is enclosed (**Appendix-LXI**).

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Board of Control in Economics dated 16.11.2017 (**Appendix-LXII**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following addition in the Syndicate decision dated 20.03.2017 (Para 14 R-iii) as part (iv)

(Appendix-LXII) with regard to admission Criteria for M.A. Economics in the Department of Economics for the session 2018-19:

“2% of aggregate marks obtained (normalized out of 2400) at Undergraduate level would be given as additional weightage to students who have studied Mathematics/Statistics at undergraduate level as an elective subject and fulfil the requirement of having studied adequate economics.”

NOTE: A copy of the letter dated 20.11.2017 of the Chairperson, Department of Economics is enclosed (**Appendix-LXII**).

- (xiv)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the recommendation (d) of the Core Committee (under Joint Admission Committee-2018) dated 19.03.2018 (**Appendix-LXIII**), regarding seat matrix (**Appendix-LXIII**) of UIET for B.E. Courses for admission of 2018-19.
- (xv)** To ratify that Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-LXIV**) between Panjab University, Chandigarh & Homi Bhabha National Institute, has been executed, to enhance collaborative research in the areas of mutual interest, both in extent and scope by using the medium of research students enrolled in the Partner Institutes

Shri Ashok Goyal said that **sub-item R-(i)** is withdrawn.

This was agreed to.

At this stage, Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the first agenda is supplied in a spiral bound form. But the agenda thereafter is sent in different forms. He pointed out that sometimes the University secretariat is not able to put together the papers. He suggested that every page which belongs to the Syndicate should carry the index and the packets which are being sent should be numbered so that the members could know that they are carrying the whole bundle to the meeting. Otherwise it becomes difficult to combine and correlate the papers. If their agenda preparation is good, it would become easier for the office to dispose off the papers.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Secretary to Vice-Chancellor to look into it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that when he came to know that Professor Arun Kumar was taking over as Vice-Chancellor, he was very happy to know from someone that Professor Grover would help the University in getting the grants.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members could not use his connectivity in the country and abroad.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they were not able to use it because they did not get the time but whatever time he got, he tried his level best to coordinate between the University and the Government. He has tried his best even at other places also. The Vice-Chancellor is also a witness to this that whenever he (Shri Sanjay Tandon) was available, he personally took care that the University should get the funds. But there are certain impediments which are created in the system or are subjected from person to person, it is difficult to comment on that. But at the same, they all should try to work together for the betterment of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is going to stay in Chandigarh and work for the University in a different way.

While referring to **sub-item R-(x)**, Shri Prabhjot Singh said that since the advertisement was issued two years ago, it should be re-advertised.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu also said that the posts be re-advertised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the validity is up to 31st May and let it be done so that they could get two Assistant Registrars for both the Regional Centres as otherwise nobody is ready to go there. The work would go smoothly. He said that recently they had also appointed about 300 Clerks, the advertisement for this was also issued during the time of then Vice-Chancellor Professor R.C. Sobti. With those persons, the work is going on smoothly.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the legal issues should be checked.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no legality issue involved.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the validity has already expired on 28.2.2018.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even he had got the appointments made for the advertisements which had been issued about 5 years ago. They should not go into technicality. The candidates have already applied against this advertisement.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Prabhjot Singh said that now more persons would have become eligible.

The Vice-Chancellor said that sometimes somebody is eligible while at other times ineligible.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even if they extend the validity of the advertisement, would they be able to fill up the posts.

The Vice-Chancellor said that 'yes', they could fill up the posts.

Shri Ashok Goyal replied that they could not fill up because they have to seek the permission from MHRD.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no need of permission from MHRD as long as they spend the money within the 6%.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, 'no'. They have got the permission for 3 Deputy Registrars, 27 teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said alright, he would cancel the interviews.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that validity should not be extended otherwise they would have to face the problems.

The Vice-Chancellor said, alright. They (members) have to run the University.

At this stage, while referring to **sub-item R-(xi)** regarding condonation of lectures, Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that there are some students of Muktsar who are facing problems of shortage of attendance.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is a representation from the students that the classes are not being held due to shortage of teachers and the roof of the classroom had also fallen. Now the roll numbers of all the students have been stopped.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Secretary to Vice-Chancellor to have a telephonic talk with the Director of the Muktsar Centre.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested that the matter should be expedited before the start of the examinations and they should take decision in the best interest of the students.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the benefit should be granted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is only one teacher of law.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that under the circumstances in which the classes are being held at Muktsar, all the students should not be deprived of the chance of appearing.

