

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Tuesday, 8th October 2013 at 4.00 p.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice-Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Dr. Dinesh Talwar
4. Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon
5. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
6. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
7. Dr. Jagwant Singh
8. Professor Keshav Malhotra
9. Professor Naval Kishore
10. Professor Nandita Singh
11. Dr. R.P.S. Josh
12. Professor Shelley Walia
13. Shri Satya Pal Jain
14. Dr. Tarlok Bandhu
15. S. Gurdev Singh Ghuman
Director Higher Education, Punjab
16. Professor A.K. Bhandari Registrar ... (Secretary)

Principal R.S. Jhanji, Shri Satish Kumar and Smt. Gurpreet Kaur Sapra, Director Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh could not attend the meeting.

Condolence Resolution

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

- (i) Professor Usha Kanwar, Professor (Retd.) and former Chairperson of the Department of Zoology, Panjab University, who passed away on 4.10.2013;
- (ii) Professor G.S. Bhalla, very eminent Economist, who had served at the Panjab University in the Department of Economics from 1969 to 1975, passed away on September 13, 2013 at Puducherry, Tamilnadu;
- (iii) Dr. S. Bhatnagar, former Director of Directorate of Correspondence Studies (now University School of Open Learning) on September 28, 2013. He was a visionary distance educator; and
- (iv) Dr. J.G. Jolly, Founder of Blood Bank Society and Emeritus Professor, Department of Transfusion Medicines, Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education & Research (PGIMER), Chandigarh, passed away on October 5, 2013.

In their deaths, the University has lost dedicated and eminent educationists/doctor. We pray to the Almighty to give peace to the departed souls in Heaven and strength & courage to the members of the bereaved families to bear this irreparable loss".

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Professor Usha Kanwar, Professor G.S. Bhalla, Dr. S. Bhatnagar and Dr. J.G. Jolly 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 feel immense pleasure in informing the distinguished members of the Syndicate –

- (i) that the Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2013-14 powered by Thomson Reuters have ranked Panjab University in the bracket of 226-250 best Universities in the World. These rankings judge Universities world over across all of their core missions – teaching, research, knowledge transfer and international outlook, by employing 13 carefully calibrated performance indicators to provide comprehensive and balanced comparisons.

The 13 performance indicators are grouped into five areas:

- a) **Teaching:** the learning environment (worth 30 per cent of the overall ranking score)
- b) **Research:** volume, income and reputation (worth 30 per cent)
- c) **Citations:** research influence (worth 30 per cent)
- d) **Industry Income:** innovation (worth 2.5 per cent)
- e) **International Outlook:** staff, students and research (worth 7.5 per cent).

Our University has obtained the highest rank among all Indian universities which participated in the global survey. The Planning Commission and MHRD, Government of India had asked Panjab University to provide data to this survey in May 2013.

The Syndicate acknowledged the performance and achievement of the Panjab University with thumping of desks.

- (ii) that Department of Science and Technology of Government of India has approved a proposal to set up Policy Research Centre at Panjab University Campus, which would focus on promotion of Industries – Academia Research. DST would provide Rs.1 crore in the first year to set up the infrastructure and deploy personnel to serve this Centre. The proposal was presented by Dean (Science), Professor Rupinder Tewari, Fellow, Panjab University, Professor Manmohan

Gupta and Professor Gurmail Singh, on behalf of the University. The release of funds in the future would happen after evaluation on year to year basis. Such Centres are being set up under 12th Five Year Plan as a part of Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) policy enunciated by Government of India. The proposals of four Centres have been accepted so far and Panjab University is one of them.

- (iii) that S. Gurdev Singh Ghuman, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, has been promoted as an IAS Officer.”

Professor Keshav Malhotra congratulated the Vice-Chancellor, faculty members and non-teaching staff of the University, on behalf of the Syndicate, for doing such a hard work on the basis of which the Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2013-14 powered by Thomson Reuters has ranked the Panjab University in the bracket of 226-250 best universities in the World. In fact, the faculty members were working towards this for the last so many years.

Shri Ashok Goyal, while endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that he also congratulate the Vice-Chancellor, faculty members, students and the non-teaching staff of the University for working so hard that the Panjab University has been ranked in the bracket of 226-250 best universities in the World by the Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2013-14 powered by Thomson Reuters. In fact, this ranking is based for the period 2007-2011. But neither has it been mentioned here nor they had tried to identify the faculty members, who are the architects of this great achievement. In fact, they should have done this exercise, so that those who had contributed more and also those who had contributed less, are encouraged to contribute more in future.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that he also congratulates the Vice-Chancellor, faculty members and the students, who had worked hard in this regard. He felt that not only they should be proud of their ranking, but also should be proud of the fact that the ranking has been given by the Times Higher Education World University Rankings, an institution to which he was quite familiar, and it is one of the top institutions in the Western Academic World. He, however, felt that they must raise their level further so that they are in the first 200 Universities.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) felicitations of the Syndicate members be conveyed to S Gurdev Singh Ghuman, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, on his promotion to the cadre of IAS;
- (ii) the information given by the Vice-Chancellor in his statement at Sr. Nos. 1 (i) and (ii), be noted; and
- (iii) the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meetings dated 15.05.2013 and 29.06.2013, as per **(Appendix-I)**, be noted.

After the decisions on the Vice-Chancellor's statement were taken, the members started general discussion.

- (1) Referring to the statement of the Vice-Chancellor regarding ranking of the University in the best universities of the World, Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that the University could achieve the pivotal position because of the efforts of faculty and non-teaching staff, in recognition of which the University should also think of giving some financial benefits, e.g., special increments to the employees, which, however, might not be possible due to financial restraints. But the University must at least give the instalment of 8% Dearness Allowance (DA), which became due from 1st January 2013 to its employees, in anticipation of the announcement of release of the said DA instalment by Punjab Government. In view of this, he suggested that the instalment of 8% DA should be released by the University as well as has been done by the (U.T.) Chandigarh, in anticipation of release of DA by the Punjab Government. He further stated that since at present almost 92% grant to the University is given by the Central Government, the instalment/s of DA should be released/given to the University staff as and when the same is/are announced by the Central Government to its employees, which in fact was the practice followed by the University up to the year 1974. He, therefore, suggested that the item regarding release/payment of instalment of DA to the University employees as and when it is announced by the Central Government to its employees, should be placed before the Board of Finance.

Shri Ashok Goyal, in addition to what Professor Keshav Malhotra said, stated that instead of going to the Board of Finance, as the U.T. Administration has done, the Syndicate could take the decision to release payment of DA to the University employees, in anticipation release of DA by Punjab Government, especially keeping in view that the UT Administration, which is also following the Punjab Government, has already done this. Therefore, the Panjab University is not debarred from taking a decision to release payment of DA to its employees in anticipation of release of DA by the Punjab Government. He further suggested that for all times to come, they should incorporate it in their rules/regulations that DA shall be released/paid to the University employees as and when announced by the Central Government from time to time because the State Government/s also release the same DA as was being done by the UT Administration, till a few years back.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that following the example of UT Administration, they should release the instalment of DA to the University employees, in anticipation of release of DA instalment by the Punjab Government.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that, earlier, the UT Administration used to release DA instalment to its employees as and when the DA instalment was announced by the Central Government. Only three-four years back, the UT Administration reversed that decision on the noting of its Finance Secretary, who wrote that since the UT is following the

Punjab Government in the matter of pay-scales, instalment of DA should not be released until the same is announced/ released by the Punjab Government. Now the U.T. Administration has released payment of D.A. instalment in anticipation of its announcement by the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be better if a copy of the resolution of the Syndicate is sent to each and every member of the Board of Finance for their information.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 8% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 01.01.2013, be released/paid to the University employees, in anticipation of the announcement of release of the said DA instalment by Punjab Government and Board of Finance on the analogy of U.T. Administration;
 - (2) a copy of the Resolution be sent to all the members of the Board of Finance for their information; and
 - (3) for future, an agenda item regarding release/payment of instalment of DA to the University employees as and when it is announced by the Central Government to its employees by delinking the University from the Punjab Government so far as DA is concerned, be placed before the Board of Finance.
- (2) Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that since the payment of leave encashment (Earned Leave) of 300 days to the faculty members has been withheld for the last about three years, the payment of leave encashment (Earned Leave) of 180 days to the faculty members, as per the existing provision, be made, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that the number of days of encashment of Earned Leave was increased by the Punjab Government from 180 days to 240 days and later on from 240 days to 300 days. But the amendments had not been carried out in the Regulations. The provision for accumulation/ encashment of 180 days Earned Leave existed in the Regulations and whatever provided in the Regulations, the same should be given to the teachers. Simultaneously, amendment in the Regulations regarding encashment of 300 days, as per Punjab Government, should be made.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that the Punjab Government has already approved leave (earned leave) encashment of up to 300 days.

Dr. Jagwant Singh enquired could they increase number of days of earned leave encashment from 180 days to 300 days, in anticipation of approval of amendment of Regulations by the Government of India, keeping in view the fact that the Senate has already approved the said amendment and only the notification to be issued by the Government of India is pending?

RESOLVED: That the payment of leave encashment (Earned Leave) of 180 days to the faculty members, as per the existing provision, be made, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

- (3) Professor Shelly Walia stated that a few years ago when he was a member of the Syndicate/Senate a decision regarding sanction of seed money ranging between Rs.10,000/- and Rs.15,000/- to the newly appointed teachers was taken. He needed clarification whether the said incentive of seed money was given to the teachers for writing proposals for having research project/s from funding agencies or for writing research papers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that though no approval has been sought from him in the last 15 months on any such request, he would check and find out whether there is any budget provision.

It was clarified that a provision has been made that the young teachers, who wanted to write certain research projects for acquiring them from the funding agency, they would be given a seed money ranging between Rs.10,000/- and Rs.15,000/-so that they could start their work straightaway. All such proposals/requests are processed by the Dean Research.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would check and find out.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under the CAS, at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur

2(i). Considered minutes dated 26.08.2013 (**Appendix-II**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Law) Stage-1 to Assistant Professor (Law) Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Law) (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Law) (Stage-2) at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University, the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

1. Dr. Virender Kumar Negi - 03.09.2012
2. Mrs. Vinay Sharma - 19.09.2012.

NOTE: The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under the CAS, in the Department of Anthropology

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2013 (**Appendix-III**) 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 Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Kewal Krishan be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) with effect from **28.01.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under the CAS, in Department of Human Genome Studies & Research

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2013 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor Stage -1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Human Genome Studies & Research, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Shashi Chaudhary be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) in the Department of Human Genome Studies & Research, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) with effect from **27.11.2011 (i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course, i.e. 26.11.2011)**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under the CAS, in the Department of Chemistry

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2013 (**Appendix-V**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committees for promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Vikas be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) with effect from **02.06.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under the CAS, in the Department of Life Long Learning & Extension

2(v). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2013 (**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), in the Department of Life Long Learning & Extension, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Prabha Vig be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Life Long Learning & Extension, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) with effect from **03.03.2009**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under the CAS, at University School of Open Learning

2(vi). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2013 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Education) Stage-2 to Assistant Professor (Education) Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Jatinder Grover be promoted from Assistant Professor (Education) (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Education) (Stage-3) at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) with effect from **19.07.2012**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under the CAS, in the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology

2(vii). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2013 (**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), in the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. (Mrs.) Renu Thakur be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) with effect from **26.09.2011**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under the CAS, at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology

2(viii). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2013 (**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), at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Gaurav Verma be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) with effect from **01.03.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under the CAS, in the Department of English & Cultural Studies

2(ix). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2013 (**Appendix-X**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of English & Cultural Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Meenu Aggarwal nee Gupta be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) in the Department of English & Cultural Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) with effect from **03.11.2009**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under the CAS, at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana

2(x). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2013 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (English) Stage-1 to Assistant Professor (English) Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra nee Sophia Alphonse be promoted from Assistant Professor (English) (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (English) (Stage-2) at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) with effect from **25.12.2010 (i.e. the date one day after completion of Orientation Course on 24.12.2010)**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under the CAS, at University Institute of Legal Studies

2(xi). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2013 (**Appendix-XII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (English) Stage-2 to Assistant Professor (English) Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Chanchal Narang be promoted from Assistant Professor (English) (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (English) (Stage-3) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) with effect from **06.07.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under the CAS, at University Institute of Legal Studies

2(xii). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2013 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Sociology) Stage-2 to Assistant Professor (Sociology) Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Navneet Kaur Arora be promoted from Assistant Professor (Sociology) (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Sociology) (Stage-3) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) with effect from **06.07.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Appointment of Assistant Professors in the Department of Public Administration and USOL

3(i). Considered minutes dated 19.12.2012 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Professor in the Department of Public Administration, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

3(ii). Considered minutes dated 20.12.2012 (**Appendix-XV**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Professors-2 (General-1 and SC-1) in the Department of Public Administration at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

NOTE: 1. The Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court disposed of CWP 16056 of 2013 (**Appendix-)** with a direction to respondent No. 1- University to take a **final decision on this issue expeditiously but in any case on or before 31.12.2013.**

2. The grouse made in the present petition is that even though the petitioner was shown to have been selected, he was not issued an appointment letter and thereafter in

response to an inquiry under the Right to Information Act he was informed that the matter is still under consideration.

3. The Syndicate meeting dated 24.8.2013 has decided that the above item **be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate along with writ petition.**

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that it has been mentioned in the note at Sr. No. 2 that “even though the petitioner was shown to have been selected, he was not issued an appointment letter and thereafter in response to an inquiry under the Right to Information Act he was informed that the matter is still under consideration”. He said that such a decision had never been taken by the Syndicate. In fact, this item was placed before the Syndicate in its January 2013 meeting, wherein after discussion, the item was withdrawn. He enquired how this reply ‘that the matter is under consideration’ given under R.T.I. Act.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that the reply should have been given that the item was withdrawn from the meeting of the Syndicate dated 27.1.2013. The decision of the Syndicate regarding withdrawal of the item was unanimous.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that do they know the difference between withdrawn and deferred items?

The Vice-Chancellor stated that it is quite possible that he had a misperception that the withdrawn item could be re-introduced. But he had informally talked to some of the senior Syndicate members having vast experience, who had given him to understand that withdrawn item *prima facie* could be re-introduced.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to know the names of those senior members who had advised the Vice-Chancellor that the withdrawn item could be placed before the Syndicate for re-consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that since one of the candidates represented to different authorities several times, he thought it proper to place the item before the Syndicate for re-consideration.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the matter is already in the Court and the person could again go to the Court on the plea that though the item was withdrawn, it was re-considered. Only they knew as to what transpired in the Syndicate consequent to which the item was withdrawn. That the withdrawn item could be re-introduced, is nothing but a misleading perception. There is definitely a difference between withdrawn and deferred item, that is why the two terminologies are used. The senior persons having vast experience, who had told the Vice-Chancellor that the withdrawn item could be re-introduced, should have been wise enough to tell the difference to the Vice-Chancellor. As far as the discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate held in January 2013 is concerned, though the Vice-Chancellor had given his views that the recommendations of the Selection Committees should be accepted, maybe he was prevailed upon by the majority. At that time, the decision was that since the Syndicate in its December 2012 meeting had taken the decision not to hold the meeting/s of the Selection Committees after 15th December

2012, but the Vice-Chancellor conducted the interviews. Therefore, the Syndicate did not consider the item and the Vice-Chancellor was requested to withdraw the item, which was accepted by the Vice-Chancellor. Now, he felt that the item has been placed before the Syndicate under the orders of the High Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when the item was re-introduced for the first time in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 27th July 2013, he was totally unaware that someone had gone to the Court.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that now since the matter is in the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, they have to be very clear as to why the item was withdrawn from the Syndicate meeting held on 27th January 2013. In fact, it was withdrawn from the Syndicate meeting because of issue of jurisdiction, which was discussed in that meeting of the Syndicate and nothing has changed thereafter. It should also be admitted in the Court that the reply given to the petitioner under the RTI Act that the matter is still under consideration, was given through oversight because they have already taken such a stand in one of the cases in the Hon'ble High Court that the University, has given wrong information. Despite it being decided by the Syndicate so many times that whenever any case is filed against the decision of the Syndicate, it should be brought to the notice to the Syndicate immediately so that the Syndicate could make observation/s, if need be. His only request is that the stand of the University in the Court should be completely in tune with the decision of the Syndicate. Further, in case any such case is filed in the court, 1-2 members of the Syndicate should also be consulted before filing the reply. In the end, he suggested that this issue should not be considered in view of the fact that the item was withdrawn from the Syndicate meeting dated 27th January 2013 and the item has again been brought to the Syndicate under the orders of the Hon'ble High Court and also that the reply to the petitioner under RTI was given through oversight, and they should reiterate whatever was discussed and decided in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 27th January 2013.

This was agreed to.

Terms & Conditions for making appointments on *ad hoc* basis

4. Item 4 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

To decide the terms & conditions for making appointments on *ad hoc* basis.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate dated 15.5.2013/ 29.6.2013 (Para 64(1)) has noted the following appointment:

The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Committee constituted in accordance with the decision of Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XIV/XLVII) and in view of the authorization given by the Senate has approved the following appointments:

- (i) Dr. Puneet Kapoor, Associate Professor/Reader in Anaesthesia at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., the

pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + GP of Rs.8600 plus NPA as admissible for one year initially (not on regular basis).

- (ii) Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta as Professor in Orthodontics at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP of Rs.10000/- plus NPA as admissible for one year initially (not on regular basis).

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 8.9.2012/ 6.10.2012 (Para Revised 2(i) to 2(vi) has approved the appointment on **ad hoc basis/ contract basis** for one year.

It is relevant to mention here that, no such appointments on ad hoc basis were made in the University since long time back. Moreover, there is no provision of appointment on ad hoc basis in the University Calendar and also there are no terms and conditions for such appointments.

The Senate at its meeting dated 22.12.2012 (Para XIV) has resolved that all these appointments be approved subject to the condition that the candidates were eligible on the last date of submission of applications and a Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to ascertain the above condition and to ensure that the score have been

awarded to various candidates uniformly considering their qualifications and experience at the time of interview. **The Senate authorized the Vice-Chancellor to take decision on the recommendations of the Committee, on behalf of Senate.**

2. An office note enclosed.

2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XVI**).
3. The appointment letters and proceedings of the Selection Committee in respect of Dr. Puneet Kapoor and Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta are enclosed (**Appendix-XVI**).

Initiating discussion, Dr. Tarlok Bandhu stated that the item has been brought to the Syndicate for framing terms and conditions for *ad hoc* appointments. But if they look at the proceedings of the Selection Committees, one of the appointments, i.e., appointment of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta has been made on contract basis. Why have they clubbed the two appointments?

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they must be remembering that he had already said in one of the meetings of the Syndicate that once the posts are advertised, they could not change the nature of the appointments and that is what the office is now saying. On the basis of the interviews, the appointment letters were issued and it was decided that the terms and conditions would be decided later on. But it remained a fact that these persons appeared and evaluated by the valid Selection Committees against the regular posts. He did not know under what authority and circumstances they were appointed on *ad hoc*/temporary/ contract basis. He, therefore, pleaded that the terms and conditions in their case should be same as are of the persons appointed on probation. Secondly, instead of taking this decision in the case of these appointments alone, decision is to be taken for all such appointments because there might be more such cases, especially in the Dental Institute. Earlier, also some appointments had been made on contract basis. So much so the teachers, who were working there on permanent basis as Senior Lecturers, have been appointed as Readers on contract basis and maybe on *ad hoc* basis. On the one hand, they have been given promotion and on the other hand, whatever was being paid to them as regular teachers, has been withdrawn, i.e., payment of certain allowances, including House Rent Allowance (HRA). Though the issue has been discussed in this House a number of times, nothing has been done in this regard so far. Probably, this Syndicate took the decision that they should be paid all the allowances, including HRA, from the date they were appointed/promoted as Readers. Then maybe, some objections were raised by the Audit. If there is any such

objection, where is the problem in effecting the said decision from the current date so that these persons should have at least the confidence that their issue is being taken care of? At present, the benefits are neither being given to them from the back date nor from the current date, which is resulting in their suffering incessantly. He, therefore, pleaded that they could be considered appointed on regular basis for all intents and purposes and paid all the benefits to which they are entitled. In future, there should be only two kinds of appointments, i.e., regular and temporary, and the persons appointed on temporary basis would be entitled for all the benefits which are available to the regular appointees.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Audit objection might be that some of the persons have been appointed on contract basis. But it was not part of their service condition as per their appointment letter. Then probably they could not be paid allowances from the back date till the decision is finally sorted out. Therefore, it should be recorded that with immediate effect the payment of all the allowances be started. Since such a decision could not be implemented in anticipation of the approval of the Senate as they might land themselves in all kinds of practical problems, he urged the Vice-Chancellor to sort out the issue. He informed that those who are regular employees of the University, but have been appointed on contract basis on higher posts, are also being discriminated against so far as house allotment is concerned. They say that they should be considered for house allotment as per their entitlement from the date of their joining on the higher positions irrespective of the fact on what condition they have been appointed because the office is saying that they are not being paid allowances. On these two issues no discrimination should be done. He, therefore, suggested that all those, who are appointed on *ad hoc*/temporary/contract basis or whatever nomenclature, should be made entitled to all the allowances, including HRA.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is problem in convening the meeting to discuss CAS in Dental Institute as Dr. K.K. Talwar and Dr. Raj Bahadur, two important members of the Committee, are busy persons and it may not be possible for them to spare more time for the Committee meetings. Secondly, he suggested that a small Committee should be constituted for examining the issue of regularization of B.D.S. teachers.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there is a practical problem in this. This issue has been discussed in the Syndicate and Senate for a number of times and it had been decided that a Standing Committee be constituted to look into all such cases, including the case of ex-cadre posts of non-teaching employees. As such, all such cases of non-teaching employees have been clubbed with the teachers, which would take a lot of time in sorting out. He, therefore, suggested that the cases of teachers of Dental Institutions and other institutions should be delinked from that Standing Committee and a small Committee as suggested by Professor Keshav Malhotra should be constituted for looking into the cases of teachers of Dental and other Institutes.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that he was going through the flow-chart, which Shri Ashok Goyal was discussing and he has observed that there are two types of appointments in the Dental Institute, i.e., (i) persons have been appointed on contract basis and fixed salary by following proper procedure; and (ii) on regular basis. They assume

that since the posts were advertised on regular basis, they have been appointed on regular basis. Since the posts were advertised as regular, somewhere error has been committed, either it is due to non-fulfilment of qualification or something else, they should go by the advertised conditions and not by the recommendations of the Selection Committee.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that it meant that they are waiving off the condition/s.