The Vice-Chancellor said, fine.

While referring to **sub-item R-(xii)**, Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that there is a name of Shri D.K. Verma at Sr.No. in the list of Advocates of District Courts. If he is the same Mr. D.K. Verma, according to him, that person is already dead. So, it should be got checked. He said that he wanted to suggest 1-2 more names for the panel.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, okay, he would add the names.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that the extension should be for one year instead of three years.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, extension is for one year.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the information contained in **Item R-(i)** be treated as withdrawn;
- (ii) the information contained in **Items R-(ii) to (ix), R-(xi), R-(xiii) to R-(xv)** be ratified;
- (iii) the information contained in **Item R-(x)** be not ratified and the posts be re-advertised;
- (iv) the information contained in **Item R-(xii)** be ratified for one year only with the addition of 1-2 names to be suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal.

When the discussion on Item I-(ii) commenced, the Controller of Examinations abstained from the meeting.

Routine and formal matters

52. The information contained in Items **I-(i) to I-(ix)** on the agenda was read out, i.e. –

- (i) To note an additional information pertaining to CMJ University.
- (ii) To note the report dated 14.03.2018 of the Standing Committee, regarding complaint of Dr. Amit Joshi, Fellow, Panjab University against the University Officer.
- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Surekha Devi W/o Late Shri Sagar Kumar, Library Restorer, U.I.L.S., P.U., Chandigarh, who expired on 18.12.2017 while in service:
 1. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
 2. Ex-gratia grant under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
 3. Encashment of Earned leave upto the prescribed limit, under Rule 17.4 at page 96 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
Dr. K. Sherry Sabbarwal Professor Department of Sociology	06.03.1987	31.03.2018	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183-186 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007; and

			(ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.
--	--	--	--

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

(v) 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 Mohinder Singh Assistant Registrar Examination-I	17.11.1980	31.03.2018	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Ms. Aruna Lakhpal Nee Aruna Sangar Stenographer	01.02.1982	28.02.2018	
3.	Dr. Shiv Kumar Deputy Librarian VVBIS & IS Hoshiarpur	06.05.1983	31.03.2018	
4.	Shri Vinod Kumar Singla Assistant Registrar UBS	11.02.1982	31.03.2018	
5.	Ms. Manju Dhand Assistant Registrar Secrecy Branch	19.02.1982	31.03.2018	
6.	Ms. Ravinder Kaur Superintendent College Branch	24.07.1985	28.02.2018	
7.	Ms. Sneh Lata Chopra Superintendent Add-on-Course	02.11.1982	31.03.2018	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
8.	Ms. Satinder Kaur Superintendent General Branch	02.12.1983	31.03.2018	

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
9.	Shri Kuldip Singh Senior Assistant Department of Anthropology	20.07.1976	31.03.2018	
10.	Ms. Amarjeet Kaur Senior Assistant USOL	31.07.1989	28.02.2018	
11.	Shri Wakil Singh Security Guard A.C. Joshi Library	12.04.1972	28.02.2018	
12.	Shri Braham Singh Common Room Attendant Boys Hostel No.6	01.04.1976	31.03.2018	
13.	Shri Joginder Singh Beldar P.U. Construction Office	02.04.1993	31.03.2018	
14.	Shri Dharam Pal Sharma Binder A.C. Joshi Library	14.04.1986	31.03.2018	

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Professor Ashutosh Kumar, Department of Political Science, P.U., as Honorary Director, Human Resource Development Centre (HRDC), P.U., Chandigarh, w.e.f. 01.04.2018 in addition to his present duties till further orders

(vii) In pursuance of orders dated 16.02.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 3576 of 2018 (Dr. Parveen Rishi & Ors. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) tagged with LPA No. 1505 of 2016, wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected in the said case. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) was fixed for hearing on 05.03.2018, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

(a) Ms. Renu Gandhi, Assistant Professor, Department of Life Long Learning & Extension, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.03.2018 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing as on 28.02.2018 without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by her. The payment to her shall be

adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per performa.

- (b) she be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

- (viii) In pursuance of orders dated 16.02.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 3576 of 2018 (Dr. Parveen Rishi & Ors. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) tagged with LPA No. 1505 of 2016, wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected in the said case. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) was fixed for hearing on 05.03.2018, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (a) Dr. (Ms.) Meena Dutta, Professor, Defense Studies, University School of Open Learning, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.03.2018 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing as on 28.02.2018 without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by her. The payment to her shall be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per performa.

- (b) she be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

- (ix) To note letter dated 27.03.2018 (**Appendix-LXV**) received from Special Secretary, Department of Higher Education (Education-I Branch), Government of Punjab, with regard to constitution of the Committee by the Governor of Punjab, to consider the issue of including the vocational subject, as one of the optional subject, out of three optional subjects, already being run by the Universities at Graduation level.

While referring to **sub-item I-(i)**, the Vice-Chancellor said that there are some documents containing the information related with the

issue of CMJ University which is being raised time and again. The CMJ University has sent papers and if the members were not able to go through the same, they could go through and they would come back to it next time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has to point out some very serious and glaring omission. A decision was taken by the Senate that Professor Parvinder Singh, Dean College Development Council would be deputed to Shillong to verify the degrees of CMJ University from the State of Meghalaya as per the directions of the Supreme Court of India and whatever input they have worked till that date with him, he shared it with the Senate though there is a complaint, representation written by three hon'ble members of the Senate seeking action to be initiated against him who misled the Senate and waste precious time of the Senate and along with the representation, they have annexed some stay order granted by the Supreme Court of India. As was discussed and decided in the Senate, he was also advised to supply copies of the documents which he was referring while speaking in the Senate. As desired by the Vice-Chancellor, because he had also requested that as and when the person to Shillong is deputed, the papers may be taken from him. As desired by the Vice-Chancellor, whatever 4-5 papers that he had with him had sent to the Vice-Chancellor. He did not understand which authority and as per which decision another certificate was given by one of the College Principals again getting confirmation from the CMJ University that their degree was valid while the Senate had taken the decision that it is to be got verified from the State of Meghalaya. Now the information has come to the Syndicate which is very shocking wherein the Vice-Chancellor has given the direction contrary to and in violation of the decision of the Senate that in view of the papers given by, as he understands, Shri Ashok Goyal and as well as hon'ble member of the Senate, it is written in Vice-Chancellor's own hand "discussed with CoE and after receipt of inputs from two Senators, no need to visit Shillong at the moment". According to him, the House should also be surprised and shocked as to in this University has anybody got the authority to pass orders over and above the decision of the Senate. The decision in the Senate was taken, according to him roughly 2-3 months back. From the information which has been given by the office in the Syndicate, he could presume safely that nobody has visited Shillong as was decided by the Senate. This was also clearly made to understand by the Senate in one voice that any information obtained by any individual from the CMJ University is not binding on them. The information is to be verified from the State of Meghalaya that whatever input about the papers relating to State of Meghalaya and the information which has been used as input from the other members is the information received from the University which he has right from the beginning claiming that its degrees are valid. In the Senate also he had said that the order of the Single Bench of Meghalaya High Court of 2015 and thereafter the LPA of Meghalaya High Court in 2017, that related only qua the dissolution of the University and that did not talk anything about the validity of the degree, the decision about which was already taken by the Meghalaya Government as per the directions of the Supreme Court of India. He had only said that under the garb of that Single Bench order of 2015, the University's Syndicate had taken the decision in March, 2017 to validate the degrees and he had said though the case did not relate to validation of degrees, it related only and only to dissolution of the University and that order was also reversed by the Double Bench. He is not a lawyer, does not have the infrastructure or any kind of