Professor Naval Kishore stated that in certain other similar cases, including in the cases of Dr. Hemant Batra and Dr. Arun Garg as Professor and Reader/Associate Professor respectively, the Selection Committees had imposed the condition/s, which was/were not within their jurisdiction. He, therefore, suggested that those conditions should also be waived off and their services at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital should be treated as on regular basis.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) since the posts were advertised on regular basis, the appointments of both the persons, i.e., Dr. Puneet Kapoor, Associate Professor/Reader in Anaesthesia and Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Professor in Orthodontics at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, be treated as regular on probation; and
- (2) the condition/s imposed by the Selection Committees on the appointment of Dr. Hemant Batra and Dr. Arun Garg as Professor and Reader/Associate Professor respectively, be waived off and their appointment be treated on regular basis from the date of their eligibility.

Both (1) and (2) above be implemented in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a small Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to consider and recommend the terms & conditions, including payment of HRA and other allowances, for persons appointed and to be appointed on *ad hoc* basis.

Recommendations of Committee dated 7.5.2013 for framing the leave norms of Re-Employed Faculty

5. Considered the following recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor dated 7.5.2013 (**Appendix-XVII**) regarding leave norms for the Re-employed Faculty:

“that the teacher re-employed after superannuation, be entitled to 20 days Casual Leave (any time), Special Casual Leave for 10 days and Special Academic Leave for 30 days and Duty Leave as per University Rules and Regulation except Half Pay Leave and Commuted Leave. In addition, the Committee also recommended that Extra Ordinary Leave to the incumbent be allowed without pay.”

After some discussion, it was unanimously –

RESOLVED: That the teacher re-employed after superannuation, be entitled to 20 days Casual Leave (any time), Special Casual Leave for 10 days and Special Academic Leave for 30 days and Duty Leave as per University Rules and Regulation except

Half Pay Leave and Commuted Leave. In addition, Extra Ordinary Leave without pay not exceeding one year be also allowed to the incumbent.

Issue regarding re-fixation of basic pay of Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi, Assistant Professor, UIAMS

6. Considered if the basic Pay of Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi, Assistant Professor, UIAMS, be re-fixed at ₹19630+6000 (AGP) on account of increment given by her previous employer, mentioned in the revised LPC submitted by her w.e.f. the date of her joining with the P.U. on 19.8.2008.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 16.3.2013 (Para 6) has resolved that the pay of Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi, Assistant Professor, UIAMS be re-fixed at ₹19060/- in the same grade pay of ₹6000/- on account of revision of pay-scales with her previous employer as per revised L.P.C. submitted by her w.e.f. the date of joining in the Panjab University.
 2. An office note along with revised LPC submitted by Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi, Assistant Professor enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that the re-fixation of basic pay of Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi, Assistant Professor at UIAMS, should be allowed on the basis of the revised LPC submitted by her.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu stated that, in fact, Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi has submitted the LPC for the second time. He pointed out that it has been mentioned in the office note that “although she has again claimed for protection of pay at Rs.19630/- + Rs.6000 (AGP) on the basis of increment given by her previous employer but there seems to be contradiction with regard to the increment as it includes difference of Rs.19630-19060= 570/-, whereas according to her basic already fixed at Rs.19060+6000 (AGP), it should be Rs.752-/-”.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the LPC has been issued by Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa, which has been established by the State Legislature.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that the basic of Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi, Assistant Professor at UIAMS, was fixed according to the LPC submitted by her. Now, she has submitted revised LPC and it has been mentioned in the office note that the stage mentioned in the LPC could not be arrived at.

RESOLVED: That, in principle, the basic Pay of Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi, Assistant Professor, UIAMS, be re-fixed at ₹19630+6000 (AGP) on account of increment given by her previous employer, mentioned in the revised LPC submitted by her w.e.f. the date of her joining with the P.U. on 19.8.2008, subject to clarification from her previous employer.

Confirmation of Personal Assistants

7. Considered that the following Personal Assistants be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the persons and Branch/Department	Date of Promotion	Date of Confirmation
1.	Shri Mahinder Pal Office of the Vice-Chancellor	17.04.2009	20.09.2010
2.	Mrs. Urmil Gupta Office of the F.D.O.	15.06.2009	21.09.2010
3.	Mrs. Meena Vij Department of Physics	29.06.2009	01.03.2011

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

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that do the PAs have some career promotions?

It was clarified that the posts of Assistant Registrars are being filled up through different channels, i.e., 25% open selection and the remaining 75% by way of promotion amongst the Superintendents and PAs in the ratio of 4:1.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that he just wanted to inform that in the Punjab Government, the PAs have different channels of promotions, i.e., Private Secretary, Under Secretary, Joint Secretary, etc.

RESOLVED: That the following Personal Assistants be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the persons and Branch/Department	Date of Promotion	Date of Confirmation
1.	Shri Mahinder Pal Office of the Vice-Chancellor	17.04.2009	20.09.2010
2.	Mrs. Urmil Gupta Office of the F.D.O.	15.06.2009	21.09.2010
3.	Mrs. Meena Vij Department of Physics	29.06.2009	01.03.2011

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

Appointment of Security Officer in the Panjab University

8. Considered minutes dated 22.7.2013 (**Appendix-XIX**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Security Officer-1 in the Panjab University, Chandigarh, in the pay-scale of ₹10300-34800+GP ₹4200/- plus allowances admissible under the University rules.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that it has been mentioned in the minutes of the Selection Committee that Sr. No.15, Capt. Sandeep Sangwan be appointed as Security Officer in the University, whereas Sr. No.15 does not exist and, in fact, the name of Capt. Sandeep Sangwan is mentioned at Sr. No.12. Similarly, it has been written that Sr. No.10, Shri Naveen Dhingra, be placed at number 2 in the Waiting List, whereas the serial number of

Shri Naveen Dhingra is **9**. He suggested that it should be verified before issuance of appointment letter to the selected candidate.

It was clarified that, in fact, serial numbers have been mentioned in the minutes in accordance with the attendance chart, by mistake.

RESOLVED: That Capt. Sandeep Sangwan be appointed Security Officer in the Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800 + GP Rs.4200/- plus allowances admissible under the University rules.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the following persons, in order of merit, be placed on the Waiting List:

1. Shri Baljeet Singh
2. Shri Naveen Dhingra.

NOTE: It has been certified by the Selection Committee that the selected candidates and the candidates on the Waiting List fulfilled the education qualifications and physically and medically found fit as per medical report of Medical Officer/Doctor laid down for the post of Security Officer.

Conferment of degree of 9. Doctor of Science (*Honoris Causa*) on Padam Bhushan Professor R.P. Bambah Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that Padam Bhushan Professor R.P. Bambah, Ex-Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University and Emeritus Professor in the Department of Mathematics, be honoured with the Degree of Doctor of Science (*Honoris Causa*) of Panjab University.

NOTE: 1. The Section 23 of the PU Act reads as under:

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

2. Minutes of the Faculty of Mathematics dated 14.8.2013 enclosed (**Appendix-XX**).

Professor Shelley Walia suggested that instead of writing Professor R.P. Bambah, Ex-Vice-Chancellor, it should be written 'former Vice-Chancellor'. Similarly, instead of Emeritus Professor in the Department of Mathematics, it should be 'world renowned Mathematician'.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that according to him, one could not prefix Padam Bhushan to his/her name. Therefore, instead of Padam Bhushan Professor R.P. Bambah, it should be Professor R.P. Bambah, Padam Bhushan Awardee. Secondly, it would be better if it is written as "Professor R.P. Bambah, former President, Indian Science Congress".

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would form the resolution correctly.

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Section 23 at page 9 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007, it be recommended to Senate and the Chancellor that honorary degree of Doctor of Science (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Professor R.P. Bambah, Padam Bhushan awardee, former President, Indian Science Congress and world renowned Mathematician, on the ground that he, in the opinion of the Syndicate, by reasons of his eminent position and attainments, is a fit and proper person to receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Science (*honoris causa*).

Issue regarding allowing certain categories of teachers to continue in service without UGC-NET

10. Considered minutes dated 20.6.2013 (**Appendix-XXI**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the cases of on-going teachers appointed with condition by the Selection Committee in subjects of Computer Science & Applications, Bio-Technology, Bio-informatics, Fashion Designing without UGC-NET.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that some cases similar to these cases are pending, which also needed to be looked into. Probably, those cases were placed before this Committee. One specific case is of Mr. Varinder Kumar from GGSD College, Chandigarh. The Committee did not recommend his case keeping in view the rejection by the Syndicate in 2012. The Dean, College Development Council, would recall that Professor R.C. Sobti, former Vice-Chancellor, has put in 4-5 cases, wherein the wrong interpretation was given and the case of Mr. Varinder Kumar is one of them. He had also got a copy of the UGC Regulations. In fact, the UGC Regulations clearly say that the condition of NET applies in the case of subject/s in which the UGC NET is conducted. The UGC has written to Registrar, Panjab University on these lines. The same had been obtained through RTI application wherein it has been stated that they do not conduct NET in such and such subjects. He wondered why legal opinion was sought when a vital document was submitted stating that the UGC-NET is conducted in the subject of Biotechnology rather than Bioinformatics. All those documents are part of the record. Hence, it is a mistake on their part as the condition imposed by the Selection Committee is wrong. He, therefore, suggested that the appointment of Shri Varinder Kumar should be approved.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that in the Syndicate it was decided that the related subject in the case of Home Science was Fashion Designing. As far as Bioinformatics is concerned, Physics, Chemistry, etc. all are basic related Sciences subjects. If the UGC do not conduct

NET in a particular subject, the candidate has to qualify the NET in a related subject.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that many subjects are involved. Some of the candidates, who had done M.Sc. in Biophysics or M.Sc. Bioinformatics, have qualified UGC-NET in the subject of Biophysics. The UGC specifically say NET is required for such Masters Degree Programmes in which it conducted NET. But here the UGC has given clarification that they do not conduct NET in this subject. The candidate has also obtained information under the RTI Act.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if concession to somebody could be given, that could be thought of.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that since the UGC-NET qualified candidates were not available, the selected persons have been given time to qualify. The related subject to Home Science is Fashion Designing and the same should have been mentioned in the advertisement. If it had been mentioned in the advertisement that the candidates without NET would also be considered for appointment, more candidates would have applied and, perhaps, a better candidate might have been selected.

Dr. Jagwant Singh read out the contents of the UGC letter.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that an interview perhaps in the subject of Languages was conducted in A.S. College, Khanna, wherein it was observed by the Committee that since the B.Sc./M.Sc. candidate is not NET in the subject of Languages, he/she is not eligible. Further, in the case of first recommendation of the Committee wherein it has been recommended that till the candidate did not qualify the UGC-NET, his appointment should not be approved, that should also be approved.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that the UGC has issued separate set of instructions/guidelines at different point of times because of their conditions/requirement of NET.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar suggested that clear-cut instructions should be given to the Vice-Chancellor's nominees and the subject experts that if the candidate/s has/have done M.Sc. or M.A. in English and qualified UGC-NET in the subject of English, he/she/they should be made eligible for the post of Lecturer in English in the affiliated Colleges.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the condition imposed on continuance of service on year to year basis in the case of Shri Manjit Singh, is a ridiculous condition because, he would never qualify the University Grants Commission NET. He should be asked to clear the University Grants Commission NET within a stipulated period of two years. Referring to Mr. Rattan Deep Singh, he stated that the Panjab University has de-recognized all M.Phil. degrees obtained through distance education. When questioned, he replied that how M.Phil. could be done through distance education.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that earlier M.Phil. candidates were eligible. Later on the guidelines came that NET is essential qualification for appointment as Assistant Professor. The Selection Committees of the University went to different Colleges and imposed

the condition that the selected candidates have to qualify the UGC-NET within a period of 2 years. If the candidates are unable to qualify the UGC-NET, they should be given 2 years more time to qualify the UGC-NET.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that Mr. Manjit Singh has done M.Phil. in 2008, i.e., much before his appointment.

Professor Naval Kishore said that the Panjab University recognizes those degrees obtained through distance education, which are recognized by the DEC.

When it was suggested that the appointment of Mr. Manjit Singh should be approved, Dr. Jagwant Singh said that the cases of appointment of all those persons, who are similarly placed, should also be approved. He informed that the Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, has already cleared all such appointments of the affiliated Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could approve the appointments, if at the time of advertisement of the post the M.Phil. candidates were eligible.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there are two points that, i.e., (i) Mr. Manjit Singh was M.Phil. at the time of appearing in the interview; and (ii) the Dean, College Development Council has just informed that Mr. Manjit Singh has done M.Phil. after appearing in the interview. The essential qualifications at that time would have been M.Phil. or UGC-NET. The Selection Committee should have imposed the condition that he should qualify M.Phil. or UGC-NET within two years. Even if he has done M.Phil. after his selection, he has fulfilled the minimum qualification and is eligible. According to him, the Committee had made error in its judgement.

Professor Naval Kishore said that the UGC abolished M.Phil. qualification in July 2009 and the University adopted the new qualifications of the UGC.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council, may be authorized to verify if the candidate, i.e., Shri Manjit Singh had already acquired M.Phil. degree at the time of advertisement of the post. If yes, his appointment should be approved and, if not, he be given two years' more time to make himself eligible.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the appointment of Shri Ram Pal should be approved. He also said that as suggested by Committee, Rule 7(iii) at page 169, P.U. Calendar Volume III, 2009 should be amended.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that, in the present scenario, this rider should not be there.

RESOLVED: That the appointments of the following persons be approved:

1. Shri Rattandeep Chawla, Assistant Professor in Computer Science at Ramgarhia Girls College, Ludhiana;

2. Shri Ram Pal, Assistant Professor in Music Vocal at Guru Nanak National College, Doraha (Ludhiana) and
3. Shri Varinder Kumar, Assistant Professor in Bioinformatics at G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector 32, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council, be authorized to verify if the candidate Shri Manjit Singh had already acquired M.Phil. degree at the time of advertisement of the post. If yes, his appointment be also approved and, if not, he be given two years' more time to make himself eligible.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Rule 7(iii) at page 169, P.U. Calendar Volume III, 2009, be amended.

At this stage, Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that, last time, he had given some papers to the Vice-Chancellor pertaining to grant of 5% relaxation of marks to Ph.D. candidates. In 1991, the UGC wrote a letter in which it had been mentioned that the candidates, who had done Ph.D. before 19th September 1991, would be given 5% relaxation of marks in minimum essential academic qualification. Under the 1973 Regulations, the minimum essential qualification was M.A./M.Sc. with 55% marks. Later on, it was said that any candidate who has submitted his/her thesis up to 31st December 1997, would be given relaxation.

RESOLVED: That a Committee comprising the following persons be constituted to look into the issue:

1. Dean, College Development Council (Chairman)
2. Dr. I.S. Sandhu, Fellow & Syndic
3. Dr. R.P.S. Josh, Fellow & Syndic
4. Dr. Jagwant Singh, Fellow & Syndic
5. Deputy Registrar (Estt.) (Convener).

Issue regarding grant of extension to Ms. Nadereh Attarian, a Research Scholar, for submission of her Ph.D. thesis

11. Considered if Ms. Nadereh Attarian, a Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, be granted six months extension up to February 2014 for submission of her thesis as a special case w.e.f. the date of communication after the decision or the date for submission of Ph.D. thesis be extended to six months in general.

NOTE: 1. The Regulation 13.1 at page 193, P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, is reproduced below:

13.1. A candidate who is unable to complete research work and thesis within the time allowed by these Regulations may apply through his Supervisor and Head of the Department concerned for grant of extension.

Extension may be granted by the Joint Research Board up to a maximum of two years, i.e. every

candidate must submit his thesis on the expiry of a total period of five years from the date of enrolment of application.

Provided that –

- (i) extension shall not be granted for more than a year at a time;
- (ii) every application for grant of extension shall be accompanied by a fee prescribed by the Syndicate/ Senate from time to time.

If the thesis is received after the prescribed period of five years, the delay may be condoned by the authorities' names below:

- i) Up to 3 months – Dean of University Instruction**
- ii) Up to one year – Joint Research Board**
- iii) Beyond one year up to three years- Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Joint Research Board, under special and exceptional circumstances to be recorded.**

A fee of Rs.2000/- per year or an amount to be decided by the Syndicate/ Senate from time to time shall be charged for condonation of delay in the submission of Ph.D. thesis after expiry of the period of five years from the date of enrolment.

Provided that the maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis would be eight years from the date of enrolment, i.e. normal period: three years, extension two years and condonation period three years after which enrolment and registration of the candidate shall be treated as cancelled automatically.

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

3. The Syndicate meeting dated 27.1.2013 (Para 43(xvi)) has extended the last date for submission of Ph.D. thesis up to 30.6.2013.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu stated that giving extension beyond the period of 8 years meant violation of regulations. The Syndicate had already given a chance to submit theses up to 31st December 2012 and after that it was further extended for six months. If they allowed this candidate, maybe there are a number of candidates, who could not submit their theses within eight years and at this belated stage, they would also seek extension for submission of their theses. The Deputy Registrar (General) has quoted the provisions of the University Calendar very well, but the Dean of University Instruction has recommended submission of thesis by the candidate in violation of the regulations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Deputy Registrar (General) has made administrative judgement, whereas the Dean of University Instruction has made academic judgement.

To this, Dr. Tarlok Bandhu said that this is an emotional statement. If tomorrow somebody came for submission of his/her thesis several years after cancellation of his/her registration, what would happen?