support which the University has, it has been written in the letter alleging and where they have demanded against him that, that order of Double Bench had been stayed by the Supreme Court. Presuming and assuming that if he speaks something, he should have knowledge about everything and the University which has taken the decision, it is not supposed to have knowledge about anything. But still he welcomes any enquiry against his misconduct, he has repeated a number of times that he is ready to undergo any kind of punishment if he has committed anything wrong, but that does not mean that invalid degrees could be allowed to be valid till it is verified as per the decision of the Senate. Before anybody speaks, he would like the Vice-Chancellor to respond as to under what circumstances it has happened.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever he received from Shri Ashok Goyal, it is under the signature of the Director, Higher and Technical Education. It mentions the name of the student and that the transfer certificate from Dravidian University to CMJ University is not available. Course work was done at Jorhat University. The candidate has done the course work. In the thesis submission certificate, it is written that it is also certified that the candidate has met all requirements needed for the award of Ph.D. degree. The viva-voce was held at a later date. After making this, how could it be said that the recommendation is not valid. He fails to understand as to what it means. Could any Government official for whatever reason declare the Panjab University degree invalid. He could not just understand as to what is the meaning of this. He felt that there is no sense in sending somebody to verify this kind of thing. Even if a Clerk of the Directorate of Higher Education says that it is clearly written, he could not believe that this amounts to saying that the degrees are invalid. Though he is apprehensive of the fact that so many students could not have been admitted by CMJ University that they could not have the provision to organise the course work and award the degrees. It is a herculean thing and it appears impossible for a reputed University to indulge in this thing. He did not know as to what is to be got verified. It is a murky thing that is going on there. What he is going to gain by sending an officer to fish out from this murky thing. He got something stated by a member of the governing body and gets another thing stated by another member of the governing body levelling serious accusations against each other, what he is supposed to do. In the meeting of the Senate, serious accusations are levelled. If a member levels serious allegations against a sitting member of the Syndicate where he says things like corruption, CBI enquiry and so on. He is bewildered as to what is happening on behalf of the governing body.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when it was discussed in the Senate, on that day the information was given by Shri Ashok Goyal was that the Double Bench kept the order of the Single Bench in abeyance. Obviously, when the order is kept in abeyance, the University does not exist. When the University approached the Supreme Court about which Shri Ashok Goyal had not the information on that day. So, when that information was not there, whatever decision they took in the Senate that was on the basis of some information which are not hundred percent available. The Supreme Court has also granted stay. As far as the University is concerned, as such the situation as on today is sub-judice. So, till the issue is sub-judice, as has been said by the Vice Chancellor, there is no need to send anybody till all the decision are taken finally. Till all

the decision are available, he believed, that the Panjab University is not in a position to take any final call.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever he has received, he has put it just in a sealed cover and sent this all to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said one thing is there that even after the Senate has taken a decision the Vice Chancellor has got the right to undo the decision of the Senate as per his own wisdom and after looking into the papers which as on today, despite any kind of errors, has got the sanctity of law of the land. It is the Supreme Court who told them to deal with the cases of the degrees of those students who in fact had represented before the Meghalaya Government and he has sent the copy of the representation also which is very much there in the file of the University. He would say why the University asked the candidate what is the outcome of his representation. He (Vice Chancellor) has himself requested that he has sent this representation, pending the outcome of this representation, he may be given provisional approval and that letter was written by the candidate in 2014. After four years, the University is not keen to ask the candidate to tell as to what is the outcome of his representation which he had made as per the directions of Supreme Court. Thereafter, he would have been happy, had the Vice Chancellor asked, since he could not understand what does it mean, maybe he (Shri Ashok Goyal) could have told, what does it mean. Actually, these are the facts which the Committee recorded while hearing the grievance of the representation. After recording these facts that Committee has only recommended, not valid. After considering the recommendation of that Committee, the Director State Higher Education and Director Technical Education has passed the order, it is invalid. The recommendation dated 25th March, 2014 and the final order dated 31st July, 2014 which was conveyed to the concerned candidate on 21st July, 2014 by way of registered post. Now, he wonders if the candidate in question who is aggrieved, he or she has not raised any objection against the decision of Meghalaya Government Directorate, it is the Vice Chancellor of Panjab University who says that he does not agree with this order as if the Panjab University is the aggrieved party.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the decision was taken in the Senate, till that time only the double bench decision was available which stayed the decision of single bench.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that was only about the dissolution of the University.

Continuing Professor Navdeep Goyal said suppose there is a University which is recognized by the UGC, If any State Government declares its degree valid or invalid, to his mind, that is not correct. When the Supreme Court took the decision for the first time, the Court has taken the decision in the light of the fact that the Government has decided that the University closed. Even now the Supreme Court stay is still there and no final order has come.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was for the dissolution of the University to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it needs to be checked.

Shri Navdeep Goyal said that there is nothing to get it checked as he has everything in writing and everything is on record.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that personally, they have nothing to do with the case. After having three hours discussion on the issue, the Senate had resolved that the University should send an officer along with one or two Fellow or Syndicate members. First they should not do it. Secondly, he requested the Vice Chancellor to recall his own statement where he said that they have slipped from 55th rank to 33rd rank, if the persons with such degrees are appointed as Assistant Professors in the Colleges and University, the NAAC Team would also point out as to what type of persons the University has appointed. He (Vice Chancellor) should read their submission which they have submitted in the Supreme Court. They conferred degrees on 429 candidates within two years. Does the Vice Chancellor think that they did get the course work done to 429 candidates when they have only one Ph.D. candidate and they have admitted to it. The papers which an honourable member has given, there is a paper where it is written that the degree of the candidate is invalid. When a paper is given to all the members, it has created a confusion.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that whatever is written there the degree cannot be declared invalid on the basis of that. The candidate has done Course Work. He has not given the migration certificate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that without the migration, the certificate cannot be issued. How they can give the degree without the migration certificate. He requested the Vice Chancellor to enquire it from the Controller of Examinations whether the Panjab University used to give such certificates.

Shri Prabhjot Singh asked as to what is the problem in sending the Controller of Examinations and two other persons to Meghalaya Government to verify it.

The Vice Chancellor said, send the persons there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that it was also said in the Senate meeting to send the persons.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that the documents submitted by the College and the candidate should be got verified.

The Vice Chancellor said, can it be the basis of what is written there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, that is afterwards they have to decide whether as to what is the basis.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Controller of Examinations to go to Meghalaya Government Directorate. He also requested Shri Prabhjot Singh to go along with the Controller or if any other person would like to go, he could go. The Vice Chancellor again asked Controller of Examinations to go tomorrow along with any Syndicate member who has the time to go. He may request Shri Ashok Goyal along with him.

Dr. Amit Joshi said when they would bring the report from there, nobody would agree to it suspecting that there may not be any mala fide. Would they send the persons again.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is for them, if they want, all the 15 persons could go.

Shri Ashok Goyal said they should send those persons on whom they trust.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he is just asking what would be procedure after that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it means they do not trust each other.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said they are saying this so that they might not be held responsible.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, If he is asked to give the documentary evidence for what he is speaking, then why the onus be not put on them. Why they should run away from the responsibility? If they say that it needs to be checked, he could see even now as to what is the order of the Supreme Court. It is a matter of record as to what is order of the double bench and what is the order of the single bench. It is a matter of record as to what are the contents of the writ petition.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said asked the Controller of Examinations that he is free to take along with him any person and verify the degrees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have not to verify it from the University, they are to verify it from the Government of Meghalaya and let they should see whether the State of Meghalaya is able to justify their action or not.

Shri Prabhjot Singh again requested the Controller of Examinations to go and request any person to go alongwith him.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said the Controller of Examinations could go alone and there is no need to take any person along with.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu requested that one Syndicate member should accompany the Controller of Examinations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he volunteered to go and let Shri Prabhjot Singh also to go.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that they have discussed this matter for three hours in the Senate and for one hour in the Syndicate. But till the time it is verified from the Government of Meghalaya, it is useless.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is just possible that the State Government might have withdrawn their order.

Shri Prabhjot Singh said that with this, the other cases which have been withheld would also become eligible.

While referring to **sub-item I-(ii)**, the Vice Chancellor requested the members to see to Item I-(ii) also. This is the level of cooperation that the University Statutory Committee received from the members of the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that he would like to talk about one thing more, though he did not want to touch the subject. He asked as to what this complaint is about.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor asked Dr. Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examinations that he has to abstain from the meeting.

The Vice Chancellor read out a letter written by Dr. Amit Joshi, Fellow, which states as under:

"I wish to bring to your kind notice the unruly and derogatory behaviour of Prof. Parvinder Singh, Controller of examination with additional charge of DCDC. The incident pertains to today morning at 10:30 AM when I along with one of my fellow colleague Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu went to the office of DCDC for seeking clarification on the criteria for assigning some examination duty related work. Dr Sidhu enquired from him the guidelines for assigning Center Superintendent duties. Dr Sidhu pointed out to him some issue pertaining to this in a college in Punjab. All the time during the discussions, he was avoiding to answer the queries raised by Dr. Sidhu on one pretext or another. Dr. Sidhu requested him to answer the queries as early as possible as it is already late. He reminded him that the matter is already a week old and he has already sent SMS to him in this regard. To this, the officiating DCDC got furious and started yelling at us. The DCDC started shouting that I don't have time and I will do whatever I deem fit and if we have any problem we can give it in writing. I intervened at this stage and requested him to be polite. He didn't listen to me also and continued using abusive language and making baseless allegations. He started passing derogatory remarks against both of us to which I objected and requested him to take back his words. I reminded him that he is sitting on a constitutional and responsible position and it is his duty to provide answers to our queries to which he again refused. He replied that he doesn't have time for us. I questioned him that whether his this kind of behaviour is selectively meant for us only or this is generalized to all the fellows? We were not there to seek any favour from him. We were there just to enquire whether his office is conforming to the guidelines of the University. Why he reacted in a furious, abusive and derogatory way if he has not committed any wrong? Why he threatened to register FIR against us? What wrong we have done? Is it justified to threaten a fellow who wants to seek answers to his/her queries with filing a FIR/police complaint against that fellow? Both of us went there in our capacity as Fellows and tried to seek answers to our questions as per PU calendar guidelines. This behaviour is simply not acceptable as it