Professor Nandita Singh stated that, in fact, Ms. Nadereh Attarian was doing a comparative study and half of which was to be done in Iran and half in India. While doing the comparative study in Iran, she had developed a problem with her husband. Her husband did not allow her to come to India. Thus, she could not get visa for completing her study in India. In the process, she also lost possession of her son. She got visa for completing her study in India after taking divorce from her husband because now she was not required to take permission from her husband. She pleaded that since her's is a special case, she should be given extension of six months to submit her thesis.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, if the regulations provide for extension for more than 8 years under any circumstances, they would have no hesitation in granting the extension. If regulations did not provide, they should not say or give impression that the regulations have not been framed from academic point of view. If there is any difficulty in their regulations and they could not take care of such extraordinary cases, they should take care of the situation by amending the regulations in such a manner that in exceptional cases, the Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate could relax certain requirements. Unfortunately at the moment there is no such provision for giving relaxation. But since for Ph.D. (submission of Ph.D. theses) they had already violated the regulations not once but for many times, wherein the candidates were allowed to submit theses even after 20 years when their topics of research selected years back had become completely outdated and it was suggested that they may be asked to change/revise their topics, they may violate the regulations again. He added that he was surprised with the language written. The office has written that in view of the position explained above, orders of the Dean University Instruction are solicited if the candidate may be informed that her request for submission of Ph.D. thesis at this stage cannot be considered as the last date for submission of thesis extended by the Syndicate i.e. up to 30.6.2013 has already been lapsed, may invite

legal complication. He enquired what were the reasons when the candidates were allowed to submit their theses after a period of 20 years or more. Another extreme of the things is that they were saying the extension in the period beyond 8 years for submission of thesis by the candidate should be granted, especially when the circumstances were completely beyond her control, she was completely helpless, and there is no fault of her. But at the same time, the candidates, who failed to get their candidacy approved within a period of two years, even by a day or a week, their enrolment/candidacy was automatically cancelled by saying simply sorry to them. They had to take into consideration all those cases as well and see under what circumstances the synopses were delayed for a small period of 1 day or 1 week or 1 month or so. Either they should not violate the regulations at all or there should not be any discrimination between various types of candidates by adopting the policy of pick and choose. If at all they had to adopt the policy of pick and choose, it should be on the basis of merit of the case. Even those, who are enrolled/registered afresh, are unable to submit their synopses within the stipulated period. There are several cases which are not in his knowledge, those cases also be considered. Another proposal that the regulations should be kept as these are, but a supernumerary clause should be added for those candidates, who missed something because of no fault of their, under which they could be considered/given some relaxation. Such a provision is already there in the general regulations for examination. However, it would be better to frame an enabling regulation under general regulations for covering the Ph.D. candidates, under which the Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate may grant extension beyond 8 years. Having said that he also endorsed that Ms. Nadereh Attarian should be given six months' extension to submit her thesis. Similarly, the pending cases pertaining to delay in the submission of synopses should also be considered.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the report of the Supervisor of the candidate should not be overlooked.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is not at all pleading the cases of those candidates, whose cases have not been recommended for extension by their Supervisors. But there are certain cases which were referred to the Monitoring Committee for recommending continuation of research. As pointed out in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, in some cases, the Monitoring Committees are proving to be the Torturing Committees. Situation has reached at the stage wherein the Supervisors are intentionally not co-operating with the candidates. In case the candidate/s is/are not in a position to continue to work under the particular Supervisor, there is no harm in changing the Supervisor concerned; otherwise, the Ph.D. could not be completed by the candidates for years. But at the same time, if the candidate has not worked for Ph.D. under his/her Supervisor at all, his/her case should not be considered. In fact, they have to consider such cases on merit.

Professor Nandita Singh said that she completely endorse the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal. She added that the Deputy Registrar (General) should not have any problem if the case is recommended by the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department concerned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Deputy Registrar (General) is doing his duties as competently and diligently as his office demands.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even if the case is recommended by the concerned Supervisor and approved by the Dean of University Instruction, the Deputy Registrar (General) is required to give his views in terms of regulations. If they do it purely as an academic judgement, there is no problem. But still if the issue is so complex and think that the matter needed to be referred to a Committee, it should be referred to a Committee.

RESOLVED: That Ms. Nadereh Attarian, a Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, be granted six months extension w.e.f. the date of communication of the decision, for submission of her Ph.D. thesis, as a special case.

Issue regarding increase in rates of fee/charges for Duplicate Medical Entitlement Card

12. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the rates of fee/charges for Duplicate Medical Entitlement Card, be enhanced, as under:

- (i) For first time from ₹10/- to ₹50/- and
- (ii) Subsequently ₹100/- each time.

NOTE: Request dated 23.5.2013 (**Appendix-XXIII**) from Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, Panjab University is enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the rates of fee/charges for Duplicate Medical Entitlement Card, be enhanced/fixed, as under:

- (i) For first time from ₹10/- to ₹50/- and
- (ii) Subsequently ₹100/- each time.

Sanction of Rs.8 lac and Rs.50,53,500/- for renovation of Law and English Auditoriums

13. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor for sanction of ₹8,00,000/- and ₹50,53,500/- out of the 'Estate Fund Account' (Non-Plan) of renovation of Law Auditorium and English Auditorium respectively, as some high dignitaries are scheduled to visit Panjab University in the near future and the function is likely to be organized at Law Auditorium and English Auditorium.

NOTE: Rough cost Estimate for Renovation of Law Auditorium in Panjab University Campus, Sector-14, Chandigarh submitted by the Executive Engineer is enclosed (**Appendix-XXIV**).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that according to him the amount is much higher, but still there is no guarantee that the work would be completed within this provision.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar suggested that a Committee must be appointed to oversee the renovation of both the auditoria and Finance & Development Officer should be made a member of that Committee. He remarked that the estimates had just been given by the S.D.O. and they are approving them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are approving these estimates subject to clearance by a small Committee comprising Professor Keshav Malhotra and Finance & Development Officer (FDO).

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is not against it. He is simply saying that probably it is for the first time that the estimates have been given by the XEN, without being authenticated by the Registrar and Vice-Chancellor; and the FDO has been asked to give money. He, as a layman, does not know whether the amounts of Rs.8 lac and Rs.50.53 lac would be sufficient to renovate the Law Auditorium and English Auditorium, respectively or maybe they required more money. As suggested by Dr. Dinesh Talwar, a Committee should be constituted to see what actually needed to be incurred for this work. Even if they approved it today, probably the work of renovation is not going to start. Let it be got re-examined and even if Rs.80 lac is required they are not against the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would constitute an appropriate Committee, which would oversee the actual requirement for this renovation job. However, in principle, they approved that renovation is required to be made. While spending money they should be conscious and should have somebody to see whether the estimates are realistic and the renovations have been planned in a proper way.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that there is a Auditorium Supervisor, who is being paid a sum of Rs.8,000/- per month.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that in the Golden Jubilee Guest House somewhere it is written Golden Jubilee Hall, somewhere Dr. Ruchi Ram Sahni Executive Hall. It has also been written that since high dignitaries are expected to come, the renovation of these Halls and infrastructural modifications are required to be made. Moreover, since now the high dignitaries are not expected to come, these lines should be deleted. He further suggested that the nomenclatures such as Dr. Ruchi Ram Sahni Executive Hall should not be there in the University set up.

It was said that the matter would be looked into.

RESOLVED: That sum of ₹8,00,000/- and ₹50,53,500/-, be sanctioned out of the 'Estate Fund Account' (Non-Plan) for renovation of Law Auditorium and English Auditorium respectively renovation of Law Auditorium and English Auditorium, be approved, in principle. An appropriate Committee comprising Professor Keshav Malhotra and Finance & Development Officer be constituted to see the actual requirement for this renovation job and oversee the renovation work.

Qualifications for the posts of Clerks and Class 'C' on compassionate grounds

14. Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 24.7.2013 (**Appendix-XXV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the Educational qualifications for making appointments of Clerks and Class 'C' posts on compassionate grounds:

- (i) that the qualification of Clerks be raised from Matric (2nd Division)/ 10+2 to Bachelor's Degree from a recognized University or Institution for appointment on compassionate grounds, as is being done in Punjab Government.
- (ii) that the qualification for the posts of Class 'C' will remain unchanged.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that they should see that the President, Panjab University Staff Association, has recorded his dissent for raising the qualifications for the post of Clerk from Matriculation (2nd Division)/10+2 to Bachelor's degree. Moreover, they should see that these qualifications are not for normal positions, but for appointments on compassionate grounds. They should look the issue from a sympathetic point of view, keeping in mind the deceased employee, who has died in harness.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are giving them job over and above the meritorious candidates. He clarified that these qualifications have been fixed on the pattern of Punjab Government.

Dr. Dalbir Singh suggested that the family member of the deceased employee, who do not have requisite qualifications, should be asked to acquire those qualification/s within a period of five years.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the qualification for the posts of Clerks be raised from Matriculation (2nd Division)/10+2 to **Bachelor's Degree** from a recognized University or Institution for appointment on compassionate grounds, as is the case in the Punjab Government; and
- (2) the qualification for the Class 'C' posts would remain unchanged.

**Recommendations of
the Committee dated
20.6.2013**

15. Considered minutes dated 20.6.2013 (**Appendix-XXVI**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to function as a Think Tank for overseeing the Auditoria Complex in P.U. South Campus.

NOTE: 1. The Vice-Chancellor has given following observation:

“There is also a need to ascertain how such a Hall will be sustained and maintained. A Hall of such a size and purpose articulated requires technical support, upkeep expenses, etc. There is a need to appoint Standing Committee of this project to maintain the purposes of basic construction, installation of all necessary infrastructure and articulate a plan for its financial, administrative and technical viability.

D.U.I., Dean (Research), Registrar, F.D.O., X.E.N., D.S.W. (Men/Women), D.C.D.C., S.V.C., Professor Akhtar Mahmood and Shri Ashok Goyal are requested to apprise themselves of this updated information and accept responsibility to give consideration to the required future needs.

In the meanwhile, the construction work could go on as determined with strict compliance of time schedule proposed to the construction.”

2. The Senate at its meeting dated 24.3.2013 (Para XXII) has approved the recommendations of the Board of Finance meeting dated 11.02.2013, **except provisions for 100 Bedded Hospital and Multipurpose Auditorium**, for which a Committee be constituted to study the detailed project report and modifications/ amendments in design/ structure/ utilization/ functioning of the Hospital and Auditorium, and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendations of the Committee, as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 5.3.2013 (Para 18).

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that to have such a huge project like Auditoria Complex is nothing but suicidal. He suggested that since the University has already made a lot of investment on it, the authorities should approach U.T. Administration for completing this project and thereafter maintain it. Once it is completed it should be used by the U.T. Administration for various purposes, e.g., marriages, parties, functions, etc. and the income so generated should be shared with the University. However, no further investment should be made on this project. If the University continued with this project, it would be difficult for the University to pay salaries to its employees.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that it is a valuable suggestion and it is worth talking with the U.T. Administration that it should be considered as resource of the city. Perhaps, complete shelving of the project would not be perceived by the Society in the right spirit. Arising out of this, they should also start discussion with the U.T. Administration about this 100-Bedded Hospital and tell them that let both the Auditoria Complete and the 100-Bedded Hospital be considered as the resources for the tri-city. He, therefore, suggested that a Standing Committee headed by him comprising members of this Syndicate and the Senate be quickly constituted, which would hold discussions with the U.T. Administration, on behalf of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the first question is - do they require 100-Bedded Hospital? There were Dental Colleges at Amritsar, Patiala and CMC at Ludhiana, but none of them has hospital of its own. Though he is not against the proposed Standing Committee at all, he has serious apprehensions about it. It has been mentioned at page 71 that it was a popular decision of the Administration to create the College. But prior to this, it has been written that at present a good amount has already been spent. It has also been mentioned that keeping in view the fact that the foundation stone of this College was laid down by Hon'ble Prime Minister, it would not be a good idea to scrap the project. It is within their purview to say that the project could not be scrapped, but it is not within their purview to say that it could be scrapped. While writing this, they had also written that, however, if possible, the overall planning might be reviewed so as to

reduce the expenditure involved. He objected to the observation of the Committee, i.e., the matter has now been raised by Shri Ashok Goyal in the meeting of the Syndicate in its February and March 2013 meetings not to allocate funds for the construction of Multipurpose Auditorium as he was not a part of the Syndicate in the year 2004, where the idea was conceived and approved for construction of Multipurpose Auditorium! As far as the Multi-Purpose Auditorium is concerned, he need not to remind them and recall what were their opinion before going ahead with this project. They had to see how they have to maintain and run the 100-Bedded Hospital and Multi-Auditorium Complete with the supporting staff. As far as 100-Bedded Hospital is concerned, take it granted if they opened this hospital in collaboration with anybody, they are going to lose the control of the University by giving it in the hands of others or they are going to lose the control of the University. Even if this hospital is run by the University itself, it would be controlled by the Doctors. His simple question is that if they do not require this hospital, why do they think of having it? They only have to pay a sum of Rs.20 lac per annum for having a tie up with Government Hospital for the purpose and the things would move smoothly. There is no condition of the Dental Council of India (DCI) for having this 100-Bedded Hospital. Nowhere else, the hospital is run by the University/Dental Institute/College for the society. For patients, there is General Hospital in Sector 16, Chandigarh. They could well imagine how much would be the maintenance cost. Perhaps, the expenditure which they are incurring in all the Departments of the University, might not be sufficient to run the hospital. If it is neither required nor feasible nor a viable project, what stopped them from taking a decision to shelve this project? According to him, it is just a false ego. They have to think themselves. If society was giving money, they would have no problem. Even none of the members of the Standing Committee knew wherefrom the funds would come. To the remarks given in the proceedings of the Committee, he said that is it not appropriate to give such remarks in the proceedings of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor. At page 65 (para 2), it has been mentioned that the Vice-Chancellor has made the observation that "D.U.I., Dean (Research), Registrar, F.D.O., X.E.N., D.S.W. (Men/Women), D.C.D.C., S.V.C., Professor Akhtar Mahmood and Shri Ashok Goyal are requested to apprise themselves of this updated information and accept responsibility to give consideration to the required future needs". The Vice-Chancellor has referred the proceedings of the Committee to the Syndicate for consideration, including Ashok Goyal. He at least does not agree with that, in the meanwhile, the construction work should go on as per strict compliance. They need to rethink in view of what Professor Keshav Malhotra has suggested and also have to evaluate from need & expenditure point of view, maintenance cost, etc. Tomorrow, they might require more expenses to demolish it because Auditorium could not be put to any other use. Could they give an advertisement in the newspaper that it is available on rent? He suggested that it should be got evaluated from the experts and not by a Committee.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that the University has to incur a huge expenditure for having a 100-Bedded Hospital. According to him, they did not need this hospital as they already have several hospitals in the neighbourhood.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that when he got confronted with this, there is an anxiety about prices of equipments, paramedical staff, cost to maintain and run the Hospital among other things. That was

why he felt if this Hospital could be considered City resource with the consent of Chandigarh Administration, which has the experience of running Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh, which is affiliated with the Panjab University, and Multi-Specialty Hospital, Sector 16, Chandigarh. In Medical College, Sector 32, Chandigarh, they had recently increased the number of seats from 50 seats to 100 seats. If the Government Medical College, Chandigarh, is part of the University and when there was a requirement relating to Hospital, this project of 100-Bedded Hospital was initiated and approved. Then it was thought whether this could be made a city resource by having a tripartite agreement among the University, Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh and U.T. Administration, Chandigarh.

Professor Shelley Walia enquired why they could not make it a Medical College.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that he is not saying that the apprehensions expressed by the members are without weight. But at the same time, he would like to tell them that Chandigarh is a very small Union Territory. Many apprehensions were expressed when the issue of Dental Institute was placed before the Syndicate and Senate for the first time. Till now, the Dental Institute has worked very well and they did not question it. But at the moment the issue before them is about the expenditure to be incurred on the construction of 100-Bedded Hospital, purchase of costly equipments, recruitment of paramedical staff, maintenance of hospital, etc., which involved a huge expenditure. If they involved Chandigarh Administration in it, it meant Central Government. Therefore, they should proceed with this proposal and see whether the Government is ready to provide everything. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to proceed further and explore this possibility. He, therefore, suggested that the issue should be left at this stage and final decision should be taken after getting commitment from the U.T. Administration. The Vice-Chancellor should not only take up the matter with the U.T. Administration alone, but also with the Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh, Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education & Research (PGIMER) and, if need be, even with the Punjab Government. If need be, the members of the Syndicate and Senate should also be involved. Secondly, the sentiments of the members of the Syndicate should be conveyed to the Chairman of the Committee for giving derogatory remarks in the proceedings of the Committee. In fact, the issues are discussed in the meetings of the Syndicate objectively.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that the concerns of the members of the Syndicate to the derogatory remarks given in the proceedings of the Committee should be conveyed to the members of the Committee. The Vice-Chancellor expressed unconditional regret on behalf of the Committee appointed by him.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Committee has not discussed even a single word about the Hospital. They had not recommended anything and have just said that they should go ahead with the project of Multi-Purpose Auditorium because this has been discussed in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate and approved by them. What Shri Satya Pal Jain has said is, in fact, a fine tuned wording. He could also express as well that unless and until they get some commitments from the U.T. Administration that they would give money, it would not be possible to continue with these projects. As far

as Dental Institute is concerned, when the idea of Dental Institute was conceptualized, it was never told that they would also need a 100-Bedded Hospital, for which they could go through the proceedings. It had been made clear to them that within 4-5 years, the Dental Institute would become a money making machine. But the result is contrary to what was assured and projected to them and they are losing almost more than 12 crore, that too, without having the Hospital. They could not permit the Hospital because they are already facing lot of difficulties in meeting the salary component of the staff even. They had also to think in terms of number of patients in the Hospital. Earlier, there was a proposal that let us tie up with the Central Government thinking that a large number of persons would be attracted to come to such a Hospital and similarly they would also be happy to have some money from the Government. Now, they only have to think in terms of running the Hospital in the present scenario and see how the deficit could be reduced. Had the Senate been informed at that time that 100-Bedded Hospital is required for the Dental Institute, probably the proposal of establishment of Dental Institute might not have been approved. Since nobody was informed about the condition of having the Hospital, everybody was so excited to have Dental Institute in the City, which was missing in the City at that time. But even after the establishment of the Dental Institute, they were not told that they would be requiring a Hospital also till they reached the 3rd year. In 3rd year, a proposal came that unless and until they do not have 100-Bedded Hospital, the DCI is not going to recognize the degree/s of the Dental Institute. Thereafter, they started running from pillar to post and started thinking as to wherefrom the money would come. In the meantime, they entered into an agreement with Multi-Specialty Hospital, Sector 16, Chandigarh and later on with Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh. However, when he himself went through the regulations of the DCI, he came to know that this 100-Bedded Hospital is not mandatory. The DCI regulations simply say that either they should have to tie up with a Hospital within the vicinity of 10-20 kilometers (they are covered under this provision) or have 100-Bedded Hospital of their own. Then he enquired and found that no Dental Institute/College in India had its own Hospital. If they take a decision to establish a Medical College and then attach the same to Dental Institute, then probably it could be viable.

RESOLVED: That a Standing Committee, under the chairmanship of Vice-Chancellor, comprising members of this Syndicate and the Senate, be constituted immediately, to hold discussions/negotiations with the U.T. Administration, on behalf of the University. If need be, the matter be also taken up with the Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh, Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education & Research (PGIMER) and even with the Punjab Government.

The last following lines mentioned in the proceedings be excluded:

‘the matter has now been raised by Shri Ashok Goyal in the meeting of the Syndicate in its February and March 2013 meetings not to allocate funds for the construction of Multipurpose Auditorium as he was not a part of the Syndicate in the year 2004, where the idea was conceived and approved for construction of Multipurpose Auditorium.’

Issue regarding increase in rates of examinations, other related application forms and fee structure

16. Considered if the practice of increasing rates of examinations, other related application forms and fee structure be continued. If yes, the present rates of examinations, other related application forms and fee structure, be increased by 10% w.e.f. examinations of March 2014 onwards.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate meeting dated 15.12.2012 (Para 36(xii)) and Senate meeting dated 20.1.2013, respectively has approved the revised rates of examination, other related application forms and fee structure (after 10% increase) w.e.f. examination of March 2013 onwards.

2. An office note enclosed.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that if the examination fee for appearing in the whole examination, i.e., all the papers, is Rs.2,800/-, the examination fee for re-appear, i.e., one or two papers, is also Rs.2,800/-, which is not proper. He, therefore, suggested that examination fee for reappear examination should be in proportion to the number of papers, a candidate appear in the examination.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that earlier also he had raised this issue about 3-4 times more vociferously than Dr. Dinesh Talwar did. When this issue was raised last time, it was assured that since it is a very justified proposal, from the next examinations onward the examination fee for reappear would be fixed proportionately and charged accordingly. But nothing has been done so far. It is not only happening in reappear cases, but also in cases where the students are allowed to appear in the examinations in parts also. Frankly speaking let him confess that it is not taken care of. However, till now he was under the impression that it must have been taken care of.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that since the results of re-evaluation are never declared before the last date for submission of application forms for reappear examination, the candidates had no option but to apply for supplementary examinations. If the candidate passed in the re-evaluation, the fee paid by him in full is not refunded.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that at least 75% of the fee should be refunded to the candidates.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that when he was student in the University, the staff in the University was sufficient. Now, on the one side the strength of the students had increased manifold and on the other side, the strength of the staff has decreased. Earlier, the results of the re-evaluation were declared within 10-15 days and the students did not appear in the supplementary examination. Now, the sword of appearing in the examination is hanging on the students because the results of re-evaluation never came before the supplementary examinations.

It was pointed out that another problem had arisen during the last 6 months or so, i.e., the students are allowed to have a photocopy of their answerbooks under the RTI Act. They get the photocopy of their answerbooks before the re-evaluation process starts and get

them re-evaluated from an independent examiner. This has caused a lot of problem and delay in the process of re-evaluation.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that if a decision is taken to increase the examination fee, cost of forms, etc. by 10%, his dissent should be recorded.

The Vice-Chancellor said that because the costs are increasing by more than 10% every year, the Board of Finance has directed them to increase the rates of examination fee, other related application forms and fee structure by 10%. Secondly, since they are already running in great loss, the loss should not be further enhanced; rather the income of the University should be increased.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that the candidates have every right to get the photocopy of their answerbooks and get them evaluated independently. He suggested that if the evaluation/re-evaluation done by the University is wrong, full fee should be refunded to the candidates concerned and the examiner concerned should be debarred from any University remunerative work.

The Vice-Chancellor said that to address the issue, they should prescribe minimum charges for reappear. However, if the students are asking for reappear in more than one paper, the fee should not be less than the half of the fee and if the number of reappear is only in one paper, the minimum prescribed fee would apply.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that the expenditure has been mentioned in the note, but not the income, i.e., receipt from the examination fee. While making the increase, they need to see how much total income the University is getting from the examinations. When the Punjab Government freezed its grant, the University was compelled to look for resources and as part of that they went for the increase in the examination fee. Last year also, they increased the examination fee by 10%. Now again they wanted to increase the fees by 10%. But if they look in totality, at this stage the Colleges, which provided education for the whole year, are charging less fee than what the University is charging for conducting the examinations. On the other hand, they are prescribing less fee for the Colleges which are teaching the students throughout the year. He, therefore, pleaded that when they look into such issues, there should be consistency. From the item, it could be gauged that since the University needed income, they have proposed to make increase in examination fee. Since majority of the students belonged to affiliated Colleges, they have to pay this huge fee. When this fee has to be paid, the Colleges would think that they should not lag behind and resultantly their budgets would also go up. On the other hand, they would pay less salary to the staff and the end result would be that the employees working in the Colleges would remain underpaid. Thus, with this decision the ultimate sufferers would be the Colleges. He, therefore, suggested that this should be linked with the salary of the staff so that they are able to ask them that these are the conditions, which they are facing. Hence, these things needed to be correlated and done in a holistic manner rather than in isolation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would definitely reduce their reappear fees.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the issue regarding increase in examination fees, cost of forms, etc. should be placed before the Syndicate along with the data about the total income from the examination fees and total expenditure on the conduct of examinations. He, however, pointed out that if 3 lac students appeared in the University examinations, the income with a minimum examination fee of Rs.1,000/- per candidate would be more in comparison to expenditure.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that Shri Harpreet Singh Dua is right. He further said that though the examination fee, cost of forms, etc. had been increased during the last 2-3 years, but the expenditure on the conduct of examinations had not been disclosed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that everything could be calculated, i.e., employees cost, cost of conduct of examinations (University students, Colleges students, private students). Thereafter, the expenditure incurred on conduct of examinations for Colleges students should be segregated and the deficit should be worked out.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everything existed in the University Budget. However, if the members wanted to come back to the item next month (next meeting of the Syndicate), he has no problem.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the examination fees should be increased keeping in view the fact that the number of students, who appeared in the University examinations, had also increased manifold.

It was clarified that the University had to incur expenditure on various jobs, e.g., Common Entrance Test, Conduct of examinations, blank answerbooks, remuneration to the Centre Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, Invigilators, supporting staff, examiners, evaluators, etc. As is apparent from the office note, the increase in cost is about 50%, that is why the proposal is to increase the examination fee, cost of forms, etc. by 10%.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they were not being told as to how much they were earning from the conduct of examinations. There are ways and means for counting the employees component also. But if they count employees component also, then probably the conduct of examinations is a losing proposition.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as he understood, the members wanted detailed data (information) about the income from examination fees and expenditure on conduct of examinations so that they are able to maintain transparency while effecting increase in the examination fees, cost of forms, etc. He suggested that he should be authorized to take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate. However, he would provide this data to the members through e-mail, before forming his view.

It was clarified that the University has not been allowed to cover some of the deficit of examination, which several Universities are doing.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon stated that all the Universities have two important sources of income, i.e., (i) from conduct of

examinations; and (ii) tuition fees. Therefore, he was not against the hike in fees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that to be transparent is in the interest of the University. Therefore, the item would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting along with as much data as possible.

This was agreed to.

17. Item 17 (for consideration) be read under Item 35 (for ratification) Sub-Item (xxvi).

Recommendation of Executive Committee of Directorate of Sports dated 29.7.2013

18. Considered the recommendation of the Executive Committee dated 29.7.2013 of Directorate of Sports that the local conveyance to the players/official for Inter-University competitions be sanctioned @ ₹50/- per player per day. This be incorporated in the Handbook of P.U.S.C.

Dr. Jagwant Singh remarked that he is surprised by the majority of the decisions of the Executive Committee.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar observed that this item should be referred back. He stated that a number of Annexures have been mentioned in the minutes of the Executive Committee, but none is appended. Most importantly, in recommendations from 21 to 26, extension has been given to certain persons working on daily wage basis. Do they have power to appoint and give extension to daily wagers for that particular Department? These persons have been serving in this Department for the last several years. Further, whenever the Inter-College competitions are held, neither the Assistant Director nor Deputy Director make themselves present and only daily wagers are present. They also do not present themselves in the Prize Distribution Functions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the consideration of the item should be deferred. It be placed again before the Syndicate with full details.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred. The item be placed again before the Syndicate with full details.

Recommendations of Executive Committee of Directorate of Sports dated 28.3.2013

19. Considered the following recommendation of the Executive Committee dated 28.3.2013 of Directorate of Sports to be incorporated in the Official Handbook of PUSC:

- (i) That a special examination for those sports persons who participate in Inter-College Competitions where sports fixture clash with their examination schedule be held.
- (ii) That labour charges from ₹100/- to ₹200/- be enhanced per day per head to the employees of this Directorate who are engaged by the Organizers who get booking of the Panjab University Grounds/ Gymnasium Hall/Swimming Pool/ Sports Hostel during the holidays.

Referring to recommendation 16 of the Executive Committee of PUSC, Dr. Dinesh Talwar requested the Vice-Chancellor to check as to which extension has been given to Shri Ramesh Kothari and how much more extension could be given to him keeping in view his present age.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu said that they had created a special provision for taking the examination of sportspersons, whose dates clashed with either their preparatory camps or competitions. He suggested that they should schedule their ensuing semester examinations in such a manner that they did not clash with various Inter-College competitions.

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

Inspection Report

20. Considered if the provisional extension of affiliation be granted to D.M. College, Moga, for Certificate Add-On course in Fashion Designing & Insurance Business, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Finance, for the session 2013-14.

NOTE: Inspection Report and office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXVII**).

RESOLVED: That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to D.M. College, Moga, for Certificate Add-On course in Fashion Designing & Insurance Business, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Financing Scheme, for the session 2013-14.

Arising out of the above, Dr. R.P.S. Josh stated that he had inspected D.M. College, Moga, as a member of the Inspection Committee for grant of affiliation for B.A. Part I in the subject of Sociology. Since the total workload in Sociology subject works out to be 6 hours, the College should be granted affiliation in the subject without the condition of appointing a teacher in the subject on regular basis. Secondly, the condition of appointment of regular faculty should be imposed only for 2nd and 3rd years.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that all the Inspection Committees imposed condition for appointment of faculty on regular basis even though there is a workload of six hours during the first year of the course. Either all the Colleges should be exempted from appointment of regular faculty for a workload of six hours or none.

Professor Naval Kishore said that the suggestion put forth by Dr. R.P.S. Josh should be considered as a special case keeping in view the fact that it had been recommended by the Inspection Committee and also that the College had made admissions to the course. Or the College should be given 1 or 2 months' time to make the appointment. But they should not make it a rule.

On a point of order, Dr. Dinesh Talwar enquired whether the College had made admissions with the prior approval of the University. If not, no concession should be given to the College.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that whenever any course is started by a College, teacher/s has/have to be appointed. He did not know how the Inspection Committee recommended affiliation for the course without appointment of faculty.

Majority of the members were not in favour of accepting the proposal made by Dr. R.P.S. Josh as if approved, it would open a pandora's box.

Inspection Report

21. Considered if the provisional extension of affiliation be granted to SGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur (Hoshiarpur), for Foundation Course (2-3 months) and Certificate course (3-6 months) Political Science under the scheme of Human Rights Education under Plan as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self-financing course for the session 2012-13.

NOTE: Inspection Report and office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXVIII**).

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired why the item has been placed before the Syndicate after the period of more than 9 months when it was marked by the Deputy Registrar (General) to O.S. (Syndicate) on 12.2.2013.

Professor Naval Kishore clarified that the case of affiliation/extension of affiliation is placed before the Syndicate when all the conditions imposed by the inspection Committees are met by the College concerned.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Vice-Chancellor marked the file to the D.R.G. on 9.2.2013 and the D.R.G. marked it to O.S. (Syndicate) on 12.2.2013. Where the file remained for more than 9 months? Why he was saying so because it is the same College, in which case the report of the Committee was not supplied to the members of the Senate along with the agenda papers and, ultimately, the Vice-Chancellor had no option but to defer the consideration of the item to the next meeting of the Senate. Why it is happening again and again in the case of this particular College?

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that there seems to be something fishy and of serious nature.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would send a strong administrative message to the erring officials.

RESOLVED: That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to SGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur (Hoshiarpur), for Foundation Course (2-3 months) and Certificate course (3-6 months) Political Science, under the Scheme of Human Rights Education under Plan, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Financing course, for the session 2012-13.

Inspection Report

22. Considered if the provisional extension of affiliation be granted to A.S. College for Women, Khanna, for Certificate Add-On courses in: (i) Communicative English and (ii) Computer Based Accounting, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Financing Scheme, for the session 2013-14.

NOTE: Inspection Report and office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXIX**).

RESOLVED: That provisional extension of affiliation be granted to A.S. College for Women, Khanna, for Certificate Add-On courses in: (i) Communicative English and (ii) Computer Based Accounting, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Financing Scheme, for the session 2013-14.

Issue regarding refusal for getting inspected by certain permanently affiliated Colleges

23. Considered whether permanent affiliation granted to the Colleges by the University grants immunity to such Colleges w.r.t. the subsequent deficiencies and shortage and whether such Colleges can arbitrarily refuse inspection.

- NOTE:**
1. Representation dated 7.7.2013 (**Appendix-XXX**) received from certain Principals of the Education Colleges, Punjab, on the issue enclosed.
 2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXX**).

Professor Naval Kishore stated that a representation from the Principals of certain Colleges of Education had been received stating that the NCTE has issued show cause notices to them. The office notice in this regard is self-explanatory, which has been enclosed as an appendix. In fact, the problem is that everybody is making complaints through the Chancellor Office that the Dean, College Development Council is indulging in corruption in the University, especially regarding Colleges of Education. The data projected by the Dean, College Development Council regarding number of teachers is absolutely correct. The permanently affiliated Colleges are pleading that the reports of the Periodical Inspection Committee have been sent to the NCTE on the basis of the status one and a half year back, whereas the present status of the College is different as per the compliance sent by the Colleges. Certain Colleges had refused inspection by the Inspection Committees on the plea that they have been granted permanent affiliation even though a number of deficiencies still existed, including of teachers being between 3 to 9. Could they allow the permanently affiliated Colleges to run with less number of teachers, less payment of salary, no-contribution towards Provident Fund, non-payment of House Rent Allowance, Medical Allowance, etc.?

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu stated that he would like to know the names of the Colleges, which refused inspections by the University. According to him, the Periodical Inspections were got done by the University. Thereafter, a letter was sent to the permanently affiliated Colleges for getting themselves inspected for extension of affiliation and the Colleges said that since they have been granted permanent affiliation by the University from such and such year, they would not like to get inspected. Then the Colleges were asked to produce the letter through which they were granted permanent affiliation. The Colleges pleaded that if they were not granted permanent affiliation, they should have been inspected for extension of affiliation every year, but that was not the case. Moreover, no College could deny the inspection. If a decision is taken by the Syndicate for inspection of the Colleges of Education, the University could inspect them at any time.

Professor Naval Kishore said that since certain deficiencies have been pointed out by the Periodical Inspection Committees and if inspections are not to be carried out, how the deficiencies are to be met.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu suggested that they could name the Committees as 'Surprise/Inspection Committees'.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if there is any complaint regarding inspection of the Colleges, they should send Surprise/Inspection Committees, instead of Inspection Committees. In fact, the Dean, College Development Council, should have right to get the inspections done by the Surprise/Inspection Committees at any point of time.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that there is no problem as far as Periodical Inspections are concerned. In view of the deficiencies pointed out by the various Inspection Committees, including Periodical Inspection Committees, the Dean, College Development Council, wanted to follow up to see whether the deficiencies have been removed or not. The follow up has to be done keeping in view the teachers returns sent by the Colleges to the University. In the end, he said that if not the Inspection Committees, the Surprise/Inspection Committees could be sent.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that since the Colleges are getting 95% grant-in-aid from the Government, they are supposed to remove the deficiencies pointed out by the various Committees of the University.

Professor Naval Kishore said that if the College had 13 posts covered under grant-in-aid scheme of the Government and out of 13, 5 had retired. There is ban on recruitment of five teachers. Since the College had got sanctioned two more units of B.Ed., accordingly it has to appoint more teachers. He added that certain Colleges had not appointed even teacher/s for B.Ed./M.Ed. self-financing course.

Professor Nandita Singh stated that it had been conveyed to the NCTE that such and such Colleges of Education had such and such deficiencies. At the same time, perhaps, these Colleges have been granted permanent affiliation by the University on the basis of sufficient infrastructure and faculty. But since some of the faculty members have retired later on, they should have given some time to these Colleges for making appointments instead of reporting the matter to the NCTE.

Professor Naval Kishore said that it has now been reported by the Committee in the case of one of the permanently affiliated Colleges, the Dearness Allowance is being paid @ 20% and a sum of Rs.780/- is being deducted as Provident Fund. If the office intervened, it is alleged that the reports are changed by the office of Dean, College Development Council.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as a functionary of the University, the Dean, College Development Council, has to maintain credibility. Since the Committees of the University are using different yardsticks while making their recommendations, the Dean, College Development Council, has to use his authority to streamline the things.

Professor Naval Kishore said that it was the decision of the Syndicate to send the data of the deficient Colleges of Education to the NCTE. Each and every document of the Colleges has to be certified by the University (Dean, College Development Council). Even if there is a delay of one day by the University office, it is pointed out. However, when the matter is in the Court, nobody has the power to grant affiliation.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu said that it is not clear from the representation of the Principals of the Colleges of Education permanently affiliated with the University, why do they not want evaluation/inspection done. According to him, they wanted that the data supplied to the NCTE in 2011 on the basis of which they have been issued show cause notices, should be updated and supplied to the NCTE.

Professor Naval Kishore said that they had updated their data, but the Colleges made complaints against each other.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the note of the Dean, College Development Council seemed to be the outcome of miserable state of affairs of the Colleges of Education at the time of reporting the matter to the NCTE. Now, the item is to consider whether permanent affiliation granted to the Colleges by the University grants immunity to such Colleges w.r.t. the subsequent deficiencies and shortage and whether such Colleges can arbitrarily refuse inspection. No background has been annexed, wherein the Colleges have shown their unwillingness to get inspected. According to him, the Colleges have to undergo for inspection and the University could send Inspection Committee to any College at any time and any number of times irrespective of the fact whether it is permanently affiliated or provisionally affiliated. From the representation of the Colleges, he could only know that the NCTE has issued show cause notices to certain Colleges of Education on the basis of the data supplied to them. They say that since they have complied with so many deficiencies, which had been pointed out last year, the updated data may please be supplied to the NCTE and the NCTE should be requested to withdraw the show cause notices. He did not know whether these Colleges could be granted immunity. But nothing has been mentioned in the document. Though nothing has been written in the representation that the University could not inspect the permanently affiliated Colleges, the Dean, College Development Council, has informed that certain permanently affiliated Colleges had refused for inspections by saying that they are not authorized to send inspection teams. If they go through the document, the representation has been made on behalf of 12-13 Colleges, but if they read the letter, it has been written by one person alone, which says 'I wish to bring the following points for your'. So what is revealed in the document, in fact, is much less than what they had tried to conceal. What they had tried to conceal, the Dean, College Development Council, has put in the last sentence of his note '..... whether permanent affiliation grants immunity to such Colleges w.r.t. the subsequent deficiencies and shortages and such Colleges can arbitrarily refuse inspection. But the item, whosoever has framed, is "To consider whether permanent affiliation granted to the Colleges by the University grants immunity to such Colleges w.r.t. the subsequent deficiencies and shortage and whether such Colleges can arbitrarily refuse inspection". Thereafter, two notes have been given: (i) representation dated 7.7.2013 (Appendix) received from certain

Principals of the Education Colleges, Punjab, on the issue is enclosed; and (ii) an office note is enclosed. The fact of the matter is that the Syndicate has understood everything. It has been made abundantly clear that the Colleges have to follow the norms laid down by the University and if at any stage the University has any doubt, the University could send surprise teams. Even if some deficiencies are pointed out after having Periodical Inspection/s, then it becomes the responsibility of the University to see within 1-3 months by sending the Inspection Committee whether the deficiencies have been removed. However, in the case of Colleges which are permanently affiliated, the University should be more sensitive. But the situation here is otherwise. As informed by the Dean, College Development Council, though there is shortage of teachers in permanently affiliated Colleges also, still they are adding courses year after year. The item should have been, as observation made by Dr. R.P.S. Josh, that whether their own Inspection Committees could make recommendations contrary to what has been laid down in the regulations, which creates problems for the office of the Dean, College Development Council, Registrar and the Vice-Chancellor. Though the Vice-Chancellor is the final authority, he simply asked the people to go to the Registrar or the Dean, College Development Council to discuss the matter. Ultimately, people felt that the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar are very cooperative, but the Dean, College Development Council, is not. According to him, the report submitted by the Inspection Committee is not the final decision as it has to be considered by the competent authorities, i.e., Syndicate and Senate. The objections are raised by the members of the Inspection Committee that under what authority the office is objecting to the recommendations of the Inspection Committee. Therefore, the item should have been how to make the members of the Inspection Committees sensitive towards the regulations and irregularities being committed by the Colleges. Not only this, the people from the Colleges came to the University office to point out what irregularities are being committed in the Examination Branch, R&S Branch and Colleges Branch, which probably is their right. At the same time, the University has also right to point out the deficiencies wherever they are. Whatever has been demanded by the Colleges has already been done, i.e., the updated data has already been supplied to the NCTE. As such, the issue is over. The answer to the query posed to the Syndicate that whether permanent affiliation granted to the Colleges by the University grants immunity to such Colleges w.r.t. the subsequent deficiencies and shortage and whether such Colleges can arbitrarily refuse inspection, is no. He does not think whether the Colleges (permanently affiliated or provisionally affiliated), which are habitual offenders, have any right to refuse for inspections.

Professor Naval Kishore informed that two Colleges have refused for inspection and asked the members of the Inspection Committees to go back. Resultantly, the University has to bear the expenses incurred on their T.A. and D.A. He suggested that the Colleges should be given 2-3 months' time to send compliance report to the University, failing which the matter should be reported to the Syndicate.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that they should simply give them notices stating that they had not met the listed deficiencies, why action be not taken against them as per the University regulations.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that since the Inspection Committees and the Core Committee had pointed out the deficiencies clearly, the entire data should be compiled by the Colleges Branch for categorization of the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to issue them the notices. Their reply would be considered and those who would not reply, their cases would be referred to the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since they had ample time, they could say that if reply is not found satisfactory or reply is not given at all, the cases of such Colleges for affiliation for the session 2014-2015 would not be considered.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that all the affiliated Colleges, including Colleges of Education, should be asked to put the names of the faculty members working in their respective Colleges on their website, so that they could know as to which faculty member is working at which College. This has already been done by Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) permanent affiliation granted to the Colleges by the University does not grant immunity to such Colleges w.r.t. the subsequent deficiencies and shortage and such Colleges cannot arbitrarily refuse inspection as the Colleges have to undergo for inspection and the University could send Inspection Committee/s to any College at any time and any number of times. Further, the Colleges have to follow the norms laid down by the University under any circumstance and if at any moment, the University has any doubt, the University could send Surprise Teams;
- (2) the Colleges, which did not meet the deficiencies/conditions imposed by the Inspection Committees, be issued show cause notices as to why action be not taken against them;
- (3) the replies received to the show cause notices be placed before the Syndicate for consideration;
- (4) the cases of the Colleges, replies from which are not received within the stipulated time, be placed before the Syndicate and their cases for affiliation for the session 2014-15 be **not** considered; and
- (5) all the affiliated Colleges, including Colleges of Education, be asked to put the names of the faculty members working in their respective Colleges on their website, so that the University/ members of the Inspection Committees could know as to which faculty member is working at which College.

Item taken as Ratification item

24. Following Item 24 on the agenda was taken to Item for Ratification (**Sub-Item xxiv**).

To consider if the admission to B.H.M.S. course at Homoeopathic Medical College and Hospital, Sector-26, Chandigarh be allowed for the current session, i.e., 2013-14 in consonance with orders of the Govt. of India for implementation of provisions of Homoeopathy Central Council Regulations 2013 superseding the Homoeopathy (MSE) Regulations 1983, conveyed by Shri P. Vijay Kumar, Deputy Secretary to Government of India Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Department of Ayurveda, Yoga and Naturopathy Unani Siddha and Homoeopathy vide letter F.No. R-13040/10/2011-HD (Tech) dated 26.8.2013.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 15.6.2013/29.6.2013 has resolved that the admissions to BAMS and BHMS course be not made for the session 2013-14 as consequence of the letter dated 1.4.2013 of Government of India as it refused to grant any amnesty to Homoeopathic College from Homoeopathic (MES) Regulation 1983 from the session 2013-14, but on representation by the concerned College of Government of India vide its letter dated 26.8.2013 revised its orders which read as under:

“Therefore keeping the overall interest of continuing Homoeopathic Medical Education in the country and the long term interest of the students amnesty for non enforcement of HCC (MSR) Regulation 2013 is being granted for the academic year 2013-14 for all existing Homoeopathy Colleges. **Further all Homoeopathy Medical Colleges should also be directed to ensure compliance of HCC (MSR) regulation 2013 and accordingly remove all the shortcomings as required for getting conditional permission for the subsequent academic session 2014-15 as per the provision of HCC (MSR) regulation 2013**”.

2. The extension of the aforesaid amnesty entitles only the Homoeopathic College to make admissions during the current academic session 2013-14. Since, the last date of admissions is 30th September 2013 in the professional courses of the college it would be appropriate to pass the necessary orders in this direction as after the said date, **admission can only be made with the late fee of Rs.1800/- up to 31.10.2013.**

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, video recording of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate was started to ensure that the minutes of the meetings are written correctly. Thinking it a public document, the general public had started seeking copies of the DVDs of the recordings under the RTI Act, which has created an embarrassing situation for them. He, therefore, suggested that it should be clarified that the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate is being videographed just to ensure that the minutes of the meetings are written correctly and the DVDs are not a public document and the same would not be kept in the record after the minutes are finalized. If any member of the Syndicate has any doubt about the recording of the minutes, he/she would have the right to refer to the DVDs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the decision pertaining to videographing of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate was earlier approved by the Senate, the recommendation/s of the Syndicate have to be placed before the Senate for approval.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, the decision for videographing the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate was taken by the Syndicate. But when the Vice-Chancellor informed the Senate about this decision, the Senate decided that the proceedings of the meetings of the Senate should also be videographed. Therefore, the Syndicate has every right to review its decision. As far as the issue regarding videographing of the proceedings of the meetings of the Senate is concerned, the matter could be placed before the Senate. He clarified that the meetings of the Senate are open to the media and also to the public selectively, whereas the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate were not open to the media. Earlier, even the Director Public Relations (DPR) did not sit in the meetings of the Syndicate. The DPR was asked to sit in the meetings of the Syndicate only on experimental basis by the then Vice-Chancellor. Just after 2-3 meetings, the then DPR said that it is not possible for him to sit in the meetings. Thereafter, since then the additional charge of DPR was given to certain persons of the University faculty and it became the practice for DPR's to sit in the meetings of the Syndicate, which is not good. In fact, the responsibility of the DPR is to handle the media and not to become a media person himself. He, therefore, suggested that the practice of asking the DPR to sit in the meetings of the Syndicate should be dispensed with.

RESOLVED: That the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate are videographed just to ensure that the minutes of the meetings are recorded correctly. Thus, it is not a public document and be not provided to the public.

Award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy

25. Considered reports of examiners of certain candidates on the theses, including viva-voce reports, for the award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.).

RESOLVED: That the degree of Doctor of Philosophy be awarded to the following candidates in the Faculty and subject noted against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
1.	Ms. Nasrin Jaber Ghaderi H.No.663 Sector-11/B Chandigarh	Arts/ Psychology	EFFECTIVENESS OF COGNITIVE BEHAVIORAL THERAPY AND EYE MOVEMENT DESENSITIZATION AND REPROCESSING THERAPY IN THE TREATMENT OF CHILD VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IN IRAN
2.	Ms. Mamta Sachdeva C/o Dr. Maninder Karan, UIPS, P.U. Chandigarh	Pharmaceutical Sciences	DESIGN, SYNTHESIS AND EVALUATION OF GALLIC ACID ESTERS AS POTENTIAL ANTIOXIDANTS
3.	Mr. Virender Rihani Department of Electronics PEC University of Technology Chandigarh	Engineering & Technology	ABSTRACTION AND RECOGNITION USING ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORKS
4.	Mr. Priya Vart Thareja 701 PEC University of Technology Chandigarh	Engineering & Technology	REENGINEERING ENGINEERING EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM'S TOTAL QUALITY
5.	Ms. Abha Sethi H.No. 628, Sector-12 Panchkula	Business Management & Commerce	CONSUMER PERCEPTION OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY INITIATIVES IN NORTH INDIA
6.	Ms. Jaspreet Kaur D/o S. Dhanwant Singh V.P.O. Rangil Pur District Ropar	Languages/ Punjabi	1990 TON BAAD PANJABI NOVEL VICH BADALDE NARI BIMB DI PESHKARI
7.	Ms. Dipika #29, Income Tax Colony Pitampura, Delhi	Arts/ Psychology	GAY AND BISEXUAL MALES: PERSONAL CHALLENGES AND MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS
8.	Ms. Harpreet Bali E-101, Rail Vihar, Mansa Devi Complex Sector-4, Panchkula	Languages/ English	PEDAGOGY, POLITICS AND THE MARKET: A CRITIQUE OF SELECTED ANTHOLOGIES IN POSTCOLONIAL INDIA
9.	Ms. Ramanpreet Kaur D/o S. Sukhjinder Singh Grewal H.No. 195, Ward No.11 Near Janta College Ahmedgarh Sangrur-148021	Languages/ English	THE DYNAMICS OF VIOLENCE: A STUDY OF SELECTED NOVELS OF NADINE GORDIMER
10.	Ms. Preet Kawal Kaur H.No. 117 Sector-46/A Chandigarh	Pharmaceutical Sciences	PHYTOCHEMICAL, ANALYTICAL AND ANTI-INFLAMMATORY EVALUATION OF <i>BARLERIA</i> SPECIES
11.	Mr. Ram Rattan G-77, Kabir Nagar, (Near Ajit Nagar), Ambala Cantt.	Arts/ Economics	PLANNING AND THE TRIBES: ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN TRIBAL AREAS OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, (1951-1990)

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
12.	Mr. Sunil Sheshrao Baraskar Plot No. 230, Laxmi Nagar, Nagpur (M.S.)	Engineering & Technology	DEVELOPMENT OF A HYBRID MODEL FOR OPTIMAL SELECTION OF ELECTRICAL DISCHARGE MACHINING PROCESS PARAMETERS FOR MOULD AND DIE STEEL MATERIALS
13.	Ms. Surjit Kaur H.No. 211, Ward No.5 Kasba Road Dasuya.	Languages/ Punjabi	PUNJABI WAR-KAV DE PARSANG VICH GURU GRANTH SAHIB VICHLIAN WARAN DE PURMUKH SAROKAR
14.	Mr. Behnam Hashemi H.No. 132 Sector 11/A Chandigarh.	Languages/ English	THE INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS AFFECTING THE ADOPTION OF ICTs AMONG ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS IN ESL CONTEXT
15.	Mr. Suresh Kumar S/o Sh. Jaru Ram V.P.O. Patta Tehsil Bhoranj Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.)	Science/ Physics	PREPARATION, ALIGNMENT AND ELECTRICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF CARBON NANOTUBE CONJUGATES WITH NANOPARTICLES
16.	Mr. Narinder Singh Bola #108, G.F., Sector 51-A Chandigarh	Languages/ Punjabi	PANJABI RANG-MANCH DA UDBHAV ATE VIKAS 1900 ISVI TAK
17.	Mr. Maninder Deep Cheema #2782, Phase-2, Urban Estate, Patiala (Punjab)	Arts/ Economics	ECONOMIC MOBILITY IN RURAL INDIA: COMPARATIVE STUDY OF HOUSEHOLDS IN BIHAR, KERALA, MAHARASHTRA AND PUNJAB
18.	Mr. Anil Kumar H.No. 3958 Sector 22-D Chandigarh	Science/ Physics	ELECTRICAL PROPERTIES OF Se-Te BASED CHALCOGENIDE GLASSES
19.	Ms. Raman Dhadra D/o Raj Kumar V.P.O. Lidder Kalan Distt. & Tehsil Nawan Shahar	Languages/ Punjabi	SAMKALI PUNJABI SWEJEEVANI DA MANOVISHLESHANATMAK ADHIAN (1988 TON BAD DIYAN SWEJEEVANI DE PARSANG VICH)
20.	Ms. Karan Jawanda H.No. 131 Sector-18-A Chandigarh	Law/Law	RIGHTS OF WOMEN UNDER CHANGING PERSPECTIVE OF HINDU LAW: AN APPRAISAL
21.	Ms. Anju Kaushal Kothi No. 127, Phase-I S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali	Science/ Zoology	RESPONSE OF PRO-AND EU-KARYOTIC GENOMES TO CERTAIN METALS IN GENETIC RISK ESTIMATION ASSAYS
22.	Mr. Harnam Singh Village Sarain, P.O. Hussainpur Lalowal, Distt. Hoshiarpur (Pb)	Education/ Physical Education	AN ASSESSMENT OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY STATUS OF PUNJAB STATE SCHOOL TEACHERS
23.	Ms. Moamil Hassan H. No. 1241, Sector-8-C Chandigarh	Law/Law	MONEY LAUNDERING: INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL LEGAL CONTROL MECHANISM: A CRITICAL EVALUATION
24.	Ms. Suman Singh Agrionics Division, CSIR-CSIO, Sector-30-C Chandigarh	Science/ Chemistry	SYNTHESIS, CHARACTERIZATION AND APPLICATION OF GOLD NANOPARTICLES IN BIOSENSORS

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
25.	Ms. Pratibha Sharma #68, Top Floor Sector-21-A Chandigarh-160022	Education/ Education	EFFECT OF COMPUTER BASED MULTIMEDIA INSTRUCTION ON ACHIEVEMENT IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE, ATTITUDES AND SOCIAL SKILLS OF CLASS V STUDENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR COGNITIVE STYLE
26.	Mr. Avtar Singh H.No. 1370, Sector-19-B, Chandigarh	Arts/ Philosophy	ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSON AND SOCIETY: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL RE-THINKING ON INDIVIDUAL AND THE COLLECTIVE
27.	Mr. Masoud Ghorbanhosseini H.No. 91, Sector-10-A Chandigarh	Arts/ Gandhian Studies	HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN IRAN: A CASE STUDY OF SAFA INDUSTRIAL GROUP
28.	Ms. Shaifali C/o Dr. Gaurav Kolotra Department of Geography P.U., Chandigarh	Education/ Education	IMPACT OF WOMEN-ORIENTED TV PROGRAMMES ON SELF-CONCEPT, ADJUSTMENT AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS LIFE OF HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS
29.	Mr. Rahul Naresh Joshi C/o Dr. Kuldeep Puri E-1/35, P.U. Campus Sector-14, Chandigarh	Arts/ Gandhian Studies	EDUCATION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT- A GANDHIAN APPROACH (WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO LOK-BHARATI, SANOSARA)
30.	Ms. Siftjit Kaur H.No. 1454/A, Sector-61/B, Chandigarh	Science/ Microbiology	SPERMAGGLUTINATION BY BACTERIA: RECEPTOR SPECIFIC INTERACTIONS AND DEVELOPMENT OF SPERMAGGLUTINATING CONTRACEPTIVE
31.	Ms. Deepika Saini H.No.3339, Chandigarh Police Co-operative Society Sector-51-D, Chandigarh	Science/ Chemistry	SYNTHESIS AND CHARACTERISATION OF SOME METAL TRIHALOACETATES
32.	Ms. Venu #617, Phase-1, Mohali (Punjab)	Science/ Environment Science	MICRO LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF WATER AND SOIL QUALITY IN PARTS AND DISTRICT SANGRUR, PUNJAB INDIA IN RELATION TO AGRICULTURE AND HEALTH HAZARDS
33.	Ms. Anjali Bansal H.No. 647 Milk Colony, Dhanas Chandigarh.	Law/Law	CRIMINALISATION OF POLITICS IN INDIA: A CRITIQUE
34.	Mr. Rohit Sandal S/o Sh. B.L. Sandal V.P.O. Chakmoh Teh. Barsar District Hamirpur Himachal Pradesh	Science/ Physics	NEUTRON MULTIPLICITY MEASUREMENTS AS A PROBE OF NUCLEAR VISCOSITY AND FUSION-FISSION DYNAMICS
35.	Mr. Gaurav Kumar H.No. 312 Street No. 7/A-B Dashmesh Nagar Moga	Education/ Education	IMPACT OF A REMEDIAL STRATEGY ON TRIGONOMETRICAL ERROR PATTERNS IN RELATION TO COGNITIVE STYLES AND CEREBRAL DOMINANCE

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
36.	Ms. Vishav Jyoti V.P.O. Kungrat Tehsil Haroli District Una (H.P.)	Languages/ Hindi	UPANYASKAR SANJEEV KE SAAMAJIK SAROKAR
37.	Mr. Kiyanoush Ghalavand #1096, Sector 15-B Chandigarh	Arts/ Gandhian Studies	AGRICULTURE INSURANCE IN INDIA: A STUDY OF JAMMU & KASHMIR
38.	Ms. Poonam Saini HE-204, Phase-I Mohali (Pb)	Languages/ Hindi	MAMTA KALIA KE KATHA-SAHITYA MEIN NAARI-VIMARSH

Issue regarding action to be taken against SGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur

26. Considered if any action is to be taken against the S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur, for running the following courses without having the required affiliation from the Panjab University:

(i) B.Sc. II (Agriculture), (ii) B.Sc. III (Fashion Designing), (iii) M.Sc. II (IT), (iv) M.A. I. (English)-60 seats, (v) B.Sc. I (Medical), (vi) B.A. I (Sociology)-E, (vii) B.Sc. I (Agriculture)-additional one unit, (viii) B.A. I. (Police Administration)-E, (ix) M.A. I (Hindi)-60 seats, (x) B.A. I. (Gandhian Studies), (xi) B.Com. III (2nd unit), (xii) M.Sc. I (Mathematics)-40 seats, (xiii) B.A. I (Music)-E, (xiv) B.A. I (Public Administration)-E, (xv) B.C.A. I, II & III (one unit), (xvi) M.P.Ed. 1st and 2nd year, (xvii) B.P.Ed. (One year course) and (xviii) C.P.Ed. 1st and 2nd year (Two year course).

NOTE: The repeated refusal of the Principal to undertake the mandated inspections after fixing/ refixing the dates of inspection with his due consent, and later on arbitrarily backing out of the same, at the last moment that too when the members have had prepared themselves, every time has landed the University in a very precarious and difficult situation because of the blatant refusals as amount to not only willful defiance but also border an utter disrespect and contempt for the affiliating university by the seeker affiliated college herein S.G.G.S. College, Mahilpur.

It is because of the cited facts that the affiliation process has been held to ransom & undue and absolutely wrong reference is being made to CWP No. 19095 of 2013, which is out of context, as of now, as far as the affiliation process is concerned consequent upon which it is placed on record for information of the Hon^{ble} Vice-Chancellor that the College as on date has been running the above referred courses without having the required affiliation, the responsibility for which lies fairly and squarely on the Principal of the College for resorting to unlawful and illegal umberage and penumberage of litigation, wherefore the admissions of the

students so made in the courses under reference in the current academic session of 2013-14 are not as per University rules & regulations whereupon the students returns for 2013-14 cannot be accepted on the grounds mentioned above, much against the alleged allegations of the Principal who holds these as “the delay tactics of the University”, which, in fact, are solely attributed to the Principal as is evinced from the sequence of the events referred in the **(Appendix-XXXI)** which vouches and warrant that appropriate action may be initiated by the Syndicate.

It was informed that the decision of the Syndicate that the S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur, be not granted the status of autonomous Colleges, has been challenged by the College in the Court and the next date of hearing has been fixed for 10th October 2013. The College is not getting the inspection done by the University on the plea that it had been bestowed the status of autonomous College by the U.G.C.

Professor Naval Kishore stated that the College is running the above mentioned courses without getting affiliation from the University. For B.P.Ed. course the College has said that for this course the regulatory body is NCTE and not the Panjab University. How could the College defy the University? Last time, the inspection has been refused by the College at the last moment. During first year, the College might have been under the impression that it would be granted the status of autonomous College, but it should have got inspection done by the University at least during the 2nd year.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that since it has been mentioned that the College has refused inspection for certain courses, including (i) B.Sc. II (Agriculture), (ii) B.Sc.-III (Fashion Designing), and (iii) M.Sc. II (IT), it meant that the College has got affiliation from the University for 1st year of these courses and now the students have been admitted to the 2nd year. In their case, they have to take a different decision. In the other case, where the course/s has/have been started by the College at its own, they have to take a different decision. In certain courses, the students are just moving to next classes. Therefore, while taking decision in respect of this College, they have to keep these things in mind.

Professor Naval Kishore stated that in the case of certain courses, they could not accept the students' returns as the College has not been granted affiliation in those courses by the University.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that since the students have moved to the next higher class and got admission, they did not know whether the College has been granted affiliation by the University for their next higher classes or not. Therefore, either they have to shift those students to another College or get the inspection done for the purpose of grant of affiliation. He thought that since now the College has appointed another person as officiating Principal, he might be willing to get the inspection done for the courses, the students of which had already moved to next higher classes. If he is willing to get the inspection done, they should do it on priority basis. But as far as 1st year courses/classes are concerned, they should refuse straightaway.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would refuse affiliation for the new subjects/courses. However, for ongoing courses, they would get the inspection done.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that the University might have sanctioned 50 seats for B.Sc. I and if the College had admitted more students now, in that case they should take a decision today itself.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that all Colleges which are habitual of violating the instructions/guidelines/norms/ rules/regulations of the University, should be taken to the task.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu enquired as to what is the compulsion of the University in granting the affiliation to the College/s, even if it/they did not demand.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon suggested that alternative arrangement of the students of on-going classes should be made.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University could not take the responsibility of shifting all the students, which comprised of a huge number.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there seemed to be a dispute between the two groups of the College Management. But the University has to deal with the Principal of the College. As per latest Hon'ble Supreme Court of India judgement, if a College had admitted students unauthorizedly and even if there is no fault of the students, they have to go. Such a decision has been taken by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of students of M.B.B.S. 3rd year in some College. He, however, was of the view that the University should have given a general notice in the newspapers that the University is not responsible if any admission/s is/are made by S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur, to these courses as the University has not given affiliation to the College for these courses. The College has made some mistakes under the garb of autonomous status and the same should also have been given in the newspapers. Thus, the University probably could not escape 100% responsibility. In view of the present situation as a new Principal (officiating) is there and if he is ready to undergo the whole process of inspection, which in fact is mandatory for extension of affiliation, and is also ready to remove the deficiencies, which would be pointed out by the Inspection Committee to be sent to the College, they should take a decision to send the Inspection Committees to the College on priority basis. However, if the new Principal (officiating) is also equally adamant, they have to take a different decision. But if the University still found that in the case of ongoing courses, they have no alternative/via-media in the absence of non-grant of affiliation by the University, and that the students could also not be shifted, they have to deal with the situation as on today. He, therefore, suggested that first they should talk to the officiating Principal of the College.

RESOLVED: That the Officiating Principal of S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur, be approached and if he is ready to undergo for the whole process of affiliation, including inspection, Inspection Committee/s be appointed and sent to the College on priority basis.

Agenda Items 27 and 28 being Ratification and Information Items, these be read under Items 35 and 36.

Appointment of Senior Law Officer

29(i). Considered minutes dated 23.9.2013 (**Appendix-XXXII**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Senior Law Officer-1, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.7400/- (initial pay of Rs.31,120/-) plus allowances as admissible under the University rules, in the Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Shri Sandeep Chopra be appointed Senior Law Officer in the Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.7400/- (initial pay of Rs.31,120/-) plus allowances as admissible under the University rules.

- NOTE:**
1. A summary bio-data of the selected and wait-listed candidates were enclosed.
 2. Certified that the selected and wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

Appointment of Law Officer

29(ii). Considered minutes dated 23.9.2013 (**Appendix-XXXIII**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Law Officer-1, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.5400/- (initial pay of Rs.21,000/-) plus allowances as admissible under the University rules, in the Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Shri Sushant Batish be appointed Law Officer in the Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.5400/- (initial pay of Rs.21,000/-) plus allowances as admissible under the University rules.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Ms. Shagun Sachdev be placed on the Waiting List.

- NOTE:**
1. A summary bio-data of the selected and wait-listed candidates were enclosed.
 2. Certified that the selected and wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

Appointment of Assistant Law Officer

29(iii). Considered minutes dated 24.9.2013 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Law Officer-1, in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800 + Grade Pay of Rs.4800/- (initial pay of Rs.18,250/-) plus allowances as admissible under the University rules, in the Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Shri Sushant Batish be appointed Assistant Law Officer in the Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800 + Grade Pay of Rs.4800/- (initial pay of Rs.18,250/-) plus allowances as admissible under the University rules.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the following persons, in order of merit, be placed on Waiting List:

1. Shri Saurav Dhawan
2. Dr. (Ms.) Sunaina.

NOTE: 1. A summary bio-data of the selected and wait-listed candidates were enclosed.

2. Certified that the selected and wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under the CAS, in the Department of Evening Studies

29(iv). Considered minutes dated 30.9.2013 (**Appendix-XXXV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme, in the Department of Evening Studies (History), Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Gauri Sharma be promoted from Associate Professor (History) (Stage-4) to Professor (History) (Stage-5) in the Department of Evening Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions), with effect from **19.03.2012 (i.e. from the date of fulfilment of API score)**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10000/-, 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under the CAS, at University Institute of Legal Studies

29(v). Considered minutes dated 30.9.2013 (**Appendix-XXXVI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (History) (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (History) (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme, at University Institute of Legal Studies.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sasha be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) (History) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) (History) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) with effect from **06.07.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under the CAS, in the Department of Psychology

29(vi). Considered minutes dated 30.9.2013 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme, in the Department of Psychology.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Seema Vinayak be promoted from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) in the Department of Psychology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions), with effect from **05.08.2010**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10000/-, 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under the CAS, in the School of Punjabi Studies

29(vii). Considered minutes dated 30.9.2013 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme, in the School of Punjabi Studies.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Yograj Angrish be promoted from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) in the Department of Punjabi, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions), with effect from **17.07.2010**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10000/-, 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under the CAS, at University Institute of Engineering & Technology

29(viii). Considered minutes dated 01.10.2013 (**Appendix-XXXIX**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme, at University Institute of Engineering & Technology.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Harmesh Kumar be promoted from Associate Professor (Stage-4) (Mech. Engg.) to Professor (Stage-5) (Mech. Engg.) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions), with effect from **06.06.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10000/-, 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under the CAS, in the Department of Biotechnology

29(ix). Considered minutes dated 01.10.2013 (**Appendix-XL**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme, in the Department of Biotechnology.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Jagtar Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4) in the Department of Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions), with effect from **01.04.2013**, 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under the CAS, in the Department of Laws

29(x). Considered minutes dated 01.10.2013 (**Appendix-XLI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme, in the Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Devinder Singh be promoted from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) in the Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions), with effect from **20.07.2012**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10000/-, 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: The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Promotion of Reader, under the CAS, in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies

29(xi). Considered minutes dated 03.10.2013 (**Appendix-XLII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion as Reader under Career Advancement Scheme (Old Scheme) in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted as Reader in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (Old Scheme) (subject to fulfilment of U.G.C. conditions) w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.12000-420-18300 (unrevised) now revised to Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University, the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

1. Dr. Navleen Kaur - 01.10.2006 (on account of Senior Scale as Project Officer)
2. Dr. Anuradha Sharma - 01.10.2008 (on account of senior scale as Project Officer).

NOTE: The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letter of promotion/appointment to the persons promoted/appointed under Items C-2(i) to C-2(xii), C-8, C-29(i) to C-29(xi), be issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Action Taken Report on the decision of the Syndicate regarding GTB Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya

30. Considered the action taken report in pursuance of the Syndicate decision dated 15.04.2013 and 25.04.2013 (Para 21) with regard to show cause notice issued to G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur.

NOTE: The following documents were enclosed (**Appendix-XLIII**):

1. A copy of show cause notice issued to the College on 3.9.2013.

2. A copy of reply submitted by the College vide letter No.1938 dated 19.9.2013 (received through e-mail).
3. Date-wise events in the case of GTB Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya.
4. Objections regarding report published in newspaper were sent to Professor Rajesh Gill on 18.4.2013, to which no response has been received as yet.
5. A letter received from Mr. Balwinder Singh, Assistant Professor, G.K.S.M. Government College, Tanda, enclosing therewith a copy of letter No.3004-PC dated 15.7.2013 addressed to I.G. Police, Jalandhar by S.S.P. District Hoshiarpur.

Referring to the letter of the Government, Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that he remembered that the Superintendent of the Examination Centre has already been debarred. In fact, an enquiry was conducted by him, which was later on endorsed by two another Committees. But he did not know whether the person concerned was exonerated and allowed to act as Centre Superintendent again, especially when all the members were unanimous that this kind of role is not expected from the Centre Superintendent. Due to the intervention on the part of the College, the criminal proceedings have not been initiated by the IG Police. According to him, the University could not exonerate the person concerned on the basis of this report. Instead, the University has to take a strict action against the College, which is a habitual offender.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had placed all the documents relating to this case before the Syndicate, which he could not do before.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that when this report was considered by the Syndicate about 6 months ago, he had apprehension that if they did not take any action against the College, the services of the complainant teachers would be terminated and his apprehension has now become true. He apprehended that similar situation might arise at Guru Nanak Girls College, Ludhiana.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu wanted to know the reply of the College to the show cause notice issued by the University.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu opined that they have to supply a copy of the complaint and other documents to concerned parties, if demanded.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that the Committee, in fact, has taken a conscious decision and not an emotional one. Though they as member of the Enquiry Committee had assured the complainant teachers that the University would provide them justice, and their concern is that they could not fulfil their commitment? Though the College had received the copy of the complaint unofficially, it wanted to have the same officially, which is nothing but a delaying tactics. They had assured the girls that the University would do something and give justice to them. But he has almost come to the conclusion

that a lot of things have been covered up in this case systematically and none of the complainant has got justice and they have virtually disappeared. December 16 was not the first incident in which the crime was committed. In fact, in this case their first decision was that the centre for postgraduate examinations would not be created in this College and the Examination Centre for the same would be shifted to J.C.D.A.V. College, Dasuya. The Vice-Chancellor had assured that these instructions would be given to the concerned Officers/Officials by tomorrow. But that did not happen. Was it a part of design? If he was not wrong, to his mind the second decision was that the copy of the report be sent to the employer, which had not been done. Thirdly, the show cause notice was to be issued to the College, which was not issued till August 2013 and the same was issued on 3rd September 2013. The reply to the decision of the Syndicate that GTB Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, be not made examination centre for University examinations and a centre for students be created at J.C.D.A.V. College, Dasuya, has been given **'that the action is to be taken by the Conduct Branch'**. He did not at all know why the copy of the report has not been sent to the College. How these cases have been hushed up? In fact, the copy of the report was not sent to the employer to ensure that no action is taken against the guilty person/s. The Police had submitted its report in mid July. It was also a part of the design that is why the report has not been sent to Punjab Government. Had it been sent to the Punjab Government at that point of time, the decision would have been altogether different. In the mid July, when he enquired about the case, he was told that the enquiry was moving in a right direction. When the Deputy Superintendent of the Police (DSP) started making enquiries from the College, the College Management got him replaced by another DSP with which the College Management was comfortable. No eye witness is available because the location of the staff room was away from the place of the incidence. Shri Tarsem Dhariwal, the then Director, Higher Education, Punjab, had visited the College himself and prepared the report, but probably someone under the Government influence had compelled him to change his report. Hence, the report placed before the Syndicate is not the one, which was earlier prepared by him. According to him, the same person is playing role in the office of the Director, Higher Education, Punjab, Panjab University and in the Police Department. They have to look into as to why nothing happened up to 3rd September. Had minimum action been taken on the basis of the discussions held in the Syndicate meeting, the College might have been disaffiliated for some of the courses. The action was delayed so that the College could continue as such. They needed to know as to why Centre of Examination for postgraduate classes was not shifted from the College and why the copy of the report was not sent to the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could understand the anguish of Dr. Jagwant Singh.

Referring to the appendix, Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that it has been mentioned at page 4 (para 5) that "the documents submitted by the College authorities are conclusive evidence of the fact that more than half of the teaching staff is being paid a consolidated salary of Rs.8000/- only while the remaining staff is getting the gross salary ranging from Rs.21,600/- to Rs.35,090/- only. There is every possibility that a part of the salary being taken back in cash which may be directly going to the pockets of the key officials of the Managing Committee". He suggested that the above should be taken

as admission by the College and the University should take action against the College accordingly. As far as other things are concerned, they should see the original enquiry report. As far as the report of the DHE is concerned, somebody should tell that this is not the original report and the report which has been submitted to the University has been got changed and the person concerned has been exonerated. He suggested that they should seek the original report from Director Higher Education, Punjab.

The Vice-Chancellor said that *prima facie* while forwarding the Enquiry Committee report to the Director Higher Education, Punjab, they should request him to supply the original report.

Professor Naval Kishore suggested that a decision should be taken today itself that instructions be issued to all the affiliated Colleges to pay salary to the teachers through account payee cheques.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that, in fact, when the complaint was made by the teachers for the first time on 22.12.2012, they had not levelled charges of sexual harassment. The charges of sexual harassment were levelled later on, on 26.12.2012. Reports of IG (Police) and Senior Superintendent of Police, who are IPS and PPS ranked persons, and their enquiry report is in favour of Shri Balwinder Singh and the College. Similarly, the report of DHE, Punjab, is also in his favour as well as of the College. In her complaint dated 22.12.2012, Ms. Nargis Dhillon did not mention anything about sexual harassment. He urged that they should keep all these things in mind, while arriving at any decision. He added that though he was a member of the Syndicate and the Senate, he never entered the examination centre. Therefore, it should be ascertained whether she was assigned the examination duty on the date when the incident took place. The Committee was sent to look into the complaint and it was not in the domain of the Committee to verify if the full salaries are being paid or not. If any action is to be taken against the College, it should be on the basis of enquiry report for which the enquiry was conducted.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that, in fact, it was a Fact-Finding Committee, which submitted in April 2013 and the salary component was part of that report and there is no point in going back to it again. Who was on duty on that day and who was not on duty was not an issue. The report had been accepted by the Syndicate unanimously and the same could not be questioned now. The conclusive part which is on record is that more than 50% of the staff is getting just a consolidated salary of Rs.8000/- per month, which is hardly 25% of the total salary. Could they ignore that, especially after the submission of the report which has conclusive documentary evidence which has been submitted in the University Office? The College has been issued show cause notice and it had not contested it. The other part is that now nobody is seeking justice. In the circumstances, under which the whole process has been completed, i.e., with lot of delay, is itself wrong. If possible, they should do this exercise on the basis of their report which is in detail. The reply given is primarily from one side. This issue in an educational institution, needed to be examined by some competent authority, maybe by the National Women Commission. On the basis of the report submitted by the National Women Commission, they should take appropriate departmental action instead of hushing up the matter. However, the University must come up with as to why: (i) the Postgraduate

examination centre of GTB Khalsa College, Dasuya, was not shifted to J.C.D.A.V. College, Dasuya; (ii) the minutes were wrongly recorded; (iii) the copy of the report was not sent to the Punjab Government; and (iv) the University took so long to take action against the College?

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that he fully agreed with Dr. Jagwant Singh. When the enquiry was conducted by their own Senate members and submitted the fact-finding report, they should take action on the basis of the said report and should not take into consideration the report submitted by the I.G. and S.S.P.

Dr. I.S. Sandu said that about two years ago the services of some of the teachers of Sham Chaurasi College were terminated by the College Management. What action has been taken by the University against the College? Secondly, the Committee in its report in the case of Chela College, Chabewal, has reported that the teachers are being paid Rs.8000/- per month. What action has been taken by the University against this College?

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that they have to make a beginning from somewhere. Unless and until, they show their intentions, they are not going to become a deterrent for their affiliated Colleges.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if the teachers of Sham Chaurasi and Chela College had also come forward, they should take action against those Colleges as well.

The Vice-Chancellor said that *prima facie* the copy of the report should have been sent to the Punjab Government as correctly stated by Dr. Jagwant Singh. If it has not been sent earlier, it should be sent now. Similarly, the copy of the report of the Committee along with the copy of the complaint should also be sent to the College officially.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that fingers have been raised on the Punjab Police and Director Higher Education, Punjab. Similarly, objection has also been raised against inaction on the part of the University officials. The third category is more serious as it is written in the Action Taken Report on the decision of the Syndicate that "action is to be taken by the Conduct Branch". It has also been mentioned at page 10 (para 3) "the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor in debarring Shri Balwinder Singh, Government College, Tanda Urmur, for all kind of University work, for future, be ratified and information about this be sent to Director, Higher Education, Punjab". However, in the action taken column, nothing has been mentioned about this and it had been projected as if action has been taken on all the decisions of the Syndicate. In para 4, it has been written "that GTB Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur, be **not** made examination centre for University Examinations and a centre for students be created at J.C.D.A.V. College, Dasuya". In spite of this decision of the Syndicate, examination centre was created and examinations held there. He would not hesitate to use the word 'shameful' wherein it has been written that the action is to be taken by the Conduct Branch as if the Syndicate is at the mercy of the Conduct Branch to get its decision implemented. Instead of taking any action against those officers/officials of the University, who had not bothered to take necessary action on their part, they are raising fingers on the Punjab Police and Director, Higher Education, Punjab. Was it not undermining the authority of the Syndicate? Nobody, how much ever

bigger he/she might be, has any right to undermine the authority of the Syndicate. They should identify and fix the responsibility of the officials/officer/s, who are responsible for not taking action on the decisions of the Syndicate. He could understand if there was some delay in issuing the show cause notice to the College, but the decision which was taken there that examination centre for Postgraduate classes be not created at GTD Khalsa College, Dasuya and that Shri Balwinder Singh be debarred from any University work and information about this be sent to the Punjab Government, should have been implemented by issuing the necessary instructions by the officers, who were present in that meeting, to their subordinates. As stated by Dr. Jagwant Singh, it was decided by the Syndicate at that point of time that the copy of the report be sent to Punjab Government and the information about debarring Shri Balwinder Singh from the University work be sent to Director, Higher Education (DHE), Punjab. If they were not capable of getting implemented their own decisions, how could they expect the same from the Managements of the Colleges? Till they do not set their house in order, they probably have no moral right to ask anything from the Colleges. As far as politics is concerned, it is very well understood that the things are not going well in the office of the DHE, Punjab and Punjab Police, but they have no control over them. In fact, all this is being done in connivance with the officials of the University, which was a serious concern for all of them. The report was submitted on 6th March 2013 and by 12th April, he did not know, who Mr. Ghuman was. It has been noted by the Vice-Chancellor on 12th April 2013 at page 17 of the appendix that Principal Gurdeep Sharma and Dr. S.S. Randhawa met him with the delegation led by Principal Ghuman and they have objected to the report published in the media. He was sorry to point out that when the issue was discussed in the Syndicate on 25th April 2013 and the report of the Committee was accepted, why this fact (meeting of the delegation with the Vice-Chancellor) was not brought before the Syndicate. He only wanted that the responsibility of the officers/officials be fixed so that strong signal be sent that the University means business and the guilty, how much big he/she might be, could not go scot-free. The Colleges Branch, while issuing the show cause notice, thought that after issuing the show cause notice, their job is over and did not bother to know whether the Conduct Branch has taken necessary action. The Enquiry Committee was constituted by the Vice-Chancellor. The objections, which were raised by the Principal of the College who was represented by a delegation, were marked by the Vice-Chancellor to the Registrar and Dean, College Development Council. They in turn marked the objections/papers to Deputy Registrar (Colleges) and the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) further marked it to Professor Rajesh Gill, Chairperson of the Committee as if another enquiry was to be conducted. Now, it was being shown that no response was received from the Chairperson of the Committee in spite of the fact that it was very well within their knowledge that the work of the Chairperson of the Enquiry Committee was over after the submission of the report. Now, the question came, had the report been sent to the DHE, Punjab as decided by the Syndicate, Shri Balwinder Singh would have been debarred from the University work and then, maybe, the outcome of this enquiry could have been different. Now, the situation is other way round and instead of depending on their own enquiry and finding fault with their own office, they have to depend on the enquiry conducted by another agency or they have to refer the case to another agency, i.e., National Commission for Women. Do they have any moral right to say anything to the College, DHE, Punjab or the Police? People would

not have any confidence on them till they did not take any action against the guilty persons, who are responsible for these lapses. The question also arises as to why the Examination Centre for postgraduate classes was allowed to continue in GTB Khalsa College, Dasuya, despite there being a decision of the Syndicate that Examination Centre for postgraduate class at GTB Khalsa College, Dasuya, be shifted to J.C.D.A.V. College, Dasuya. Secondly, why the information about debarring Shri Balwinder Singh along with the report of the Committee was not supplied to DHE, Punjab? As far as sending the show cause notice is concerned, it is mentioned that though the decision was taken on 25th April 2013, the file was received back on 24th June 2013. That meant the file along with the relevant decision of the Syndicate was sent to the Colleges Branch on 24th June 2013. If this is the situation in the case of priority issues, they have to see the functioning of the University officials/officers. The matter was delayed so much that the show cause notice was issued to the College on 3rd September 2013. This all was done to ensure the guilty person/s should go scot-free. The officials/officers, who are responsible for delaying the process, should be taken to the task. Some of the people thought/projected as if it is the job of the Dean, College Development Council, but the Dean, College Development Council, does not come into picture at all as it is the duty of the Deputy Registrar (Colleges), who just referred the matter to the Chairperson of the Committee. Even after receiving the decision of the Syndicate, he did not bother to take any action till he remained Deputy Registrar (Colleges). He was relieved from the Colleges Branch on 31st August 2013 and the show cause notice was issued on 3rd September 2013, i.e., just within 3 days. Such things are needed to be seen very carefully. When the question of integrity of the University staff and members of the Syndicate and Senate come, they should be together and see that the responsibility for the lapses is fixed. Though everybody is saying that a copy of the complaint and report of the Committee be supplied to the College, the moment the report was submitted by the Committee, all the related people knew the contents of the report and started all kinds of manipulations. Maybe, notice to this was not taken in good faith. Now, they should send the copy of the report of the Committee along with a copy of the complaint to the College and also send the same to the DHE, Punjab. Probably, the DHE, Punjab, would have to stick to his old stand. If possible, the Vice-Chancellor should use his good offices to get a copy of the original report of the DHE, Punjab, which would prove to be very helpful. Otherwise also, if they find that the enquiry Committee has been misled/made some errors in their judgement/functioned in a biased manner, they have opportunity to take remedial steps. But if they find that whatever conclusion the Enquiry Committee has arrived at is right irrespective of the fact what is reported by the DHE, Punjab and Punjab Police in their reports, they are competent enough to take action against the College within their Regulations.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that since they have not taken any action in the matter during the last about 8 months, they need to introspect and see whether the Syndicate is effective enough. Why the University officers/officials have not taken any action against the guilty people, despite their being a Syndicate decision. What prompted them not to take any action? Therefore, they really need to do introspection and see why there is this kind of inadequacy working within the University.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal, Dr. Tarlok Bandhu suggested that they should fix the responsibility of their own officers/officials, who have played a role delaying the implementation of the decision of the Syndicate. In fact, this has not happened for the first time. Every time when the issue of fixing the responsibility is raised, it took the back seat. Now, it is the best time to fix the responsibility and clean their own den. He pleaded that they should move in this direction. The second issue which needed to be taken care of is as to why, in spite of the decision of the Syndicate, the examination centre for postgraduate classes was not shifted from GTB Khalsa College, Dasuya to J.C.D.A.V. College, Dasuya and why the report of the Committee was not sent to the employer of Shri Balwinder Singh, i.e., DHE, Punjab. These two things at least should be done now. Action regarding shifting of examination centre for postgraduate classes from GTB Khalsa College, Dasuya to J.C.D.A.V. College, Dasuya, should be taken on priority because the supplementary examinations are going to commence shortly.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that, as suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal, responsibility for the delay in taking action in accordance with the decision of the Syndicate, should be fixed. Secondly, action/s as suggested by Dr. Tarlok Bandhu should also be taken. Thirdly, they should refer the issue of sexual harassment of women teachers of GTB Khalsa College, Dasuya, to National Commission for Women, which they definitely look into on the plea of the Syndicate. Fourthly, what were they doing on the issue of less payment to the teachers, which the College had admitted?

Dr. Dinesh Talwar suggested that, if possible, the issue should be handed over to the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI).

Professor Shelley Walia said that since it is a case of sexual harassment of women, it would be better to hand over this case to the National Commission for Women.

It was clarified that, in fact, the different Branches of the University lacked coordination amongst each other. In the instant case, a copy of the decision of the Syndicate was sent to the Controller of Examination, who in turn marked it to Deputy Registrar (Examinations). Perhaps, due to the lack of coordination, the report might not have been sent to the DHE, Punjab. As far as this reply is concerned, it has been prepared by the Colleges Branch without gathering information from the Conduct Branch.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let us form a small Committee to do the postmortem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that an impression should not be taken as if there is difference of opinion between the members of the Syndicate when the issue of action to be taken against various Colleges came. In fact, all the members are one unit and their only concern is that whosoever is guilty should not be spared, but at the same time no innocent person should be punished.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that it seemed there is a big gap. Though they are taking decisions, nothing is happening. Therefore, whatever decision is to be taken, it should be taken after contemplating well.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that records proved that firstly there was no complaint of sexual harassment and the sexual harassment was mentioned in the second complaint.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would again relook into the whole issue a little bit to fine tune himself. Thereafter, he would sit with Shri Ashok Goyal and study the whole issue in detail.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that to whosoever a copy of the complaint and copy of report is to be sent, the same should be sent tomorrow. They have to at least go the background of the case and take remedial measures so that they are not caught in this situation again.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that whenever show cause notice is issued to a person/institution, their Lawyers are always ready to defend. Irrespective of this fact, they should implement the decisions of the Syndicate and Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that things have to improve slowly, but it would happen so only if such kind of discussions took place. They are doing self-analysis.

Professor Naval Kishore said that the decision of the Syndicate was conveyed to the Colleges Branch on 24th June 2013 and the show cause notice was issued to the College on 3rd September 2013, i.e., after almost 70 days, which of course is a lapse on the part of the College Branch.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that they have to fix the responsibility and see as to how they could improve the things. The sexual harassment case of the women teachers of GTB Khalsa College, Dasuya, along with the Enquiry Committee report should be given to both the National Commission for Women and the CBI. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to look into the issue and take necessary action. Lastly, since it had been admitted by the College authorities and there are conclusive evidence that more than half of the teaching staff is being paid a consolidated salary of Rs.8000/- only while the remaining staff is getting the gross salary ranging from Rs.21,600/- to Rs.35,090/- only, they need to take a policy decision and start taking action from this College.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) a copy of the complaint along with the report of the Enquiry Committee be supplied to Director, Higher Education, Punjab and Guru Teg Bahadur Khalsa College, Dasuya. The University should also request the Director, Higher Education, Punjab, to supply the original enquiry report, if any, about the incident;
- (2) the case of sexual harassment of women teachers of Guru Teg Bahadur Khalsa College, Dasuya, be referred to National Commission for Women and/or the Central Bureau of Investigation;

- (3) the issue of delay in taking action against the College be enquired into and responsibility for the same be fixed.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That all the affiliated Colleges be directed by the office of Dean, College Development Council, to pay salary to the teachers through account payee cheques.

Issue regarding offering of appointment to Wait-listed candidate after a period of six months

31. Reconsidered the Syndicate decision dated 27.7.2013/13.8.2013 (Para 31) (**Appendix-XLIV**) with regard to post of Assistant Professor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be offered to Mr. Suresh Thareja, who is on the Waiting List, as Dr. Raj Kumar, the selected candidate, has shown his inability to join the post on expiry of six months period of his extension, in view of the orders passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP 18711 of 2013 (**Appendix- XLIV**).

- NOTE:** 1. The Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP 18711 of 2013 (**Appendix- XLIV**) has issued a direction to decide the legal notice within a period of four weeks by passing a speaking order thereon from the date of receipt.
2. The Syndicate dated 27.7.2013/ 13.8.2013 (Para 31) has resolved that the post of Assistant Professor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, be **not** offered to Mr. Suresh Thareja, who is on the Waiting List.

That the extension in joining period be granted by the Vice-Chancellor selectively and, that too, not more than 3 or 4 months so that if the selected person did not join within the extension period, the appointment could be offered to the person placed on the Waiting List.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it gives an impression as if the item is brought to the Syndicate for re-consideration and at the same time it also projects as if the item has been brought to the Syndicate in view of the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court. He pointed out that the Syndicate in its meetings dated 27.7.2013/13.8.2013 has considered the issue and decided that the post of Assistant Professor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences be not offered to Mr. Suresh Thareja, who was placed on the waiting list, as there is no rule/regulation for allowing anyone to join after the expiry of six months. The Legal Notice U/S 80 CPC was served on the University by the Advocate of Dr. Suresh Thareja on 2nd May 2013. Keeping in view the provisions of Regulation 15 at page 36 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, which says that "... the waiting list, shall, however, be operative for a period of **six** months from the date of Syndicate meeting in which it is approved", the Syndicate took the decision on 27th July 2013 (Para 31) that the post of Assistant Professor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry at University Institute of

Pharmaceutical Sciences be not offered to Mr. Suresh Thareja. The office should have given the reply to the applicant immediately that the post could not be offered to Mr. Suresh Thareja. Instead of this, the item has been placed before the Syndicate for reconsideration, which the Court has not ordered at all. He, therefore, suggested that the item should be withdrawn and suitable reply in view of the above quoted decision of the Syndicate should be given.

RESOLVED: That the item be treated as withdrawn and suitable reply in view of the decision of the Syndicate dated 27.7.2013 (Para 31), be given.

Appointment of Technical Officer (Biotechnology Engineering) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology

32. Considered minutes dated 30.9.2013 (**Appendix-XLV**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Technical Officer-1 (Biotechnology Engineering), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+Grade Pay of Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules in the Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Shri Arun Raina S/o Shri B.N. Raina be appointed Technical Officer (Biotechnology Engineering) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+Grade Pay of Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules and his pay be fixed as per University rules.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Shri Sukhpal Singh S/o Shri Mohinder Pal Singh, be placed on the Waiting List. If he is got appointed, his pay be fixed as per University rules.

- NOTE:**
1. A summary bio-data of the selected and wait-listed candidates were enclosed.
 2. Certified that the selected and wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

Item C-33 on the agenda was taken up for consideration after the Ratification Item 34.

Appointment of Technical Officer (Electronics and Communication Engg.) at UIET

34. Reconsidered minutes dated 30.7.2013 (**Appendix-XLVI**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Technical Officer (Electrical & Communication Engineering)-1 at University Institute of Engineering & Technology in the pay-scale of ₹10300-34800+GP ₹5000/- plus allowances admissible under the University rules, in view of the recommendations of the Committee dated 30.09.2013, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in pursuance of the Syndicate decision dated 24.08.2013 (Para 7).

It was noted that –

- (1) the Syndicate at its meeting held on 24.8.2013 (Para 7) has decided that the matter (appointment of the candidate recommended by the Selection Committee dated 30.07.2013 for appointment of Technical Officer (Electrical & Communication Engineering) be got examined keeping in view the observations made by the

members and, in the meanwhile, the consideration of the item be deferred; and

- (2) the Committee (Selection Committee), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for appointment of Technical Officer (Electronics and Communication Engineering) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, reconsidered the matter in view of the observations made by the members and made the following recommendations:

1. The essential qualification for the post of Technical Officer (Electronics & Communication Engineering) was:

First Class Diploma in Electronics & Communication/Telecommunication Engineering; with seven years experience at the level of Senior Technician or equivalent in relevant Laboratories of University Department/AICTE approved College/Institute.

OR

First Class AMIE in Electronics & Communication/ Telecommunication Engineering; with three years experience after AMIE in relevant Laboratories of University Departments/AICTE approved College/ Institute/ Government Organization.

OR

First Class Bachelor's degree in Engineering/Technology in Electronics & Communication/ Telecommunication Engineering; with two years experience after essential qualification in relevant Laboratories of University Department/AICTE approved College/ Institute/ Government Organization.

2. The candidates, who appeared for interview before the Selection Committee, were already recommended by the Screening Committee duly constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.
3. The main responsibility of the Technical Officer is to maintain equipment in various Laboratories of a Branch to ensure smooth functioning of Labs.

4. The candidate selected was found to be best in the interview having more than 13 years of experience in handling equipments in Laboratories of Technical Institutes.
5. The candidates with higher qualifications such as B.E./M.E. though had some experience in teaching, but were found lacking in experience of handling equipments in the Laboratories.

After some discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That Mr. Jai Kumar S/o Shri Prem Chand be appointed Technical Officer (Electronics & Communication Engineering) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800 + Grade Pay of Rs.5000/- plus allowances as per University rules and his pay be fixed as per University rules.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Mr. Sanjeev Bhatia S/o Shri Ramesh Bhatia, be placed on the Waiting List. If he is got appointed, his pay be fixed as per University rules.

- NOTE:**
1. A summary bio-data of the selected and wait-listed candidates were enclosed.
 2. Certified that the selected and wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letter of appointment to the persons appointed under Items C-32 and C-34, be issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

At this stage, Dr. Jagwant Singh raised the issue of Guru Nanak Khasla College for Girls, Ludhiana and enquired as to what the University had done in this context.

It was informed that the College has been directed to revoke the suspension of the teachers, but they have not done it so far.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Syndicate should be taken into confidence. Also, it is very unfortunate that University had not taken any strict action against Guru Nanak Girls College, Ludhiana.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that a strict action should be taken against Guru Nanak Girls College, Ludhiana, so that strong signal is passed on to them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him correlate all these things.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar pointed out that there are two employees in the University, whose pay-scales have not been revised so far despite giving representations 2-3 times. One of them is Shri Jai Kumar, who has now been appointed as Technical Officer (Electronics &

Communication Engineering) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology (Item C-34) and the other is Mr. Deepak, who is working at Bhai Ghanaya Ji University Institute of Health Sciences. He was supported by Professor Naval Kishore.

The Vice-Chancellor assured that he would himself see that the needful is got done without any further delay.

Agenda Items 27 and 28 being Ratification and Information Items, these be read under Items 35 and 36.

Routine and formal matters

35. The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(xxvi)** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

(i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved re-employment of Dr. Vijay Rattan, Professor in Public Administration, University School of Open Learning, P.U., on contract basis up to 27.09.2018 (i.e. attaining the age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date of his joining as such after one day break as usual, as per rules/regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 (Para 58)/ 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

NOTE: (i) Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment.

(ii) The re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/ she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment under Rule 4.1, at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate has cancelled Extraordinary Leave without pay from 1.7.2013 to 25.9.2013 out of the EOL without pay already granted to Dr. Ronki Ram, Professor from 26.9.2011 to 25.9.2013, to join as Visiting Professor of Contemporary Indian Studies at Leiden University, the Hague, The Netherlands, as

he has joined back on 1.7.2013 i.e. prior to completion of sanctioned leave.

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate has approved the appointment of following persons as Assistant Professors in the Department of Computer Science & Application, purely on temporary basis, for the academic session 2013-14 against the vacant post of Associate Professor of the Department or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus other allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

1. Ms. Anjali Jindia D/o Sh. Om Parkash Jindia
2. Ms. Pratibha Bhola D/o Sh. Shakti Kumar.

NOTE: 1. The Vice Chancellor has approved the above appointments as a very special case but it will not be a precedent, in future.

2. The competent authority could assign teaching duties to them in the same subject in other teaching departments of the University in order to utilize their subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied departments at a given point of time, with the limits of the workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate has approved the appointment of Dr. Zarreen Fatima as Assistant Professor on contract basis, in the Department of Urdu w.e.f. the date she starts work, for the academic session 2013-14, against the vacant post of the department or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier, under regulation 5 at pages 111-112, on P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 on the same terms and conditions according to which she had worked previously during the last session.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor has:

- (I) sanctioned the following retirement benefits to Professor Shelley Walia, Department of English & Cultural Studies, P.U. Chandigarh **up to 17.7.2013 instead of retiral benefits which were sanctioned to Professor Shelley Walia up to 31.7.2011 i.e. attaining the age of his superannuation (60 years)**, in terms of order dated 17.7.2013 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal Nos.5527-5543 (SLP(c) Nos. 18766-18782 of 2010) Jagdish Prasad Sharma etc. Vs. State of Bihar & Ors.

With other listed Civil Appeals including CA No.5663 of 2013, which includes SPL (c) No. 21508 of 2011 (Professor Shelley Walia Vs. P.U.), entire connected bunch of matter relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) to dismiss the said petition, and his services in the Panjab University stands ceased w.e.f. 17.7.2013 i.e. date of orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 and 15.2 at pages 131-132 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007;
 - (ii) Furlough as admissible under Regulation 12.1 (B) at page 121 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007, read with the Syndicate decision dated 30.8.1986 (Para 17) with permission to do business or service elsewhere during the period of furlough; and
 - (iii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 96 of P.U. Cal. Vol. III, 2009.
- (II) approved re-employment to Professor Shelley Walia, Department of English & Cultural Studies, P.U. Chandigarh on contract basis w.e.f. the date he starts work as re-employed faculty, with one day break as usual, upto 28.7.2016 i.e. the date he attains the age of 65 years, as per rules/regulation of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.6.2008 (Para 58) and 29.2.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to the last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

NOTE: (i) Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year of re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period

of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of P.U. Cal. Vol. III will be applicable.

- (ii) Rule 4.1, at page 130 of P.U. Cal. Vol. III, 2009 reads as under:

“The re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

- (iii) Professor Shelley Walia, Department of English & Cultural Studies, P.U. Chandigarh vacate the accommodation on the University Campus within 2 months after the date of superannuation on 17.7.2013 i.e. date of orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, but not later than 16.9.2013.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has sanctioned the arrears of retirement benefits in respect of Late Shri Sukhdev Singh Saini, Deputy Executive Engineer (Horticulture), P.U. Construction Office (who expired on 10.1.2007) and ordered that the same be paid to his sons as under:-

1. Mr Ravi Kant Saini S/o Late Shri Sukhdev Singh Saini, H.No. 1468, PUSH PAC Complex Sector-49 B, Chandigarh.
2. Mr. Anoop Kumar S/o Late Shri Sukhdev Singh Saini, H.No. 1468, PUSH PAC Complex Sector-49 B, Chandigarh.

NOTE: The Succession Certificate issued by the Court of Dr. Sukhda Pritam Civil Judge (Junior

Division) Chandigarh is attached
(Appendix-XLVII).

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the fee-structure as recommended by the Committee dated 21.6.2013 **(Appendix-XLVIII)** constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to be followed by the Degree Colleges affiliated to Panjab University for the session 2013-14 subject to compliance of the following mandatory conditions:

1. That all the Colleges would pay salary, including all admissible allowances such as ADA, HRA, annual increment, etc., and other benefits viz. - retirement benefits, gratuity, PF, leave encashment, etc. as amended from time to time by the State Government/U.T. Administration/University.
2. That the College prospectus should carry only the approved Heads and Colleges would not be allowed to charge any fee/fund under any other head not approved by the University.
3. That the Colleges would be required to submit the Income and Expenditure statement duly audited by the Chartered Accountant to the Colleges Branch of the University by 30th June, every year.
4. That the Colleges would charge fee/funds for all Undergraduate, Post-graduate and Self-financing courses, strictly as per the fee structure approved and notified.
5. That the tuition fee and admission fee as prescribed by the UT/Punjab Government for the affiliated non-Govt. Colleges.
6. That the Colleges should create special separate head for charging fee towards retirement benefit fund, amalgamated fund, student aid fund and scholarship fund (meritorious students).
7. That new fee/fund structure applicable for the session 2013-14 would, in future, be a part of the college prospectus. This may strictly be adhered to and the colleges shall invariably provide a copy of the prospectus to the University for record.
8. That the College shall appoint regular faculty in each course in compliance of the Panjab University norms.
9. That fee/funds charges should be displayed prominently on the College Notice Board & Website.
10. Copies of fee/funds/other University charges are enclosed **(Appendix- XLVIII).**

NOTE: Consideration of the above item (R-xxix) on the agenda was deferred by the Syndicate dated 27.7.2013.

- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the decisions of the Core Committee constituted by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 29.6.2013 (Para 57) (**Appendix-XLIX**) regarding grant/non-grant of extension of affiliation to the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University for the session 2013-14 (**Appendix-XLIX**).

NOTE: The compendium containing details regarding deficiencies reported to the College/s, compliance received, letter sent to the College/s conveying decisions of the Core Committee **are appended-.**

- (ix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the fee structure (**Appendix-L**) of USOL as proposed by the Chairperson, USOL for the session 2013-14.

- (x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has condoned the shortage of lectures of the students of various Teaching Departments/ Regional Centre/ Institute of the University for the session 2012-2013 as recommended by the Academic Committee/Board of Control of the respective department/Regional Centre/Institute, list enclosed (**Appendix-LI**).

NOTE: The Senate in its meeting dated 12.10.2003 (Para XXIII) has resolved that the power of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate to condone shortage of lectures be approved as under the amendment/additions in the relevant regulations be made accordingly and given effect from the academic session 2002-2003 in anticipation of the approval of Government of India/ Publication in Government of India Gazette:

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Board of Control and for reasons to be recorded, be authorized to condone shortage of lectures up to another 10 lectures delivered in various paper(s) to the best advantage of the candidate in addition to the authority vested in the Chairperson/ Head of the Department.

- (ii) The Syndicate may, for reasons to be recorded, make further relaxation up to 10 lectures delivered in various paper(s) in cases of extreme hardship beyond the limit/s stipulated in (i) above.

- (xi)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Mr. Harvinder Singh, as Assistant Professor in Economics, at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, against the post lying vacant there, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-2014 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of ₹15600-39100+AGP of ₹6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar Vol.-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign him teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

- (xii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Ms. Shafali as Assistant Professor in Commerce, at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, against the post lying vacant there, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-2014 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of ₹15600-39100+AGP of ₹6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar Vol.-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize her subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

- (xiii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Ms. Lipika Gaur Guliani as Assistant Professor in Commerce, at University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism, Panjab University, Chandigarh, against the post lying vacant there, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-2014 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of ₹15600-39100+AGP of ₹6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize her subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Ms. Abha Sethi, as Assistant Professor in Commerce, at, University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh against the post lying vacant there, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize her subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Ms. Inderjot Kaur, as Assistant Professor in Law, at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar Vol.-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize her subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(xvi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Ms. Shweta, as Assistant Professor in Commerce, at P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur (subject to approval of the Punjab Govt./UGC), purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis,

through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize her subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(xvii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Shashi Kant Rai, as Assistant Professor in Hindi, at P.U. Constituent College, Nihalsinghwala, Distt. Moga, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar Vol.-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign him teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(xviii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Ms. Lakhveer Kaur, as Assistant Professor in Physical Education, at P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize her subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(xix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Mr. Karan Gandhi, as Assistant Professor in Commerce, at P.U. Constituent College,

Nihalsinghwal, Distt. Moga, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the post/s are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign him teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(xx) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Simranjit Singh, as Senior Assistant Professor in Oral Pathology at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP of Rs.7000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign him teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(xxi) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Simarpreet Singh, as Associate Professor in Public Health Dentistry at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP of Rs.8600/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar Vol.-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign him teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(xxii) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. (Ms.) Neeraj Sharma, as Associate Professor in Oral Medicine & Radiology, at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP of Rs.8600/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize her subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(xxiii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Mrs. Shruti Sahdev, Medical Officer (Homoeopathic), SSGPURC, Bajwara (Hoshiarpur) for further period of three months w.e.f. 7.9.2013 to 4.12.2013 with one day break on 06.09.2013 or till the post is filled in afresh (on contract), whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & conditions.

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

(xxiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to admit students for BHMS course to Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh for the session 2013-2014 in the light of the amnesty granted by the Govt. of India up to 30.9.2013 as per rules.

NOTE: Letter F.No. R-13040/10/2011-HD (Tech) dated 26.8.2013 received from Deputy Secretary to Government of India Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Department of Ayurveda, Yoga and Naturopathy Unani Siddha and Homoeopathy is enclosed (**Appendix-LIII**).

(xxv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the validity date of advertisement No. 14/2008 for another six months, i.e., up to 14.2.2013 for filling up various B & C class posts.

(xxvi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to start the online submission of examination forms for all the PG courses (Semester System) Examinations w.e.f. 26th September 2013 (**Appendix-LIV**).

NOTE: The last date for submission of examination forms (online/by hand for private/re-appear/regular candidates of all Colleges/ Departments/USOL) has been extended up to 15.10.2013 instead of 1.10.2013 without late fee.

Referring to Sub-Items R-(iii), R-(iv) R-(xi) and R-(xii), Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon vehemently stated that what was the necessity to fill up the posts of Assistant Professors on temporary basis by holding Walk-in-Interviews, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, in anticipation of approval of Syndicate, especially when these posts could have been advertised and filled up on regular basis by following proper procedure as these were lying vacant for the past quite some time. He added that about one and a half months have been taken for filling up these posts on temporary basis, whereas during this period even these could have been filled up on regular basis. He vociferously said that he must be told as to how these posts were filled. He did not at all expect that a learned person like Professor Arun Kumar Grover would become so unethical in appointing certain persons on *ad hoc* basis against the posts of Associate Professors in the Department of Computer Science. His remarks alluded to prevalent of corrupt practices in appointments being made in the University in recent times. He did not know what were the difficulties in advertising the posts and filling them on regular basis?

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that the posts could not be advertised due to non-approval of the template. Secondly, if the posts of Associate Professor or Professor could not be filled up on regular basis due to one or the other reason, to meet the teaching requirement persons have to be appointed as Assistant Professor on *ad hoc* basis.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the 120 vacant posts should be advertised and filled up on regular basis at the earliest.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that since the academic session had already begun, the filling up of these posts immediately was necessary.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon should know that there is a lot of difference in the process followed for filling up of posts on temporary basis and on regular basis. A lot of time is required to fill the posts on regular basis as they have to give advertisement in the newspapers, screening of applications, appointment of Selection Committees, conduct interviews, etc., whereas the posts could be filled up on temporary basis within a shorter span of time. Secondly, for regular appointments the candidates also needed to be given sufficient time.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon stated that if they intended to fill up the posts on regular basis, these could be filled up within 3 weeks time. But they chose to allow continuation of persons appointed on temporary basis for 3-4 years, as they have sympathy with them.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he was sorry to say that Dr. Dhillon should show some reverence to the office of the Vice-Chancellor of this University. The tone and tenor and manner in

which he is speaking without understanding the Administration, is also not proper.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon stated that he had served in an organization bigger than the Panjab University, i.e., Punjab School Education Board, which dealt with the whole of State of Punjab. He had also been filling up the posts there and knew the entire process. The process of filling up these posts on temporary basis through walk-in-interviews is going on for the last two months. According to him, during this period, these posts could have been filled up on regular basis.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that all the posts, including the recently filled up on temporary basis, should be advertised and filled up on regular basis at the earliest.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon stated that they could have filled up these posts on temporary basis, only if the qualified and meritorious candidates were not available. It has also been observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India that for temporary/*ad hoc* appointments, only less meritorious candidates apply and the meritorious candidates do not apply for temporary/*ad hoc* appointments.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was in the knowledge of Professor A.K. Bhandari, Registrar, that the delay in filling up of the posts on regular basis was because of the non-finalization of the templates due to which the posts could not be advertised. Thus, the posts had to be filled up through walk-in-interviews.

Shri Ashok Goyal also referred to the agitated state of mind of Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon did not have anything biased in his mind. He further said that all these posts should be advertised at the earliest and filled up by March 2014.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they also knew with what urgency he was pursuing the job of giving the advertisement for filling up of the posts on regular basis. Now, the file is nearly complete.

Dr. Dhillon said that he was listening to such statements for the last several months.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired if these posts have been filled through walk-in-interviews, why the same had not been mentioned in the item.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that, at this point of time, they should take a decision to advertise all these posts and the process for filling up these posts should be completed by March 2014 and the persons appointed against these posts on temporary basis should be relieved by March 31st, 2014.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in principle, they could not do everything microscopically here. Committees have been constituted to oversee different aspects.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon stated that the appointment of Dr. Zarreen Fatima (Sub-Item R-(iv)), has been made as Assistant Professor on contract basis in the Department of Urdu for the session 2013-14 or till the post is filled in on regular basis. That meant, she would continue as such as long as the post is not filled on regular basis. He, however, pointed out that under above Regulation 5, no appointment could be made by the Vice-Chancellor for a period of more than one year. If the appointment/s is/are to be made for a period of more than one year, as per Regulation 5(b) at page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, the power rests with the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that such posts, which required to be filled up on regular basis, should be identified, advertised and filled up on regular basis at the earliest.

The Vice-Chancellor said that for filling up the posts on regular basis, they have to give enough time to the candidates to apply.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if qualified persons are not available, they could fill up the posts on *ad hoc* basis.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon suggested that the appointments made under Sub-Items R-(iii), R-(iv), R-(xi) and R-(xii) should be made up to 31st March 2014 and these persons should be relieved on 31st March 2014 (afternoon). In the meanwhile the posts should be advertised and appointments made on regular basis.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(iv), Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thought that Dr. Zarreen Fatima has been working in the Department of Urdu for the last so many years. Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon has taken a strong objection to allowing continuation of persons on *ad hoc* basis for years together. The reply to the objection of Dr. Dhillon has been given in Sub-Item R-(iii) note 1 that the Vice-Chancellor has approved the above appointments as a very special case, but it should not be a precedent, for future. Meaning thereby, these appointments have not been made through walk-in-interviews. Had these appointments been made through walk-in-interviews, the proceedings of the Selection Committee would have been annexed? He (Dr. Dhillon) had pleaded that if these positions were so urgent, these should have been filled up on regular basis. Shri Goyal stated that since the appointments had already been made, they could not do anything, but they should ensure that these posts are filled up on regular basis by issuing the advertisement as early as possible. They should advertise the posts on priority basis against which they have made such appointments. Heavens are not going to fall if they issue the advertisement in instalments. He remarked that there are certain departments which are intentionally delaying sending of qualifications and other requirements of the posts because they wanted their favourite persons to enter into the University service through backdoor entry.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was trying his level best to fill up the posts on regular basis.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that Dr. Zarreen Fatima, who is appointed as Assistant Professor in the Department of Urdu, is being paid a salary of Rs.25,800/- per month. If she fulfilled the requisite qualifications, she should be paid full emoluments according to the scale. Referring to the statement that some departments are not

sending the qualifications, he said that the qualifications are not to be decided by the department concerned as these are decided by the UGC.

It was clarified that in certain subjects the UGC had prescribed qualification as Masters in relevant subject and many departments are looking into as to what are the relevant subjects.

Dr. Jagwant Singh remarked that Shri Ashok Goyal is right that some people are favouring certain persons and allowing backdoor entries. He suggested that they should follow the UGC Regulations/Guidelines.

When an example of Biotechnology was given, Dr. Jagwant Singh pointed out that UGC Regulations required Master's degree in the relevant subject and the relevant subject has been clarified by the UGC as 'subject concerned'. Further, if there is sufficient workload for a different subject, say for papers on Microbiology, then the post may be advertised as Assistant Professor in Microbiology in the Department of Biotechnology. He further pointed out that when the subject of Biotechnology was introduced for the first, the teachers might have been from other subjects. Now, since they were awarding degree in M.Sc. Biotechnology for the last 15-20 years, the relevant subject ought to be Biotechnology. Therefore, for post of Assistant Professor Biotechnology, the relevant degree is M.Sc. in Biotechnology.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would give a couple of days' time to the departments to send the qualifications and other requirements relating to the post/s to be advertised. Those departments, which did not supply the requisite information, their names would be deleted from the first advertisement to be given in the newspapers.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that these persons should be allowed to continue up to the end of the current session, but the posts should be filled up on regular basis from the next academic year.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu suggested that all the vacant posts for which the qualifications and other requirements are received within the stipulated time, should be advertised in one go.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(vii), Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that since the consideration of Item 16 pertaining to increasing the rates of examinations, other related application forms, etc. has already been deferred, the consideration of the item (Sub-Item R-(vii)) regarding fee-structure to be followed by the Degree Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, be also deferred and these two items be brought back to the Syndicate together.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(xxiv), Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he wanted to know for his own information that if the Government of India has granted general amnesty to Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh for making admission to BHMS course for the session 2013-14, do they have to follow the orders of the Government of India? Would the University not to go for Inspection for the College? He did not know why this decision has been taken. Though he was not against the decision, the Syndicate has every right to be informed properly. Secondly, he did not know wherefrom this has been written in the office note by the Deputy

Registrar (Colleges) that 'the extension of the aforesaid amnesty entitles only the Homoeopathic College to make admissions during the current academic session 2013-14. Since, the last date of admissions was 30th September 2013 in the professional courses of the college, it would be appropriate to pass the necessary orders in this direction as after the said date admission can only be made with the late fee of Rs.1800/- up to 31.10.2013'. Under the garb of this direction the office at its own has fixed the last date without late fee as 30th September and the last date with late fee of Rs.1800/- up to October 31? The office has stated that since the 30th September is going to pass, maybe because the meeting of the Syndicate could not take place on 21st and 28th September 2013, the College should be allowed to admit students to BHMS course for the session 2013-2014 by the Vice-Chancellor in the light of the amnesty granted by the Govt. of India up to 30.9.2013 as per rules, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate. It was not the fact that the last date for admission to BHMS course was 30th September as the last date for admission was 31st October. Secondly, there was no concept of making admission with late fee. These dates are not to be fixed by the University as the last date has been fixed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India as 31st October. He was sure that neither the Syndicate nor the Senate has taken any decision with regard to last date for admission to medical courses with late fee of Rs.1800/-with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor. In this case the last date has already been fixed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, which has now become law of the land. Now, the Syndicate is being given the impression that the College has been allowed to make the admissions, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, and in case the College was not allowed to make admissions, there would have been contempt of Court as the admissions could be made up to 31st October. It had also happened in the past. Had it been in the notice of the Vice-Chancellor that the last date for admission to BHMS course is 31st October, he would have sent Inspection Committee to the College and might not have by passed the procedure. He suggested that the official who has mentioned the wrong dates should be taken to the task.

Professor Naval Kishore stated that this practice was going on for the last so many years. As far as dates are concerned, he had seen the file and found that the Hon'ble Supreme Court had fixed the last date for admission as 31st October in 2003. But the office is following the procedure of allowing making admission to BHMS course without late fee up to 30th September and with late fee with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor up to 31st October since 2003.

The Vice-Chancellor said that *prima facie* they could have delayed their permission till the approval of the Syndicate.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar pointed out that the salary to the faculty is not being given by the Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh, as per the approved norms.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would send an Inspection Committee soon to Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(xxvi), Dr. R.P.S. Josh enquired whether the staff has been given adequate training for dealing with the examination forms submitted by the candidates through online.

It was clarified that as on today, they had received 14850 examination forms through online. They had given the students choice to submit their examination forms either online or through traditional mode. Earlier, the examination forms were submitted by the students through traditional mode. Now the students had requested the University to give them a chance to apply online. The team of the University, which has been entrusted this job, has been doing the job very well.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that even in the Punjab School Education Board, the Principals of the Schools submit the returns of the students online. The system of submission of forms online is a very good one and the same should be continued.

Dr. Tarlok Bandhu said that the system of submission of forms online is a good one and it would also help in reducing the expenses.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that majority of the students of the rural areas are depending on the booksellers of the cities for purchase and submission of examination forms. They also did not know about the functioning of the e-mail facility. According to him, such students would not be able to submit their forms online. He pleaded that the plight of such students should also be taken care of while deciding this issue.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that the Principals of the affiliated Colleges should be authorized to submit the examination forms of the rural area students taking nominal charges.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that when the students of 10th and 12th Classes could submit their examination forms online with the help of the Principals of their Schools, why could not the students of higher classes? Since this is a good facility, the students should be motivated to use this facility.

Professor Nandita Singh, appreciating the efforts made by the University, said that the process of submission of examination forms online has already been started. To deal with the problems of the students while submitting examination forms online, Help Desks should be created.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that, ultimately, they have to move in the direction of submission of forms online. However, in case of Admit Cards of the students belonging to the affiliated Colleges, the same should be released through the Principal of the concerned College because he/she has to see whether the student concerned has attended requisite number of lectures. He, therefore, suggested that the Admit Cards of the college students should be allowed to be downloaded by the Principals of the Colleges and issued to the students by countersigning them.

It was further clarified that, ultimately, the Admit Cards could be accessed by the Principal of the College concerned as they only would be given the requisite Login ID.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the information contained in **Item 35– R-(i) to R-(vi) and R-(viii) to (xxvi)** on the agenda, be ratified subject to modification that all the

appointments made under **Sub-Items R-(iii), R-(iv), R-(xi) and R-(xii)** be approved up to 31st March 2014 and the appointee be relieved on 31.03.2014 (afternoon);

- (2) consideration of Item 35-R-(vii) on the agenda be deferred and the same be placed before the Syndicate along with Item C-16; and
- (3) the Departments/Institutes/Schools be asked to send the qualifications and other requirements relating to the post/s to be advertised within a couple of days' time. Those Departments/Institutes/Schools, which did not supply the requisite information within the stipulated time, their names would be deleted from the advertisement to be given in the newspapers.

Routine and formal matters

36. The information contained in Items **I-(i) to I-(iii)** on the agenda was read out and noted, i.e. –

(i) To note the Annual Audited General statements of Accounts (**Appendix-LV**) of the following Funds Accounts for the year 2012-2013 in term of Rule 6 at page 611, P.U. Calendar Volume III, 2009:

- 1. Housing
- 2. Conveyance

NOTE: Rule 6 at page 611, P.U. Calendar Volume III, 2009 reads as under:

“The expenditure out of the ‘Revolving Fund’ will be incurred with the recommendation of the Committee and approval of the Vice-Chancellor. The progress of the objectives along with the annual statement of the accounts will be reported by the Chairman of the Department to the Syndicate after 31st March every year.”

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Dr. Vijay Rattan Professor Public Administration University School of Open Learning	11.08.1977	30.09.2013	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.

2.	Dr. Rajinder Jindal Professor Department of Zoology	25.01.1982	31.08.2013	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations
----	---	------------	------------	---

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Dr. (Mrs) Neelam Sharma Deputy Librarian A.C. Joshi Library	01.09.1977	31.10.2013	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Ms. Jitan Superintendent Secrecy Branch	15.11.1976	31.08.2013	
3.	Shri Surinder Singh Bains Superintendent Secrecy Branch	07.11.1972	30.09.2013	
4.	Mr. Kundan Singh Superintendent University School of Open Learning	06.11.1972	30.09.2013	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations
5.	Sh. Amarjeet Singh Research Associate (Technical) Department of Botany	08.10.1984	31.10.2013	
6.	Ms. K. Varudhini Senior Assistant University School of Open Learning	15.01.2002	30.09.2013	
7.	Shri Surat Singh Senior Assistant, Accounts Branch	18.01.1977	30.09.2013	

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

A.K. Bhandari
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE-CHANCELLOR

Item C-33 on the agenda was considered after all other items had been taken up.

At this stage (i.e., before the consideration of the agenda item No.33), the Vice-Chancellor abstained himself from the meeting. The Syndicate unanimously elected Professor Dalbir Singh Dhillon to chair the meeting.

Recommendation of the Dean of University Instruction regarding extension in term of appointment of Professor Neera Grover

33. Considered the recommendation of the Dean of University Instruction, conveying the recommendation of the Academic and Administrative Committee dated 19.7.2013 (**Appendix-LVI**), of the Department of Music, P.U., Chandigarh, that the term of appointment of Professor Neera Grover against the vacant post of Professor, purely on temporary basis be extended for one more year, as per Panjab University rules.

After due deliberations, it was **resolved** not to accord approval to recommendation in item no.33.

The meeting of the Syndicate ended after the consideration of this item.

A.K. Bhandari
Registrar

Confirmed

D.S. Dhillon
CHAIRMAN

NOTE: 1. The Vice-Chancellor has observed that:

The meeting was ended by the officiating Chairperson of the Syndicate after considering Item C-33, without asking the Vice-Chancellor to re-join for the meeting, who was waiting in the adjoining room for nearly half an hour. The Vice-Chancellor was not informed of the finishing of the consideration of Item C-33. The Vice-Chancellor could not formally conclude the meeting with the National Anthem.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon has written that:

It is an irrelevant, superfluous and unwarranted paragraph and its tone

and tenor is nothing but an accusation against the undersigned who was elected unanimously to preside over the meeting of the Syndicate in the absence of the Vice-Chancellor, in accordance with the Regulation 4 on page 35 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. I, 2007, which is reproduced as under:

“4. The Vice-Chancellor shall preside at all meetings of the Syndicate at which he may be present. In his absence, the members present may elect another member to preside at such a meeting. The conduct of business and order of the speaking shall be under the control of the Vice-Chancellor, or, in his absence, of the member who is presiding.”

As item No. C-33 was the last item on the Agenda; the meeting was rightly concluded by the undersigned as Chairman of the meeting at the relevant point of time. Needless to say that the Vice-Chancellor while in the Chair had already completed the Agenda items, including the one listed as Item C-34, leaving item No. C-33 to be discussed by the Syndicate as the last item, since the same pertained to Dr. Neera Grover, wife of the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Arun Grover, who abstained during the discussions on the item. It is not understood, how this Para has been made part of the minutes while none of the members, present in the Syndicate at the relevant time, made any such expression. Hence, the said highlighted paragraph merits to be deleted and it should be replaced by the following expression:

‘It was decided to take up item No. C-33 in the end.’

Regulation 7 may also be referred to first line of which reads,

‘All proceedings at the meetings shall be recorded in writing and signed by the Registrar and countersigned by the Vice-Chancellor or Chairman.’

In conformity with this Regulation, minutes are duly recorded in writing, signed by the Registrar and confirmed by the Vice-Chancellor in respect of the items deliberated/decided under his Chairmanship. Similarly, the proceedings related to Item No. C-33 have also been recorded in writing and signed by the Registrar and confirmed by the undersigned as Chairman of the meeting at the pointed time.

It will be appreciated, if the office of the Registrar has reasonable control over the language about the members of the Syndicate and especially the Chairman of the meeting, who is duly and unanimously elected by the Syndicate.

- 2.** The Vice-Chancellor has made the following observations:

“The acting Chairperson for the Item C-33 had no authority to end the meeting. The Vice-Chancellor had been waiting in the adjoining room to resume meeting after the consideration of Item C-33.

The record of the deliberations that lasted for nearly half an hour have to be made available. Please comply.

Secretary, Syndicate is enjoined to provide an account independently to the Vice-Chancellor/Chancellor.”

- 3.** The Secretary, Syndicate has given the reply as under:

“Professor D.S. Dhillon, member Syndicate, who chaired the meeting of the Syndicate on 8.10.2013 for the consideration of item No. C-33 has been informed of the comments/queries of the Vice-Chancellor vide endorsement No. 6405/RP dated 6.11.2013 for his kind perusal and further instructions. Response from Dr. Dhillon is still awaited.

Regarding orders of the Vice-Chancellor to the Secretary, Syndicate to provide an independent account of deliberations on item No. C-33, it is humbly stated that:

After the Vice-Chancellor abstained himself from the meeting, the members started deliberations so as to who may chair the meeting in the absence of the Vice-Chancellor. The following Regulation 4 of Chapter II (A) (ii) of P.U. Calendar Volume I (Page 35) was read out to the members:

“4. The Vice-Chancellor shall preside at all meetings of the Syndicate at which he may be present. In his absence, the members present may elect another member to preside at such a meeting. The conduct of business and order of the speaking shall be under the control of the Vice-Chancellor, or, in his absence, of the member who is presiding.”

The names of two three persons were suggested on the floor of the house to chair the meeting for this item. After some discussion it was unanimously decided that Dr. D.S. Dhillon would chair the meeting for the consideration of item No. C-33. Dr. Dhillon agreed to Chair the meeting for the consideration of this item. This took about five minutes.

The Chairman enquired about the present status of the appointment of Professor Neera Grover. It was pointed out that last year on the request of the Department of Music, the then Vice-Chancellor, Professor R.C. Sobti had marked the request for emergent temporary appointment of Professor Neera Grover to the Syndicate. Last year, the Syndicate had resolved to make emergent temporary appointment of Professor Neera Grover in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh for a period of one year under Regulation 5 of Chapter V(a) of P.U. Calendar Volume I (page 111-112).

Professor Neera Grover joined the Department on December 17, 2012 and that her term of the appointment will be ending on December 16, 2013. This took around five minutes.

The members then started browsing through the item and annexure papers related to the item. The recommendations of the Department of Music and of the DUI were read out. There was some discussion so as how and under which provisions the recommendations are to be considered. This took about another five minutes.

Some members of the Syndicate were of the opinion that as a case is pending in the High Court challenging the previous appointment of Professor Neera Grover for a period of one year, made last year under Regulation 5 of Chapter V(a) of P.U. Calendar Volume I (page 111-112), therefore only the resolved part of the item should be recorded to avoid further complication in the said court case at a later stage. This was agreed upon by all the members who were present and the Chairman.

It was then resolved not to accord approval to recommendations in Item No. C-33.

After some general discussion lasting about five minutes and as Item No. C-33 was the last item to be considered, it was decided to end the meeting.”