lacks objectivity. He may agree or disagree with us but he should be conscious about his behaviour, language and choice of words. All the time during the entire discussion neither of us used or uttered even a single provocative or abusive word. Finally when his threatening of FIR and his behaviour crossed all the civilized and acceptable limits, we walked out from his room under protest. We didn't say even a single word to him except for walking out. We request you to kindly look into the matter and take suitable action against Prof. Parvinder Singh (Controller of examinations with additional charge for (DCDC). Hope you will give due priority to this mail as it involves sanctity of two important offices of the University."

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that he referred this letter to the Standing Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, Standing Committee about what. The Vice Chancellor said that Standing Committee for complaints.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to request that while marking the complaints, please see what is the term of reference of a particular Committee. The Standing Committee was constituted for a particular purpose and this complaint is not covered under that purpose. It does not mean that any complaint could be referred to that Committee and he wondered that the Committee which has been constituted, they also did not see whether this falls under their purview or not. Tomorrow, if a case pertaining to sexual harassment is sent to this Committee, are they competent to deal with that complaint? No, they have to say that this complaint does not relate to them, so it may be sent to that Committee. Whatever is sent by the Vice Chancellor, they do not hesitate in dealing with the complaint. He would like to read relevant portion from the P.U. Calendar, Volume-III where it is very clearly mentioned that the following guidelines will be followed in processing of serious allegations against the University or individual officers/officials/ teachers /students of the University pertaining to irregularities concerning Finances, there is no finance involved, Admissions, no admission is involved, Examination, no examination is involved, Appointments, no appointments are involved, Plagiarism, no plagiarism is involved or any other allegation which amounts to moral turpitude. This Committee is meant only for this purpose. Now if somebody has misbehaved with an honourable Fellow member, he is equally pained. But that does not fall in the purview of this Committee. Now, Professor Ronki Ram ji, a man of political science, Supreme Court has not been able to define till date, what moral turpitude is, and to this behaviour, he is saying moral turpitude. He asked Professor Ronki Ram, does he know that theft is not moral turpitude. Does he know that it is only murder and rape which has now been, till date defined as moral turpitude.

Professor Ronki Ram informed that the two judgements are involved to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that is not regarding moral turpitude. Continuing Shri Ronki Ram said that then how would they decide the things to be taken to the Standing Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Standing Committee has to see whether any corruption is involved in it, whether any wrong

admission is made or any wrong appointment is made. This is what he has read. The things which are covered has been written. Referring to the Calendar, he said that this is the latest edition. The Committee was not there 20 years back. It has come into existence only at the time of Professor M.M. Puri. At that time the discussion was that in case some outsider files a complaint against an officer of the University where corruption is involved or some illegality is involved about admission, appointment or examination, it was also written there that an affidavit is also required to be taken from the complainant. It should be taken seriously. But he does not know under what circumstances, the purpose for which this Committee was made, never any complaint from the outsider came against an officer of the University. It is only within the system and they are complaining against each other and the complaint is marked to this Committee.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that whatever Committee is there, they are running into administrative problem. Let they have some other Committee to deal with that problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is coming to that point also. Let they should see how seriously they handle such complaints. Actually, there is casual approach at every level. If two of them have complained and one of them did not appear, probably the things would have been settled or may be somebody did not want to pursue it. There was another complaint where a member of the Syndicate alleged to have misbehaved by the same officer. He does not know, what happened to that. That probably was also sorted out. It is presumed that if something is sorted out, then the person does not want to pursue the complaint, may be, that is why this is the outcome. Now since this has come as report of the Planning Committee, it was his duty, of course they want to continue with that, no problem. But as far his knowledge, they should give the complaint with the seriousness which it deserves. They should also ensure that it is expedited in a desired manner whether to work reconciliation for sorting it out or if in spite of best efforts if it is not possible to take it to logical ends. He does not want to speak on behalf of the complainant as the Vice Chancellor said that why they did not cooperate. He has no knowledge about the incident and firsthand knowledge, he cannot comment, what is right and what is wrong. He does not what was recorded because he did not go into the report of the Standing Committee as he thought it was not within jurisdiction of that Committee.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said the first point that it should not have been referred to the Committee, to which he agreed. The second point is that the complainant himself is not appearing, no Committee can do anything.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he would like to correct it as he is the complainant. It is an incident of 11th May. It has been said to expedite it, but he is telling about the meaning of 'expedite' in the Panjab University dictionary that 11th May has again come. He had appeared before the Committee. Probably, they would not see such a Syndicate that the complainant, witness as well as the person against whom the complaint has been made he is also sitting and even one member of the Enquiry Committee is also sitting here. He has twice written the Vice Chancellor but he knows what would be the end result as he has now understood the working of the University. Hopefully, he might not adopt it by God's grace, but he has

understood it as to how the offices are being used. He has appeared before the Committee, so it is wrong to say that the complainant himself has not appeared before the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has not said so.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has said that the complainant has himself not appeared. This was also stated by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi. He appeared before the Committee and the Committee asked him some questions. They asked if he had gone there after having the appointment. He told the Committee that he has not sought time as he had gone there with Shri Inderpal Singh Sidhu and they can ask Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu whether he has sought time or not. Now the Committee has given its report which he has also discussed with Shri Ashok Goyal ji. Neither he nor the Controller of Examination has mentioned in his statement that this case belongs to Tanda College case. But he did not know from where it has been mentioned in the report. On being asked by Shri Prabhjot Singh as to who were the members, Dr. Amit Joshi said that on the day he appeared, there was Professor Anil Monga, Dr. Ameer Sultana and Professor Rajat Sandhir.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked as to what has to be done by them.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is for them to see as to what has to be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor while informing the House that this is the level of the cooperation the University is getting. This can be discussed.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked, cooperation from whom.

Shri Ashok Goyal said from those who are the accused and who are the complainants.

Dr. Subhash Sharma enquired as to what the Committee has said.

Dr. Amit Joshi while telling about what the Committee has said that there are procedural lapses in the examination system. He further said that this thing came in the report because a complaint was made that a school teacher was appointed as Centre Superintendent who was working on ad hoc.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said there is need of reforms in such matters. The regular teachers of Colleges did not perform their duty and the adhoc teachers perform such duties.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Principal has recommended the names of wrong persons and so there should be procedure to check it. This was also endorsed by Dr.R.K. Mahajan.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Committee has also made similar recommendations. He read out some portion from the report of the Committee which states that the Committee strongly feels that an institution on mechanism in the form of the Small Complaint

Redressal Committee. When the members closed the discussion on this item, Dr. Amit Joshi asked as to what has been done in this case.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said nothing is to be done as the item was an information item only.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to learn something from the previous incident. When such a complaint would be received in future, the given Vice Chancellor should not send it to any Committee. It should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting and let the Syndicate take a decision on it.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said why he (Vice Chancellor) is putting this onus on the Syndicate. Does it mean that the Vice Chancellor should stop working and everything would be done by the Syndicate?

The Vice Chancellor said that the Syndicate is the Government of the University.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the Executive has to do his job. Does it mean that the Prime Minister should stop working and the Cabinet would do everything?

The Vice Chancellor said that a Vice Chancellor has no freedom to take a decision at this stage.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that it is regarding delegated powers and that also in different circumstances. The Vice Chancellor has to do this as he is supposed to do this.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu suggested that it could have been better if the Vice Chancellor had called both the parties and settled the issue.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the information contained in **Item I-(i)** be noted and a Committee consisting of Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Prabhjot Singh and Controller of Examinations be requested to visit the Department of Higher and Technical Education, Government of Meghalaya to verify the validity of the degrees in question; and
- (ii) the information contained in **Items I-(ii) to I-(v) and I-(vii) to I-(ix)** be noted;
- (iii) the information contained in **Item I-(vi)** be treated as withdrawn.

(Parvinder Singh)

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR