

## **PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on Saturday, 5<sup>th</sup> December 2015 at 11.00 a.m. in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### **PRESENT:**

1. Professor Arun Kumar Grover ... (in the chair)
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Ms. Anu Chatrath
4. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
5. Dr. Ajay Ranga
6. Professor Anil Monga
7. Professor A.K. Bhandari
8. Professor Akshaya Kumar
9. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
10. Dr. (Mrs.) Aruna Goel
11. Dr. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop
12. Dr. B.C. Josan
13. Dr. Charanjeet Kaur Sohi
14. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
15. Shri Deepak Kaushik
16. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
17. Dr. Dinesh Talwar
18. Dr. Dalip Kumar
19. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
20. Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon
21. Dr. Emanuel Nahar
22. Ms. Gurpreet Kaur
23. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
24. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
25. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
26. Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky
27. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
28. Shri Jasbir Singh
29. Dr. Jaspal Kaur Kaang
30. Shri Jagpal Singh alias Jaswant Singh
31. Shri Jarnail Singh
32. Dr. Jagwant Singh
33. Dr. Kailash Nath Kaul alias Kailash Nath
34. Dr. Krishan Gauba
35. Shri K.K. Dhiman
36. Dr. Karamjeet Singh
37. Dr. Keshav Malhotra
38. Dr. Kuldip Singh
39. Shri Krishna Goyal
40. Shri Lilu Ram
41. Dr. Malkiat Chand Sidhu
42. Dr. Mukesh K. Arora
43. Shri Munish Pal Singh alias Munish Verma
44. Shri Naresh Gaur
45. Dr. Nandita Singh
46. Professor Naval Kishore
47. Professor Navdeep Goyal
48. Dr. N.R. Sharma
49. Dr. Parveen Kaur Chawla
50. Professor Preeti Mahajan
51. Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh

52. Professor Ronki Ram
53. Professor Rupinder Tewari
54. Dr. R.P.S. Josh
55. Shri Raghbir Dyal
56. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
57. Professor R.P. Bambha
58. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
59. Dr. S. S. Sangha
60. Shri S.S. Johl
61. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora
62. Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa alias Surjit Singh
63. Professor Shelly Walia
64. Shri Satya Pal Jain
65. Dr. S.K. Sharma
66. Shri Sandeep Kumar
67. Shri Varinder Singh
68. Dr. Yog Raj Angrish
69. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) ... (Secretary)  
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Professor Gurdial Singh
2. Dr. K.K. Talwar
3. Sardar Kuljit Singh Nagra
4. Shri Maheshinder Singh
5. Shri Naresh Gujral
6. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
7. Dr. Parmod Kumar
8. Shri Punam Suri
9. S. Parkash Singh Badal
10. Smt. Preneet Kaur
11. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
12. Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar, D.H.E., U.T., Chandigarh
13. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar
14. Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma
15. Shri Surjit Singh Rakhra
16. Dr. Tarlochan Singh
17. Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab
18. Shri Vijay Kumar Dev
19. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
20. Shri V.K. Sibal

**I.** The Vice-Chancellor said, “With a deep sense of sorrow, I am pained to inform this December House about the sad demise of the distinguished colleagues –

- (i) Professor Shishu Kaur, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on 12<sup>th</sup> November, 2015”.
- (ii) Professor Naresh Tuli, Chairperson, Department of Geology and Dean, Faculty of Sciences, on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2015.

As a mark of respect to the departed souls, the Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Professor Shishu Kaur and Professor Naresh Tuli, and observed two minutes’ silence, all standing, prayed to the Almighty to give peace to the departed souls and give strength and courage to the members of the bereaved families to bear irreparable loss of their dear ones.

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

**II.**

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

1. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Tirath Singh Thakur ji was sworn in as the 43<sup>rd</sup> Chief Justice of India on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2015. We feel honoured and proud that Mr. Justice Thakur had addressed the Panjab University Law Graduates at the second Law Convocation held on April 11, 2015 at Panjab University. He is also associated with the University in numerous capacities and is known to many members of this University, many eminent citizens of this city and so on. He is really delighted that he is the Chief Justice of Supreme Court of India.
2. Nobel Laureate Professor Venkatraman Ramakrishnan who took over as President of the Royal Society London from 1<sup>st</sup> December 2015, will visit Panjab University Campus on January 5, 2016. He is in the city for two days and will stay at IISER, Mohali. He will visit Department of Physics and address the students during the DST Inspire Internship Camp at Panjab University auditorium. He was designated to receive the *honoris causa* Degree at the last Convocation, but he could not come. Now, he has offered the University to honour this commitment to be with us for interacting with our faculty. Incidentally, he was summer student at Panjab University Campus in the year 1969.
3. Professor R.C. Sobti, Emeritus Professor and former Vice-Chancellor, P.U., Chandigarh, and currently Vice-Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (A Central University), Lucknow has been elected as Fellow of The World Academy of Sciences (TWAS), earlier known as Third World Academy of Sciences.
4. His excellency, Governor of Haryana and Chancellor, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar has appointed Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar, UGC Professor of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, as Vice-Chancellor of Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Tech Hisar for a period of three years.
5. Professor Gurmeet Kaur Bakshi, Department of Mathematics, has been elected as Fellow of National Academy of Sciences, India.
6. Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Chairman, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences has been bestowed upon with the prestigious 'Jaswant Singh Rai Memorial Lectureship Award-2015' by the Guru Nanak Dev University on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2015 at Amritsar, for his contributions in Pharmaceutical and Life Sciences. The award includes engraved plaque and honorarium of Rs.25,000/-.
7. Professor Ronki Ram, Fellow & Shaheed Bhagat Singh Professor of Political Science and Dr. Parmod Kumar, Fellow, Panjab University and Director, Institute for Development and Communication (IDC) have been nominated as members of the Indian National Commission for Cooperation with UNESCO (INCCU) by the Ministry of Human Resource & Development, Department of Higher Education, Government of India, for four years
8. Professor Krishan Gauba, Fellow, Panjab University and Head, Department of Oral Health Sciences, PGIMER, has been elected as President of Indian Dental Association (IDA), Chandigarh Branch.
9. His Excellency, Professor Kaptan Singh Solanki, Governor of Punjab, has appointed Professor B.S. Ghuman of the Department of Public

Administration as Chief Finance & Economic Adviser to Government of Punjab. It is an honorary position.

10. Dr. Balram K. Gupta Professor (Retd.) and former Chairperson of the Department of Laws, has joined as Director, Chandigarh Judicial Academy, Sector-43, Chandigarh.
11. Department of Science & Technology (DST) under its FIST-2015 Programme, has identified Chemistry Department of Panjab University for support in Level-II Category with a grant of Rs.3.05 crores for a term of 5 years for strengthening research and postgraduate teaching facilities in the Department.
12. ICSSR, New Delhi, has sanctioned a major Research Project on 'Problems of Religious Minorities in India: A Comparative Study in the State of Punjab' to the Centre for Study of Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy with a grant-in-aid of Rs.18,00,000/- for 24 months of the study.
13. Mr. Jaswant Singh Gill, Panjab University alumnus and founder CEO of Sun Deep Cosmetics Inc., California, USA, has donated Endowment amount of Rs.1.30 Crore ((over 2 Lac USD) for providing scholarships to the students and research scholars of University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) on 'Need-cum-Merit' basis."

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) felicitations of the Senate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Professor R.C. Sobti, Emeritus Professor and former Vice-Chancellor, P.U., Chandigarh, and currently Vice-Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (A Central University), Lucknow, on being elected as Fellow of 'The World Academy of Sciences (TWAS);
  - (ii) Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar, UGC Professor of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on his being appointed as Vice-Chancellor of Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar, for a period of three years;
  - (iii) Professor Gurmeet Kaur Bakshi, Department of Mathematics, on being elected as Fellow of National Academy of Sciences, India
  - (iv) Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Chairman, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on having been bestowed upon with the prestigious 'Jaswant Singh Rai Memorial Lectureship Award-2015' by the Guru Nanak Dev University on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2015 at Amritsar, for his contributions in Pharmaceutical and Life Sciences;
  - (v) Professor Ronki Ram, Fellow & Shaheed Bhagat Singh Professor of Political Science on having been nominated as member of the Indian National Commission for Cooperation with UNESCO (INCCU) by the Ministry of Human Resource & Development, Department of Higher Education, Government of India, for four years;

- (vi) Dr. Parmod Kumar, Fellow, Panjab University and Director, Institute for Development and Communication (IDC), on having been nominated as member of the Indian National Commission for Cooperation with UNESCO (INCCU) by the Ministry of Human Resource & Development, Department of Higher Education, Government of India, for four years;
  - (vii) Professor Krishan Gauba, Fellow, Panjab University and Head, Department of Oral Health Sciences, PGIMER, on being elected as President of Indian Dental Association (IDA), Chandigarh Branch.
  - (viii) Professor B.S. Ghuman, Department of Public Administration, on having been appointed as Chief Finance & Economic Adviser to Government of Punjab; and
  - (ix) Dr. Balram K. Gupta, Professor (Retd.) and former Chairperson of the Department of Laws, on joining as Director, Chandigarh Judicial Academy, Sector 43, Chandigarh.
- (2) the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. Nos. 1, 2, 11, 12, and 13, be noted and approved.

**III.**

At this stage, Principal S.S. Sangha stood up and said that he wanted to raise an important issue. Firstly, their question should be answered only then they would allow the meeting to continue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not permitting this matter for discussion at the moment. This matter could be discussed during the zero hour. He urged the members to let the agenda proceed.

Despite this, some of the members continued speaking without seeking the permission of the chair, and pandemonium occurred.

Professor S.S. Johl said that whether permission has been given or not, but the discussion has taken place. Therefore, it is better that this issue should be discussed immediately after the election to the Board of Finance.

**This was agreed to.****IV.**

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-1** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-1.**

To elect (by simple majority vote) two Fellows (Non-Syndics) as members of Board of Finance for a term of one year i.e. from February 1, 2016 to January 31, 2017 under Regulation 1.1(iv) at page 37 of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. The following valid nominations duly proposed and seconded, have been received:

1. Ms. Anu Chatrath  
House No. 2055, Sector 15-C  
Chandigarh

2. Dr. Dalip Kumar  
Associate Professor  
P.G. Government College for Girls  
Sector-42, Chandigarh

3. Dr. Dinesh Kumar  
W-9, Sector-14  
P.U., Campus  
Chandigarh

2. The candidature of the persons proposed is provisional subject to their being not elected as members of the Syndicate in the ensuing election on 6.12.2015.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there were three candidates in fray against the two vacancies. He further asked if there was anyone who wished to withdraw his candidature.

Dr. S.S. Johl enquired if the elected candidates also got elected as members of the Syndicate in the forthcoming elections, would they continue to be the members of the Board of Finance. If not, would it not be a punishment?

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they could keep membership only in one body, i.e., Syndicate or the Board of Finance.

Dr. S.S. Johl said that then the election of the Board of Finance should be held after the elections of Syndicate. As such, this sequence is not right.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to state that the point raised by Dr. Johl is 100% right that two Non-Syndics are to be elected to the Board of Finance. Professor R.P. Bambah might remember that earlier the meeting of the Senate used to be held before the elections of the Syndicate, so that the Senate knew as to who the Non-Syndics are, but for the reasons best known to most of the people sitting here, they started holding the meeting of the Senate before the elections of the Syndicate. This technical difficulty always came, but nobody raised objection/s because everybody knew who would be the candidates for the next Syndicate. However, technically and legally, Dr. S.S. Johl is right that they are wrong.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he understands. The factual position at the moment is that there are three candidates, and one of the candidates is not present. So they have to assume that she is in the fray, and out of the other two, nobody has offered to withdraw. Hence, they shall have the election. When it was suggested that they needed at least 45 minutes for the voting, the Vice-Chancellor said that alright, they could have it either immediately after lunch or they could fix a time supposing they are going to have the lunch at 2.00 p.m., they could have voting between 1.15 p.m. to 2.00 p.m.

**This was agreed to.**

Ultimately, the voting took place between 1.00 p.m. to 1.45 p.m., and after the counting of ballots, it was found that Ms. Anu Chatrath secured **37 votes**, Dr. Dalip Kumar **38 votes** and Dr. Dinesh Kumar **33 votes**.

In view of the above, the following persons were declared elected as members of the Board of Finance for a term of one year, i.e., from February 1, 2016 to January 31, 2017 under Regulation 1.1(iv) at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

1. Ms. Anu Chatrath  
House No. 2055, Sector 15-C  
Chandigarh

2. Dr. Dalip Kumar  
Associate Professor  
P.G. Government College for Girls  
Sector-42, Chandigarh.

**V.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-2**, on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-2.** To elect (by single transferable vote) Five Fellows to Academic Council for the term 1.2.2016 to 31.1.2018 under Regulation 1.1(1) at page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. The following valid nominations duly proposed and seconded, have been received:

1. Ms. Gurpreet Kaur  
House No. 953, Sector 39-A  
Chandigarh
2. Dr. Kuldip Singh  
Associate Professor  
Guru Nanak National College  
Doraha (Punjab)  
PIN-141421

2. The candidature of the persons proposed is provisional subject to their being not elected as members of the Syndicate in the ensuing election on 6.12.2015

Since only two valid nominations duly proposed and seconded had been received for election of Five Fellows to Academic Council, the following two persons were declared elected to the Academic Council for the term 01.02.2016 to 31.01.2018, under Regulation 1.1 (1) at Page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume 1, 2007:

1. Ms. Gurpreet Kaur  
House No. 953, Sector 39-A  
Chandigarh.
2. Dr. Kuldip Singh  
Associate Professor  
Guru Nanak National College  
Doraha (Punjab)  
PIN-141421.

It was further decided that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to nominate other three Fellows to the Academic Council for the term 1.2.2016 to 31.1.2018, under Regulation 1.1(1) at page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on behalf of the Senate.

**VI.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-3**, on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-3.** That the appointment and Waiting List of the persons to the posts and the pay-scales noted against their name be approved as under:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Person/recommended for appointment</b>	<b>Post</b>	<b>Pay-scale</b>	<b>Pay per month</b>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY</b>				
1.	Dr.(Ms.) Sonal Singhal	Associate Professor in Inorganic Chemistry (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
<b>WAITING LIST</b> Dr. Gurjaspreet Singh (SC) <b>(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 2(ii))</b>				
2.	Dr. (Ms.) Navneet Kaur	Associate Professor in Analytical/ Industrial Chemistry (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
<b>WAITING LIST</b> Dr. (Ms.) Sonal Singhal <b>(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 2(iii))</b>				
3.	Dr. Ganga Ram Chaudhary (SC)	Associate Professor in Physical Chemistry (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
<b>WAITING LIST</b> Dr. Vikas <b>(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 2(iv))</b>				
4.	Dr.(Ms.) Navneet Kaur	Associate Professor in Organic Chemistry (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 2(v))</b>				
<b>DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS</b>				
5.	Dr. Vipin Bhatnagar	} Associate Professors (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
6.	Dr. Bivash Ranjan Behera			
7.	Dr. Sunil Kumar Arora			



<b>WAITING LIST</b>				
1. Dr. Ashok Kumar S/o Shri Ranjeet Singh 2. Dr. (Ms.) Sunita Srivastava				
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 2(vi))</b>				
8.	Dr. Bivash Ranjan Behera	Professors (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
9.	Dr. Vipin Bhatnagar		Rs. 10,000	
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 2(vii))</b>				
<b>UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF ENGINEERING &amp; TECHNOLOGY</b>				
10.	Dr. Naveen Aggarwal	Associate Professors in Computer Science & Engineering (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
11.	Dr. Ajay Mittal		Rs. 9,000	
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 2(viii))</b>				
<b>CENTRE FOR NANO SCIENCE &amp; NANO TECHNOLOGY</b>				
12.	Dr. Sunil Kumar Arora	Associate Professor (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University..
<b>WAITING LIST</b>				
Dr. (Ms.) Navneet Kaur				
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 2(ix))</b>				
<b>DEPARTMENT OF ZOOLOGY</b>				
13.	Dr. (Mrs.) Harpreet Kaur	Associate Professor (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9000	On a pay to be fixed according to rules of the Panjab University.
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 2(xii))</b>				

- NOTE:**
1. The above appointments would be on one year's probation.
  2. The competent authority could assign them teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching department/s of the University in order to utilize their subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied department(s) at a given point of time, with the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.
  3. Appointment letters to the above persons (Sr. Nos. 1 to 13) have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.
  4. The appointments at Sr. No. 1 to 13 have been made subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No. 17501 of 2011.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there is a Note No. 4 at page 4, which says that the appointments at Sr. No. 1 to 13 have been made subject to the final outcome/decision of

the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011. In case he (Vice-Chancellor) remembers, in September meeting, he had enquired from his (Vice-Chancellor) Office that could they update the status of this case. Secondly, unfortunately the Establishment Branch is putting this condition on all the appointments, including the candidates selected under the general category, perhaps if he is not wrong, this case pertained only to the candidates of SC/ST categories. Thirdly, this case talked only and only about the University Institute of Legal Studies, and has nothing to do with the other appointments being made by the University in various other Departments. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to direct the Registrar not to put this condition.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Okay", they could delete it.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-3 on the agenda**, be approved.

**VII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-4** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-4.** That Dr. Upma Bagai be promoted from Associate Professor (stage-4) to Professor (stage-5) in the Department of Zoology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. 30.6.2014 in the pay-scale of Rs. 37400-67000 +AGP Rs. 10,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 2(xi))**

**VIII.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-5**, on the agenda was read out, i.e. –

**C-5.** That the following persons be promoted from Associate Professor (stage-4) to Professor (stage-5) in the Department of Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the date mentioned against each in the pay-scale of Rs. 37400-67000 +AGP Rs. 10,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

1. Dr. Kirandeep Singh : 20.12.2014
2. Dr. Latika Sharma : 11.06.2012

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 2(xiii))**

Professor Askhaya Kumar said that he has read the corresponding paragraph of the Syndicate. There is a legal part, who is got promoted under the CAS, she is not found suitable in this case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right at the moment, they are just discussing/considering the promotions of Dr. Kirandeep Singh and Dr. Latika Sharma.

Professor Akshaya Kumar said that this case needed to be discussed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could come back/raise this issue during the zero hour as matter/s arising out at the moment is/are not allowed.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-5 on the agenda**, be approved.

**IX.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-6, C-7 and C-8** on the agenda were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-6.** That, as per LPC issued by her previous employer consequent upon her placement in Senior scale, the pay of Dr. Veena Puri, Assistant Professor, Centre for System Biology and Bio-informatics, be re-fixed at Rs.29070/- (Basic Pay Rs.22070/- +Rs.7000/- AGP) with next date of annual increment on 01.07.2011 i.e. Rs.29950/- (Basic Pay Rs.22950/- + AGP Rs.7000/-) in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 + Rs.7000/- AGP.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 3)**

**C-7.** That Dr. Sukhmani Bal Riar, Reader (designated as Associate Professor) Department of History, P.U., be promoted as Professor, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) from the date she became eligible.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 4)**

**C-8.** That the date of promotion of Professor Narinder Kumar, Department of Statistics, be treated as 1.1.2009 (instead of 17.8.2009) for the purpose of notionally fixation of his salary at par with Professor S.K. Soni.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 8)**

**X.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-9** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-9.** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 19.08.2015, to check the Roster (regarding reservation of teaching positions) and see whether it is in accordance with the guidelines/policies of the Government of India/UGC issued from time to time, be approved.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 9)**

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that, besides the recommendations of the Committee, while preparing the Roster System, the rules of Central Reservation Policy (Government of India) and the guidelines of DOPT should be strictly followed. Secondly, the Committee has talked about only the permanent employment in the University, whereas in the Central Government notifications and DOPT guidelines, it has clearly been mentioned that separate Roster System be implemented for permanent employment and for all kinds of temporary employment, irrespective of whether it is temporary, *ad hoc*, guest faculty, part-time, etc., a separate Roster System is to be implemented. Therefore, he urged that this should be added in the guidelines and the Roster should be prepared accordingly.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that his suggestion in this regard is that they should form a small Committee, get it recommended and place the same before the Syndicate and then install it, instead of doing it in an *ad hoc* manner. Considering that they have a large fraction of temporary employees in the University and it stands to reason that when they have a large number of temporary employees in the University, the temporary employment should also reflect the reservation. They would have it process. He should be extended all kind of help and they would have it processed as quickly as possible.

**This was agreed to.**

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-9 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XI.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-10 and C-11** on the agenda were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-10.** That enhancement of DA and Annual Increment to all the teachers continuing beyond the age of 60 years as per the Interim orders of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman and Panjab University and others), be approved as a policy.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 10)**

**C-11.** That the appointment of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, as Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, be approved w.e.f. 29.06.2010 (i.e. retrospectively) on notional basis up to 14.01.2014 without monetary benefits on the directions of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court and financial benefit, be given from actual date of joining i.e. 15.01.2014.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 29)**

**XII.** The Vice-Chancellor said that the following **Item C-12**, on the agenda, be treated as withdrawn because an authorization in this regard had been given to him:

**C-12.** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 10.09.2015 regarding the revised pay of all the Professors appointed by Direct Selection be fixed at a stage not below Rs.43,000/- pursuant to item No. 19 of Board of Finance dated 17.8.2015, be approved.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 22)**

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that this relates to Item C-12 although not directly, she would like to know because in the Senate of September, they were informed that all the cases of directly appointed Professors would be resolved/settled by 31<sup>st</sup> December 2015 so that they did not face any problem while fixing basic pay in accordance with the recommendations of the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him give them the feedback. The recommendation/s of the Board of Finance was/were sent to the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India, and the MHRD referred the same to the UGC. The day before yesterday, he has spoken at the MHRD and they have accepted that, that reference to the UGC was not appropriate because they are following this thing. So he has taken it up and is expecting that in a few days time, it would be done. When Professor Rajesh Gill enquired if he was sure that all anomalies would be resolved, the Vice-Chancellor replied in affirmative. The MHRD has also accepted that what they are doing is as per the UGC guidelines. Something which is as per the UGC, the MHRD should not have asked them to go back to the UGC. So the Director Higher Education has accepted this. They should wait just for 2-3 days.

**XIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-13** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-13.** That –

- (i) minutes of the Committee dated 25.05.2015 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to determine the modalities for implementation of N.C.T.E. Regulations-2014 along with the minutes dated 05.05.2015 and 07.04.2015, be approved;

- (ii) while issuing recognition letter to the Colleges, it should be mentioned that the number of seats would be as per the revised NCTE Regulations-2014; and
- (iii) write a letter to the UGC seeking a clarification with regard to criteria of 55% marks.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 13)**

**Items C-14 to C-24 were taken up later.**

**XIV.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-25** on the agenda were read out, viz. –

**C-25.** That the appointment and Waiting List of the persons to the posts and the pay-scales noted against their name be approved as under:

Sr. No.	Person/ recommended for appointment	Post	Pay-scale	Pay per month
<b>DEPARTMENT OF BIOCHEMISTRY</b>				
1.	Dr. Sudesh Kumar	Associate Professor in Inorganic Chemistry (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
2.	Dr. (Ms.) Navneet Agnihotri			
<b>WAITING LIST</b> Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura <b>(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 2(i))</b>				
<b>DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY</b>				
3.	Dr. Kewal Krishan	Associate Professor (General)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 2(ii))</b>				
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HINDI</b>				
4.	Dr. Ashok Kumar	Associate Professor (SC)	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9000	On a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.
<b>WAITING LIST</b> Dr. Rajender Singh (SC) <b>(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 2(iv))</b>				
<b>DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION</b>				
5.	Dr. Jatinder Grover	Associate Professor	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9000	On a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.  In view of his outstanding performance during the

Sr. No.	Person/ recommended for appointment	Post	Pay-scale	Pay per month
				interview and of experience, the Selection Committee has recommended two additional increments over the minimum due to him at Associate Professor level.
6.	Dr.(Ms.) Satvinderpal Kaur	Associate Professor	Rs.37400-67000+AGP Rs. 9000	On a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.  In view of her very good performance during the interview and experience, the Selection Committee has recommended one increment on the minimum due to her at Associate Professor level.
<p><b>Waiting List</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dr. (Ms.) Kuldeep Kaur (SC)</li> <li>2. Dr. (Ms.) Manju Gera.</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 2(X))</b></p>				

- NOTE:**
1. The above appointments would be on one year's probation.
  2. The competent authority could assign them teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching department/s of the University in order to utilize their subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied department(s) at a given point of time, with the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.
  3. Appointment letters to the above persons (Sr. Nos. 1 to 6) have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.
  4. The appointments at Sr. No. 1 to 6 have been made subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No. 17501 of 2011.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood pointed out that it has been suggested in the item that Dr. Sudesh Kumar and Dr. Ms. Navneet Agnihotri should be appointed Associate Professors in Inorganic Chemistry in the Department of Biochemistry, whereas, in the Department of Biochemistry no specialization in Inorganic Chemistry is required.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the words "Inorganic Chemistry" against the designation of these persons be treated as deleted.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations contained in **Item C-25 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XV.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-26, C-27, C-28, C-29 and C-30** on the agenda were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-26.** That the following persons be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs. 10,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>
1.	Dr. Neeraj Jain (Professor in Hindi) (w.e.f. 30.04.2012)	Department of Evening Studies- MDRC
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 2(iii))</b>		
2.	Dr. Gurpreet Kaur (Professor in Punjabi) (w.e.f. 01.12.2014)	Department of Evening Studies- MDRC
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 2(v))</b>		

**C-27.** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>
1.	Dr. Sudhanshu Kumar Sarangi (Assistant Professor Sanskrit) (w.e.f. 27.12.2013)	Viveshvarananda Vishvabandhu Institute of Sanskrit and Indological Studies (VVBIS&IS), Hoshiarpur
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 2(vi))</b>		
2.	Dr. Neetu Goel (w.e.f. 23.12.2014)	Chemistry
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 2(vii))</b>		

**C-28.** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

1. Dr. Shweta Rana : 26.08.2015
2. Dr. Varinder Kaur : 26.08.2015.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 2(viii))**

- C-29.** That Dr. Jatinder Grover be promoted from Assistant Professor (Education) **(Stage-3)** to Associate Professor (Education) **(Stage-4)**, at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **19.07.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.9,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 2(ix))**

- C-30.** That Dr. Naveen Gupta, be allowed the benefit of past service rendered at DAV (C) Dental College, Yamuna Nagar, on the same analogy as has been allowed in the case of Dr. Latika Sharma, Department of Education and he be considered for promotion, under career Advancement Scheme, from Lecturer to Lecturer (Senior Scale) w.e.f. the due date i.e. 04.05.2006 (after excluding the period of 18 days w.e.f. 30.03.2006 to 16.04.2006 for which he was not paid salary).

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 14)**

**Items C-31 to C-33 were taken up later.**

- XVI.** Considered the recommendations of the Syndicate **dated 22.11.2015 Para 21 (Item C-34)** on the agenda), and

**RESOLVED:** That, it be recommended to the Chancellor, that in accordance with Section 23 at page 9 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 –

- (1) degree of Doctor of Literature (D.Litt.) (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Dr. Nuruddin Farah, Department of English, 207, Lind Hall, 207, Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN55455, 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 degree of Doctor of Literature (D.Litt.) (*honoris causa*).
- (2) degree of Doctor of Science (D.Sc.) (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Professor Harkishan Singh, Professor Emeritus, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, 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 degree of Doctor of Science (*honoris causa*).
- (3) degree of Doctor of Science (D.Sc.) (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Shri Shiv Nadar, Founder & Chairman HCL, 8 & 9, GB Palya, Off Hosur Road, Bangalore-560068 (Karnataka), 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 degree of Doctor of Science (*honoris causa*).



**XVII.** Considered the recommendations of the Syndicate **dated 22.11.2015 Para 22 (Item C-35)** on the agenda) and; –

**RESOLVED:** That the title of Professor Emeritus, be conferred on the following faculty members:

- |    |   |                       |
|----|---|-----------------------|
| 1. | Professor Raj K. Gupta<br>Department of Physics<br>Panjab University<br>Chandigarh                            | <b>PHYSICS</b>        |
| 2. | Professor K.K. Bhasin<br>Department of Chemistry<br>Panjab University<br>Chandigarh                           | <b>CHEMISTRY</b>      |
| 3. | Dr. G.S. Gupta<br>Ex-Professor<br>Department of Biophysics<br>Panjab University<br>Chandigarh                 | <b>BIOPHYSICS</b>     |
| 4. | Professor S.P. Khullar<br>H.No. 1633, Sector-7-C<br>Chandigarh  | <b>BOTANY</b>         |
| 5. | Professor Pam Rajput<br>Dept-cum-Centre for Women<br>Studies & Development<br>Panjab University<br>Chandigarh | <b>WOMEN STUDIES</b>  |
| 6. | Dr. Neelam Man Singh<br>Chowdhary<br>H.No. 9, Sector 4<br>Chandigarh  | <b>INDIAN THEATRE</b> |

**XVIII.** Considered the recommendations of the Syndicate **dated 22.11.2015 Para 23 (Item C-36)** on the agenda), and

**RESOLVED:** That the awards of Udyog Ratna and Gian Ratna be conferred on the following persons respectively in the Convocation to be held in 2016:

- |    |   |                        |
|----|---|------------------------|
| 1. | Shri Y.C. Daveshwar<br>Chairman, ITC<br>37, Jawaharlal Nehru Road<br>Kolkata-700071                           | Udyog Rattan (2015-16) |
| 2. | Professor J.S. Grewal<br>(Former Vice-Chancellor<br>G.N.D.U., Amritsar)<br>H.No. 29, Sector-11<br>Chandigarh. | Gian Rattan (2015-16)  |

**Item C-37 was taken up later.**

**XIX.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-38** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-38.** That two new awards namely “Panjab University Khel Ratna” and “Panjab University Kala Ratna” containing a Citation and an amount of Rs.1 lac each be instituted and be given in alternate years to recognize outstanding contribution in the field of Sports and Performing & Visual Arts.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 24)**

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that a good practice has been initiated, but the award should be given every year instead of in alternative years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had six such awards and propose to give three awards every years. Earlier, the awards used to be two and now they have increased them to six. All these six awards could not be awarded in a given year. Therefore, award of three awards in alternative years is appropriate.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation contained in **item C-38 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XX.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-39** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-39.** That the honour of first Panjab University Khel Ratna Award, be bestowed on Hockey Legend Shri Balbir Singh, # 1067, Sector 36-C, Chandigarh.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 25).**

**Item C-40 to C-41 were taken up later.**

**XXI.** At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor stated that decisions on important items, including appointments, have been taken, as decided earlier, now they could discuss the issue pertaining to Principal Tarlok Bandhu.

The Vice-Chancellor, clarifying as to why Principal Tarlok Bandhu’s Senatorship had to be discontinued, stated that Principal Tarlok Bandhu was teaching in a College and he had got elected as a member of the Senate from a certain College Constituency. He went on to accept the Principalship of another College. Later on, he (Principal Bandhu) asked that his probation should be extended by one year, which was extended by another year. So he has completed two years as Principal of another College. They (the University) had not taken any action after the completion of his two years. A representation arrived from the Chancellor Office that there is an issue being raised that when he (Principal Bandhu) is no longer a part of the constituency from where he was elected as his two years are over and the University system stipulates that the person at the end of two years of his/her probation is confirmed by default and this matter be examined. So they sent it for legal opinion and the legal opinion said, quoting the Calendar, “that the confirmation is there by default at the end of two years”. So if the Managements do not have right not to extend probation beyond two years, the confirmation is there at the end of two years by default. If he has completed two years and if he is confirmed by default as per the University Calendar, then he is a Principal, and he is no longer a part of the constituency from which he had been elected. The Legal Retainer has said that he ceases to represent as a Senator of the constituency. So these are the circumstances under which the Senate membership of Principal Tarlok Bandhu had to be terminated. So this is it. One can question it. There are various avenues open if one continues to feel aggrieved – one can go and legally challenge it; and one can go to

some other authority, including the Chancellor. These are the circumstances, in which it happened.

Principal S.S. Sangha stated that he has two-three questions on the issue. One is that the Vice-Chancellor received mail on 24.11.2015 from one Mr. Gurusaran Singh. Firstly, they should be informed what is the address of the complainant and the same should also be verified from the Cyber Crime, because they always take an affidavit while taking such an action. Secondly, whether a notice has been served on Principal Tarlok Bandhu. Thirdly, earlier they used to appoint Committee(s) on such issues/cases, including other minor issues. But when a Senate member is terminated, no Committee has been constituted. Fourthly, what proof the University authorities have that Principal Tarlok Bandhu has been confirmed, and instead they (members) have several proofs, wherein the probation period of persons had been extended even after two years, including in the Panjab University Campus. In the instant case, the Management of the College has given in writing that the case of confirmation of Principal Tarlok Bandhu is yet to be decided. On what basis they can say that he (Dr. Bandhu) has been confirmed, and instead Dr. Tarlok Bandhu could even go back to his earlier College/employer. They (the University authorities) are saying that he (Principal Bandhu) has been confirmed. How can they say that the confirmation depends on the decisions of the Management of the Colleges, and it has to be seen by the Management? On the other side, he (Dr. Bandhu) has been allowed to be kept in lien. They wanted answers/replies on these issues from the Vice-Chancellor. Have they any proof from the Management/s of the College/s that Principal Tarlok Bandhu has been confirmed. Fifthly, Principal Tarlok Bandhu has written both to the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar that before initiating any action against him, he should be heard, but they have completely ignored him. Even in the University Anthem, it exists that to teach flying without feathers "Pankhon ke bager urna sikhata". He thought that perhaps he (Vice-Chancellor) has misunderstood it that one cannot fly after cutting down of feathers. In fact, he (Vice-Chancellor) is cutting down the feathers and all this is being done with political motive. He (Principal Tarlok Bandhu) has attended the meeting of the Senate held on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2015, though his lien with the previous employer was up to August 2015. Why he (Principal Bandhu) was allowed to attend the September meeting of the Senate? All this has been done within a week knowingly. The other important issues, including reservation to rural students, owing to which more than 2 lakhs students are suffering, is pending for the last about 2 years. Though that issue had the approval of Director Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh and the Syndicate, the same legal issue they have not bothered to touch for the last about two years. They (University authorities) called the staff of the University on Sunday and took this action by getting themselves involved in it. They have sent him (Principal Bandhu) an e-mail deliberately at 4.50 p.m. so that he could neither approach the Court nor take part in the Syndicate elections. It is right that presently majority is with him (the Vice-Chancellor), but tomorrow majority could be with them as nothing is certain. The Vice-Chancellor should not act like this. In fact, an injustice has been done to Principal Tarlok Bandhu, by removing him from the Fellowship of the University, and that too, on the basis of a mail of the person, whose address could not be verified. Principal Tarlok Bandhu has been removed from the Fellowship of the University without given a chance to be heard despite his request that he should be heard before initiating any action against him. They required replies to all these queries.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that whenever they appoint Lecturers or Principals, they appoint them on probation. It is true that it has been written in the Calendar that probation could not be extended beyond two years and the person/s concerned would be treated as confirmed automatically. He enquired whether they do it in the University. Why they place the matter of confirmation of all Class 'A' employees before the Senate? Firstly, they confirm them and later on, issue letter of confirmation. He enquired whether all such employees are confirmed without the decision of the Senate and issuance of confirmation letters. He (Principal Tarlok Bandhu) should be allowed to retain his lien for three years as had been done earlier by the Senate in the case of Charanjit Grewal. Even Shri Vineet Punia has also been allowed to retain his lien with his previous employer for three years. The Management of his College is saying that they

have not confirmed him and he is also saying that he is not confirmed, how do they dream that he has been confirmed? Have they presumed themselves that he has been confirmed? If they presume/think like that, they do not need to bring such cases to the Senate. Then straightaway a letter should be issued that after two years, he/she is automatically stood confirmed. Secondly, he (Vice-Chancellor) is saying that a mail has been received by him, whether a copy of the same has been supplied to Principal Tarlok Bandhu because a decision has been taken by the Senate that only a Fellow can make the complaint on a simple piece of paper and not the general public. The person of the general public has to make the complaint on an affidavit. Whether they have obtained an affidavit from the complainant and verified his address and telephone number? The complainant has neither given his address nor the telephone number. How he (complainant) has come to know that he (Principal Tarlok Bandhu) is seeking election as Dean, Faculty of Education. In fact, everything, including hobnobbing, is happening from here. He enquired what action has been taken by the University authorities on the letter written by Principal Tarlok Bandhu to the Vice-Chancellor and the Chancellor. They needed replied to all these queries.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has explained the factual position. The factual position is that he is a Principal of a College and has spent two years as Principal of the College, and by the Calendar of the University, he stands confirmed. So if he stands confirmed, he ceases to be a member of the Senate from that constituency.

Principals Hardiljit Singh Gosal and S.S. Sangha jointly said that if the persons stood automatically confirmed after a period of 1 year/2 years, why they place the matter pertaining to their confirmation before the Senate. Instead they place the matter relating to confirmation on each and every employee before the Senate and after their confirmation, issue the letters of confirmation. They said that this provision of the Calendar should be implemented in all the affiliated Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has explained to them the circumstances. He added that the Governing Body of the University is all of them, and if they want to change the regulations, etc., because he is not making and instead they are the larger body, let somebody come up with a item, which he would process the way the things need to be.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that Principal Tarlok Bandhu is an elected member and the elected members are approved by the Chancellor and notification in that respect is issued by the Chancellor and only Chancellor could issue letter/notification of his termination/removal.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the Chancellor has received a representation, which has been forwarded to them by the Chancellor stating that please attend to it as per the University Regulations/Rules. They have obtained the legal opinion. When a few members starting saying something collectively, the Vice-Chancellor said that he has explained it to them.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal remarked that they are not satisfied with the reply of the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he (Vice-Chancellor) has explained and now he should listen to them. He enquired as to whether they had taken action on all the anonymous complaints received by the University so far. He would just now prove that an anonymous complaint received, has been got filed by him (Vice-Chancellor) keeping in view his own interests. Each and every aspect relating to that complaint was told to him (Vice-Chancellor) by him (Gaur). In fact, he was replaced from the Committee with some other Fellow by the Vice-Chancellor and the complaint was got filed.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that, earlier, he was a member of that Committee. The Vice-Chancellor himself got the complaint filed as he has interest in that. He (Gaur) himself told him (Vice-Chancellor) each and everything about the case while VC meet at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

Principal S.S. Sangha remarked that, that means, he (Vice-Chancellor) could do whatever he wishes to.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that there is a different provision for confirmation in the University and there is automatic confirmation after two years. After two years, there is no provision for extension. In the case of Principal Ajit Singh, SGGS Khalsa College, who had gone to the Court against his removal from the Fellowship, the Court has justified the decision of the Syndicate to be right. Though Principal Ajit Singh wanted to continue as member of the Senate, his case was rejected.

Principal S.S. Sangh said that a notice is required to be issued to the person concerned so that he could know it. They could not do anything like that by keeping the person concerned in the dark.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that Dr. Tarlok Bandhu is personal friend of his, but he never discussed this issue with him (Dr. Jagwant). This issue involved two issues – (i) Is he confirmed or not and what should happen to him? and (ii) whether probation can be extended beyond two years or not? He said that he has been consistent on this even when he was not a member of this House. The UGC also says that the maximum period of probation is two years, and somewhere this House and the University has decided that the initially probation period is for one year, and if he is not wrong, if no letter or reason is given one month before the confirmation, then at the expiry of one year, the person is deemed to be confirmed. These are the instructions, which they have issued. They can also extend the probation period by another year. After the maximum period of probation, the person stands confirmed. The other issue is the question of the lien. Can the confirmed person have lien on the other post? Some friends are citing that there are instances where the person is confirmed, and he continued to have lien on the other post. This is one point where he is not clear that if these things have been happening here, what were the legal bases or whether legal opinions were taken or not. Even if they consider that a person on confirmation, ceases to be a voter in the constituency of teacher, so he cannot be their elected representative. This position is acceptable and he thought that some persons left the constituency of teachers after becoming Principals on their completion of two years, and one of them was Principal Tarsem Bahia. After completion of two years, he gave up the membership – whether it was done after the confirmation or not, he was not aware of that, but that happened. One thing which bothered him is that even if they accept that the person is not to continue as a member since he ceases to be a member of the constituency which he was representing, the elected member of this House, as their elections is also approved by the Chancellor, so if it is a revocation coming out of the approval, neither this House nor anybody present here had the capacity, and that should have been done at the Chancellor level; otherwise, they are undermining the authority of the Chancellor. Something which he is supposed to do, they are doing on his behalf, but that should not happen. To him, it seems that the probation cannot be extended beyond two years. He disagrees that probation could be extended for the third year also. If he accepts that, that means the Managements would extend the probation period of College teachers and Principals beyond the maximum period, but that is simply not acceptable. He felt that since they are elected and a notification to that respect is issued, they are not members of this House, till it is not approved by the Chancellor. Since it seems that the approval of the Chancellor has not been taken, to him, he (Principal Bandhu) should have been in the today's meeting or the process should have been completed before.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that he endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Jagwant Singh because they have fought together against Managements of several Colleges. He is neither talking against Principal Tarlok Bandhu nor about ousting him nor continuing

him to be the member of the Senate. He is just talking about the rules/regulations and the provisions of the Calendar. He said that he totally endorsed Dr. Jagwant Singh. They are fighting against several Managements, which intentionally did not confirm the teachers for two years, and if they did not confirm, also did not issue letter of confirmation. Then they told their friends (concerned teachers) that they stood confirmed. Therefore, there is no issue that the probation could be extended beyond 2 years, 3 years, 4 years and so on. If they or the University allowed this, several Managements of the Colleges would not confirm the teachers during the entire period of their service. Even if one of their friends is not to be confirmed, they gave him a letter before one month of his confirmation, and thereafter, extend his/her probation period for another year. After two years, neither the probation period has ever been extended nor could it be extended, and if anybody is doing it, he is doing it wrongly and violating the Calendar.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal gave the passing remarks that their own Senate has itself extended the probation period of certain persons beyond the permissible period of two years.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that though there is a rule that probation period could not be extended beyond two years, but his query is – if an anonymous complaint was made to the Chancellor and the Chancellor has marked the same to the University and if the University with its own findings/factual positions should have again forwarded the case to the Chancellor. So it was clear that if an anonymous complaint was sent to him (Vice-Chancellor), it should have been processed as per the laid down procedure, but the procedure has not been followed for the termination of an Hon'ble member of the Senate. These things must have been kept in mind before taking any decision. Secondly, the person has also not been given the confirmation letter. As such, there is a doubt even in the mind of the Principal also as to what would happen. Legally, he should have been given the letter of confirmation. Even if he automatically stands confirmed, the factual position should have been conveyed to him. He thought that the University is not going to give its verdict on the basis of an anonymous complaint. There are many instances where the anonymous complaints had been filed. Therefore, along with comments or whatever else, the complaint should have been forwarded back to the Chancellor because the election of the Senate is always approved by the Chancellor. Every member of the Senate has received letter from the Chancellor only and not from the Vice-Chancellor. Therefore, the termination also lies with the Chancellor. He enquired as to why the procedure has not been followed.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that the things are very clear that the probation could not be extended beyond two years. The argument that when a person joins another Institution on probation, after completion of probation of two years, even if he ceases to be member of his previous position from where he has been got elected, his termination is to be done by the Chancellor. But if they see the past practice, Principal Tarsem Bahia, who had been got elected from the Lecturers Constituency, himself resigned morally when he completed 2 years and 15 days as Principal. At that time, it was said by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that he (Principal Bahia) should give in writing; otherwise, his cancellation would be there before the next meeting of the Senate. They have several such cases because this type of decision is to be taken by the University authorities. Even if anonymous complaint is made, action on the same is to be taken by the University authorities as per the provisions of the Calendar. Now, the issue is not that the matter related to Principal Tarlok Bandhu, but when his constituency has become Principal from Lecturer, it is not possible that he could continue as member of the Senate. It is not a matter of precedence; rather, it is a matter of legality, regulations of the Calendar, etc.

On a point of order, Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that there are many instances, whereas only one example of Principal Tarsem Bahia is being given repeatedly. There are many instances where the lien had been extended beyond two years. The factual position

of lien and the confirmation both should have been taken into account. In fact, Principal Bahia was working in the same Institution, question of lien did not arise.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that when a person becomes Associate Professor or Professor in the University, he seeks election from his new constituency and not from the constituency of which he earlier used to be a member.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the question is that the laid down procedure should have been followed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that he would not speak regarding the probation because the rule is clear and the first step the University might have taken and his (Vice-Chancellor's) office might have enquired from the concerned Branch and the Dean, College Development Council Office, as to why the confirmation letter has not been issued or the College concerned has sent any communication for his confirmation, then why the same has not been received in the University. In case they are very sincere for protecting the University Calendar, why they were missing from the very first step as they are not protecting his (Principal Bandhu's) right to be confirmed after the completion of two years' probation period from the concerned College by the University. The first step the University should have taken to ensure that he (Principal Bandhu) is confirmed by the College after the completion of two years' probation period. Secondly, the laid down procedure has not been followed. The Vice-Chancellor's Office has not yet been authorized to terminate the membership of any Fellow. If he was not wrong, in the last meeting of the Syndicate (November meeting of the Syndicate), there was an item that in case there is a complaint against the higher official/s of the University, then how to handle it, and even the Committee, which has made the recommendations, has proposed that in case the complaint is against the Vice-Chancellor or any of the Fellows, then the Committee should be constituted by the Chancellor to look into the same. In the instant case, he has not seen or not even heard from his (Vice-Chancellor's) side that when a complaint was received from the Chancellor's Office, a Committee was constituted to look into the facts of the case. Secondly, even if the office finds that he (Dr. Bandhu) has been confirmed as Principal, in that case also his (Vice-Chancellor's) office is not authorized to terminate. He (Vice-Chancellor) could simply communicate the facts to the Chancellor's Office, and it is the Chancellor's Office, which could take the appropriate action. He still remembers that in case of President, PUTA, who is present here, in the September meeting of the Senate, they were waiting for the notification of his membership from the Chancellor's Office. Unless and until the notification comes, one could not be the member even though the day he was elected as President, PUTA, he becomes member, still they were waiting for the notification. The Vice-Chancellor might remember that he might have communicated to the Chancellor that Professor Akshaya Kumar has been elected as President, PUTA, but he would only attend the meeting after received notification about the same from the Chancellor's Office; otherwise, he would not attend. So there is a serious procedural lapse so far as this case is concerned.

On a point of order, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he did not agree at all with the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Dinesh Kumar. Whenever a new Senate is formed, the approval of all of them comes from the Chancellor, but when their term ends on 31<sup>st</sup> October, no notification is received. It is understood that if a teacher retires from faculty from which he/she has been elected, he/she ceased to be a member of that faculty. Similarly, if he/she shifts other faculty, he/she ceases to be the members and there is no need for the notification.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that whatever is being followed in this case, is in accordance with the provisions of the Calendar. Nobody is above the Calendar, neither sitting this side nor that side or in the lobby. Everything is to be decided in accordance with the rules and regulations. If the rules and regulations are not followed, then definitely there is a case because nobody could make a law if it is not followed. Whatever things are there, the same would be amicably discussed. Citing an example, he said that there was a case about 4-5 years ago that the honorary guests used to be honoured with

certain gifts/replicas. So the replicas were given to them, though he would not name the persons. One of the members of this House stood up and said what is this replica, why did they not give the replica of a particular type, which resulted into chaos to the extent of grappling between the members and he was a witness to that incident. He had intervened and saved the person concerned. The same person has today said earlier in the meeting that this person (Ronki Ram) has spoiled their whole work. He said that he is appealing to them with folded hands that this type of comments should not be given.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that Section 13 of Panjab University Act says that the number of Ordinary Fellows shall not exceed eighty five and thereafter, it has been mentioned as to how they would be elected. Clause (f) of Section 13 says “eight shall be elected by the Professors, Senior Lecturers and Lecturers of affiliated Arts Colleges from amongst themselves, among whom three shall be elected to represent the districts of Ferozepur, Hoshiarpur, etc.”. If they look at Section 13(5), it has been written “No person elected in his capacity as a member of any of the categories enumerated in Sub-Section (I) shall continue to hold his office after he has ceased to possess the requisite qualification”. So in this case, obviously, it is ceases to, which means the person should continue to act as Associate Professor and not as a Principal. Once he is confirmed as Principal, he does not continue as Associate Professor. Since he ceases to be as Associate Professor, obviously the ceasure of Senate membership is immediately there.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him just read out to them what he received from the Chancellor –

“It is requested that the University authorities may kind examine and take action as required. The response if required may be sent directly to the petitioner. A copy of the response may kindly also be sent to this office for information.”

He would like to continue from where Professor Navdeep Goyal has left, there is Clause 6 to Section 13, which says “If in the case of any election a dispute arises whether any person is or is not a Principal, Professor, Reader, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, or Head of a College within the meaning of clauses (b), (c) (d), (e) and (f) of Sub-Section (1), the question shall be determined by the Vice-Chancellor whose decision shall be final”.

Professor A.K. Bhandari intervened to say, “please don’t quote this as this is not applicable here. This is not an election issue. Don’t quote the Calendar wrongly. His (Vice-Chancellor) office has given him wrong information”.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it related to dispute in election, but now no election has been held.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that allow him to first re-read it, and then he re-read it as reproduced below:

“If in the case of any election a dispute arises whether any person is or is not a Principal, Professor, Reader, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, or Head of a College within the meaning of clauses (b), (c) (d), (e) and (f) of Sub-Section (1), the question shall be determined by the Vice-Chancellor whose decision shall be final”.

So if he has ceased to be a member of the category from which he/she has been elected, and he/she is no longer representing them. He said that the Chancellor has asked him to attend to this matter, he has attended to this matter, and they have been asked to inform, he has informed the person concerned. The Chancellor’s Office has also been asked to inform, it has been informed. This is all that he has to say. If they think, he has done something not legally right, and the person concerned feels that it is not legally right, the matter could be represented to the Chancellor or to the Court.



Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is very sorry that the Chairman of the Senate is the Chancellor and in whose absence, the Vice-Chancellor chairs the meeting. Saying that that if he (Principal Tarlok Bandhu) is aggrieved, let him go to the Court, this is what he (Vice-Chancellor) has said in the last meeting of the Syndicate also in the case of change of Faculties, as if somebody would go to the Court only after seeking his (Vice-Chancellor) permission. That's one right, it is for one to decide whether one is to exercise that right or not. He simply wants to know whether in their set up, the Chancellor is supreme or the Vice-Chancellor, and he thinks, "the Chancellor is supreme". If right now, he asks, according to the Gazette of Government of India – whether Dr. Tarlok Bandhu continues to be the member of the Senate or not, "Yes" because the cancellation of notification, which was issued in the year 2012, has not been done till date. Unless and until the notification in the Government of India Gazette is cancelled, nobody including the Chancellor has the right to communicate that he ceases to be the member of the Senate. Here the notification was issued after the approval of the Chancellor and the notification in the Government of India Gazette still exists, and superseding the decision of the Chancellor and ignoring the Gazette notification of Government of India, and not even the Vice-Chancellor, a communication has been sent under the signatures of the Registrar that he (Principal Bandhu) ceases to be the member of the Senate. Nowhere, probably, has been mentioned that it has been approved by the Vice-Chancellor or the Chancellor. Coming to the way the University has acted, he enquired what was the hurry, especially after the member of the Senate approached that this is what he apprehends that the University is going to move in this direction to cancel his membership, in a clandestine manner. If any such move is there, before taking any decision in the matter, he should be given an opportunity of personal hearing in terms of principles of natural justice. He enquired why that request was ignored and why the communication was sent at 5.00 p.m. yesterday, i.e., the last working day before the meeting of the Senate, which was supposed to start at 11.00 a.m. today. Knowing fully-well that neither he (Principal Bandhu) has time to represent nor he has time to knock the doors of the Court nor he has any liberty to go to the Chancellor. Then what does it mean. Why they could not wait, as they have been waiting. So far as Vice-Chancellor's observation is concerned that the regulation is very clear, the regulation is also very clear about the University teachers also that it cannot be extended beyond two years. Let the Vice-Chancellor make the statement on the floor of the House that in the case of University teachers and the University employees, nobody has been confirmed beyond two years. Whether the probation has been extended beyond two years or not, and whether on the request of the employee or without the request of the employee? Whether the University has been allowing them to retain their liens with the previous employers or not? Whether the University has not been allowing the lien of the person, who has been working in the University and got appointed outside, beyond two years? If the University has this liberty to extend probation beyond two years at the request of particular employee, which had been by the Syndicate and this Senate, not once but number of times, how do they know that Dr. Tarlok Bandhu might not have been confirmed by the management even after two years on his own request. How do they know, unless and until they give him a chance to explain that this is complaint which they have received? As per this-this regulation/s, he (Dr. Bandhu) ceases to be the member of the Senate, and in case he has to say anything in the matter, he is requested to submit explanation within such and such time as the matter is to be reported to the Chancellor. The Chancellor has nowhere said that he (Vice-Chancellor) may take appropriate action. He (Chancellor) simply says that he should attend to it and inform the petitioner, but he did not know who that petitioner is as his/her identity is yet to be established and with the information to the Chancellor. The Chancellor never told the Vice-Chancellor to enter into the shoes of the Chancellor. He (Chancellor) only said that whatever is to be said, let it be informed to the Chancellor. If, at all, the Vice-Chancellor is convinced with the legal opinion, which he (Shri Goyal) is sure is wrong, that he could have informed the Chancellor that in their view as per the Regulation quoted by the Vice-Chancellor or as quoted by Dr. Navdeep Goyal, that in their view he (Principal Bandhu) ceases to be the member of the Senate. If the Vice-Chancellor approves their recommendation, the notification to the effect that he ceases to be the member of the Senate, may please be issued for publication in the Gazette of Government of India. That was the proper

procedure. Now, they say the Vice-Chancellor had read out the provision of election, he agreed with Professor Bhandari that at this stage, when the election is going on that whether somebody is eligible to elected or not, whether somebody is eligible to contest or not. But as far as the ceasure is concerned, it is very clearly mentioned in the Act itself, which probably for the reasons best known to the Legal Retainer who has given the legal opinion or for the reasons best known to the Vice-Chancellor, he did not know why, all appointments being made in two ways, appointments by way of election and appointment by way of nomination, and of course, appointment by way of continuing of the ex-officio members. Section 35 of the Act says: "All appointments of the Vice-Chancellor, Fellows or the Registrar of the University, or cancellation thereof, all degrees, diplomas, titles, licences conferred by it and any regulations made by it shall be notified in the Official Gazette". It is a settled law that anything which is already notified in the Gazette, until and unless that is cancelled, that continuity goes on. As far as Dr. I.S. Sandhu's objection that they will automatically cease to be members of the Senate on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2016, probably he has not read the notification carefully where it is mentioned that it is notified that such and such member is member of the Senate for the term starting with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> November 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2016. Same dates are mentioned for Dr. Tarlok Bandhu also. So, without the notification of the cancellation, whether it is even within the purview of the Senate to cancel the membership of Dr. Tarlok Bandhu. If not, he did not know why should they hesitate in accepting that if they have committed a serious procedural lapse, he knows that the Vice-Chancellor might like to say that let this House decide by majority. He knows that tomorrow, a stage might come whether somebody should be hanged or not for committing offence under section 302, let this House decide by way of majority. Let them not forget that they could take decision only in the matters which are within the purview of the Senate. They could not take law into their hands just because of majority. That is why he said and he endorsed the proposal of Professor Keshav Malhotra that some senior members who have been given wrong feedback by the Vice-Chancellor about the members of the Syndicate and Senate that they are the mischievous elements, as if they are the disgruntled elements, as if they are the politicians, as if they are who have spoilt the academic environment of the University, let them come to the Syndicate and see what is actually happening in the Syndicate and let them see who is actually doing politics in the Syndicate and let them see who actually is spoiling the academic environment in the University just because he is not in the habit of going to anybody and complaining how the Chairman of the meeting behaves. Not that, he did not have the copies of the videography which is made in the Syndicate. If he shows to those members that this is how the conduct of the Chairman of the meeting is, how he losses the temper, this is how the Chairman who is supposed to be the custodian of the meeting himself violates the smooth conduct of the meeting. They would be convinced that something is wrong, if not on one side but on both sides. He is not here to bring bad name to the Vice-Chancellor, to the University, even to the Syndicate but at the same time, he wanted that those well wishers of the University, who are sitting in the side galleries and watching the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate, they must know actually, he is ready, they must call for his explanation that this is what has been alleged against him, they give him an opportunity to explain and then he would tell them the reality is totally contrary to what those persons have been told. This is in front of everybody. This is the attitude that in front of everybody, the Vice-Chancellor has said that that if anybody is aggrieved, let him go to the Court notwithstanding the fact that the Vice-Chancellor has exceeded the authority by sending this communication in spite of the fact that the member of the Senate requested that before taking any decision in the matter, he may please be given to chance to explain. That is the law of the land. Even if some added member who has been elected there, if he is to be removed because he ceases to have that qualification by virtue of which he was elected, he could not be removed without giving any notice. The Chancellor never meant that the Vice-Chancellor order the termination. The Chancellor only wanted that if any action is required to be taken in the matter, it should be informed to the Chancellor. In his view, a completely wrong decision has been taken. He could give the discount that may be without ulterior motive, may be unintentionally, but definitely a very serious illegality has been committed.

Professor D.V.S. Jain said that a point has been raised whether a confirmed employee can keep lien on a post. Citing the example of Professor Bakshi, who was appointed Professor in University of Delhi, was a Reader in the Panjab University. He wanted to keep lien and applied to the University to keep the lien after one year. But the University denied him to keep the lien because the University wrote to the University of Delhi and tried to find out whether he was confirmed employee or not. The University of Delhi replied that they do not keep the Professors on probation, but he/she is confirmed on the day that person is appointed. Therefore, he was denied lien not only here, even he was not given any interest on the Provident Fund. This is a factual position that Panjab University does not give a lien to the confirmed employee. This is what was followed in his case. He thought that it is not the question of authority of the Vice-Chancellor or Chancellor, everything is dictated by the rules of the University. Whatever rules they have, these have to be followed whether it is the Vice-Chancellor or Chancellor or the Senate. They have to go by the rules and nobody could violate the rules.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that at the face of it, it seems very impressive that the promptness with which the University moved after getting anonymous complaints, it is really impressive and this impresses her a lot. She would greatly appreciate if the same promptness had been adopted objectively in all other cases also. In her service career, she has seen the complaints and the evidence is there, even the affidavits are submitted. The meeting would not be conducted for years together. She has been a member of Enquiry Committees where they found the evidence, the guilt was proved. But till date no action has been taken by the University, by the Chairman of this very Senate and the complaints were much more serious than this including sexual harassment and nothing was done. In this case not only the complaint is entertained, not only that the adjudication is made, but action is taken and information is given at the end of the Vice-Chancellor. Why this selectivity? Where is the objectivity that they talk about as teachers being the torch bearers of the society? What they are doing? Why this pick and choose? She requested to pick up all those cases which have been pending for years together, those filthy cases which show the dark side of the University, something should be done about those also.

Dr. Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that they all agree that there is the Calendar and they follow the same. If nothing negative is reported about the employee during the probation period, then the employee is automatically confirmed. The members agree on that. This person whom they are discussing about is not being victimized if they say that he ceases to be a member of the Senate once he retires. Another thing, if they allow him the membership of the Senate, then they would be setting a wrong precedent. She cited the example of Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla who is retiring by the end of this month, she would also like to continue after retirement. In this way, they would have to continue every candidate after the retirement.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he wanted to add to what Professor D.V.S. Jain said. Dr. Damodar Panda of the Department of Chinese and Tibetan Studies of Panjab University, who joined as a Professor in a Central University, asked for his lien to be extended for more than one year. Panjab University did not allow the extension of lien. He had to resign from the Professorship at Shantiniketan University and came back and joined on the lower post of Associate Professor in the Panjab University. The things are said easier. He wanted to tell clearly that the August House is very much here. Sometimes in the Syndicate, the things are not there on the video recording, which are given to the members. It should be put on the Panjab University website in order to know the behaviour of all of the members. This is a live House. He cited the example that when he came from Holland in the year 2013. He has seen what is going on. Everybody knows that what is going on and what is not going on. Many of the (Senate) colleagues have retired as Principal. He wanted to ask just for information whether notifications about those have been published in the Gazette of Government of India that he/she ceases to be a member of the Senate.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that just to clarify as Professor D.V.S. Jain has rightly pointed out that the management of the College has specifically confirmed to the University that the issue of confirmation will be taken up in the meeting of the Management Committee as and when it would be held as has been done in the case of University employees as they would be doing in the Senate.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that that is a different condition.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he simply says that if the management says first of all, the propriety demands that, they should ask the Principal, but they did not do so. They did the direct correspondence with the management to inform the status of the person (Dr. Tarlok Bandhu). The management informed that his case of confirmation would be taken up in the next meeting of the management committee. And the University who is neither the employer nor any representation has come from the aggrieved party, they say that he is deemed to be confirmed. If the person who is aggrieved, the Vice-Chancellor says that if he is aggrieved, let him go to the Court. But if he does not want to go to the Court, that means that he is ready with the punishment that he has been awarded. So it is just possible if an excess has been committed against him by the management, it is his decision to come to the University to take protection under this Regulation or not. Maybe it is through an understanding that the management has requested or maybe he has requested, they have been acceding to the request of the employee that he may not be confirmed. He said that let the Vice-Chancellor make a statement that they have not extended the probation beyond two years in the case of the employees of the University when the provision is the same for all. The provisions in the Calendar are that all the Colleges would be paying salaries to the teachers strictly in terms of scale of pay as prescribed by the UGC or the University. Unless and until the teachers, who are underpaid, they represent to the University, could the Vice-Chancellor issue any notice of disaffiliation, or on inspection, some Committee points out, nobody has ever bothered to do justice to those teachers who have been working on a salary of Rs.5,000/- per month. There nobody is bothered about the Regulations and what the Colleges are doing and since because they are the superior authority, the Syndicate and Senate of Panjab University, they do not know, they are not bothered about for what they are sitting here and if they are extending the probation beyond two years, how could they stop the Colleges from extending probation beyond two years. This should be kept in mind. Let them not try to give an impression as if the rules are very clear whether it is the Vice-Chancellor or the Chancellor, even if some Deputy Registrar has passed the orders, they have to see only the orders were right or not. Any order is wrong or illegal till it is passed by the competent authority.

Dr. Kuldeep Singh said that Dr. Tarlok Bandhu is a good friend of his, but if there is any legality in the issue, they must address the same. He read the Regulation 2.3, Chapter VIII (E) of Calendar Volume-I appearing at page 171, which says, "A teacher will ordinarily be appointed on one year's probation after which he will normally be confirmed if his work and conduct are found satisfactory. It would be obligatory on the part of a Governing Body to notify to the teacher in writing before the expiry of one year's probationary period, whether he had been confirmed or his period of probation had been extended and in absence of such a notice the teacher would be deemed to have been confirmed." The second part is "the probationary period shall in no case be extended beyond two years from the date of appointment". It means that no one could be on probation beyond two years. That is a procedural way to get the confirmation from the management. Otherwise, there is no such letter from the Principal to Dr. Tarlok Bandhu that his work and conduct is not satisfactory. Otherwise, he had the liberty that if the management is not confirming him, after giving one month notice, he could have joined as he was maintaining the lien and could continue his membership in the Senate. But both, the Principalship and the constituency from which he was elected, could not be held simultaneously. It would have been graceful, if Dr. Tarlok Bandhu had resigned himself on the ground that he had become the Principal and not representing the constituency from which he was elected. If he could not get the letter of confirmation and due to this he wanted to take benefit of this, it is not a good thing. The Calendar is clear

in itself, and they should respect the Calendar. As Principal (Mrs.) Sohi said that if in future, a Principal who is going to retire, and says that the management did not issue the letter of retirement, he/she could say that he/she would continue till he/she is not given the letter. That is why, both the positions, as the provisions of the Calendar are right, however, they could be procedural lapse, but to say that both the Principalship and the membership of the Senate would continue is wrong. Either of the two, i.e., Principalship or the membership of the Senate could continue. Since Dr. Tarlok Bandhu had kept the lien, he could have joined back there.

Dr. R.S. Jhanji said that as in the case of University, Senate is the Governing Body, there is a separate Governing Body in the Colleges where all the appointments are made by the Governing Body and are sent for approval to the University. As in the case of confirmation also, all the selections are not approved directly, those are sent by the Governing Bodies. In the similar case, he failed to understand that a communication was sent to the Governing Body about the status of Dr. Tarlok Bandhu whether he is confirmed or not and a communication was sent by the Governing Body to the University that the matter is under consideration. Still he was not confirmed. If it means automatically confirmed, what was the need to send the communication to the Governing Body whether he was confirmed or not? They could assume that he is confirmed. Why the communication has been sent? If there was doubt somewhere whether the employee was confirmed or not and the Governing Body writes back to the University that the matter is under consideration. What was the hurry? A chance must have been given to the Governing Body and the concerned employee also. In this case, no procedure has been followed.

On a point of order, Dr. Kuldeep Singh said that the decision of the management would not come up to October 2016 and the status would remain.

Professor Rupinder Tewari said that he came to know about this issue in the morning. What he has heard from Professor Yog Raj Angrish and Dr. Kuldeep Singh, he fully agreed that Dr. Tarlok Bandhu should have resigned on moral grounds. But at the same time, if the Chancellor sends a message to the Vice-Chancellor to take action, he must have given a chance of hearing to Dr. Bandhu before taking a decision. Whatever and what lapse has taken, he could not understand, whether the office of the Vice-Chancellor has guided him about this, the Vice-Chancellor knows about it. Whatever is being done, if Dr. Bandhu would have been allowed to attend the meeting today, there would have been no harm, what would have happened. It is a political issue. Some persons are in favour. He is sorry to say that some persons who are talking against Dr. Tarlok Bandhu, he is a colleague of theirs. The members talk about rising above the politics. But here is a practical example for the members. The members could do that and call Dr. Bandhu and have a meeting with him and thereafter take a decision.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that he thought that they were acting on behalf of an anonymous communication. Neither the University nor Dr. Bandhu have tried to find out from the management, which is the employer of that candidate, that whether he is confirmed and what is the actual status. They were acting on the basis of anonymous letter and based on that the decision is taken. It is very strange.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that he would start with the point which had been made earlier. To his mind, the approval by the Chancellor has to be routed through a process. Even if they conclude that any person who was representing a particular constituency ceases to be a member of that, therefore, he is not entitled. It has to go through certain process and that process has been missed. In that discussion, they should not try to put something on record regarding the rights of employees. He is concerned about that if they go about that they should not conclude that the probation could not be extended beyond two years because the meeting of the governing body had not taken place. He consistently said that the probation comes to an end after one year unless it is extended by the competent authority. Under no circumstances, it could not be extended beyond two years. The other issue about complaint against Dr. Tarlok Bandhu, there was no

complaint against him even as a student because his conduct has been so good. But the question, about which he is not clear, Dr. Bandhu is confirmed, deemed to be confirmed as Principal. Could he continue to have the lien on the position of Lecturer? If he could have lien, then he should continue as member of the Senate. If he does not have the right to continue on that position, then he could not continue as member. But even if they conclude that on this point that he is not entitled to be a member, this information has to come from the authority which granted the approval. That lapse has taken place. That is against or in favour of Dr. Tarlok Bandhu is not an issue. The issue is that they are trying to take a decision dispassionately and if there is some lapse, the corrective steps could be taken. That could be done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that when one shifts from the College to the University, it is a routine procedure that when he/she is about to complete one year or completes one year, the report about work and conduct is asked from the Chairperson or Head of the Department. The report is sent and it takes some time to place the same before the Syndicate and after having been approved by the Syndicate, the reports are placed before the Senate. After approval by the Senate, when the minutes are sent, then the letter of confirmation is issued even if it is effective from back date. All this process takes about 2-2½ years. Citing an example, he said that some persons came to him, being the Chairperson, and he said that have those persons got the letter from the University. On this they represent to the management that they had not got the letter of confirmation from the University because the management had not given the letter. Those teachers take lien for one year and get it extended for 2-2½ years. Another thing, that there is a rule in the University that the Provident Fund would be deducted from the salary of the employee only after he/she is confirmed. If an employee is automatically confirmed, why the University does not deduct the Provident Fund after the completion of one year? Since the Provident Fund is not deducted after one year, there is a loss of interest to the employee for the period of 2-2½ years for which the Provident Fund was not deducted because the letter of confirmation was not issued by the University. In this case, similar thing has happened. The management says that they have to hold a meeting of the management committee. It is also happening normally in the University that after one year, the period of probation of an employee is over whereas the letter of confirmation is issued about 2-2½ years. It is a routine matter. In this routine, meeting of the management committee, it is to be considered whether the confirmation has to be done or not. In the meantime, Dr. Bandhu thought that since his confirmation is not being done, he got his lien extended so that if the management did not confirm him, he could maintain the lien and not face difficulty. So, it was a routine matter which has been exploited to cease the membership of Dr. Tarlok Bandhu. Even in the University, some of the teachers and non-teaching staff also gave in writing that their probation be extended and it has been done by the Syndicate and the Senate. But in the case of Dr. Tarlok Bandhu since it has a bearing on the Syndicate election. He had started canvassing for the forthcoming elections. Why did the University not take this action a month ago? He attended the meeting of the Senate held earlier. According to him till the date, it is not notified, Dr. Tarlok Bandhu is not given an opportunity to be heard, the management does not confirm and issues the letter, he should be allowed to continue as a member of the Senate.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that Dr. Tarlok Bandhu had completed two years in the month of August. There was so much time available to take the action, but why the action was not taken. A notice could have been issued to him. Citing his own example, he said that he joined as Lecturer in the year 1987 and got the confirmation letter in the year 1995. In the Government, it takes a long for the issuance of confirmation letters. Since it was in the knowledge of the University, he should have been asked whether he was confirmed or not and he could have submitted the reply. Instead of taking decision suddenly, it should have been better if the procedure should have been followed.

On a point of order, Dr. Kuldeep Singh said that in the government, employees are not confirmed so easily. There are so many examples that the persons selected through the PPSC do not get their confirmation letters till the time of retirement and they

retire without getting the confirmation orders. If they think that on getting the confirmation, action would be taken, then nothing would happen.

Shri Munish Verma said that in this way they are challenging the government.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that for information of the House and drawing the attention of the Vice-Chancellor, he would not go back to the year 2012, 2013 or 2014 and just remind the Vice-Chancellor of the meeting of the Syndicate held in the month of September 2015 where a request had come from a particular employee of the University to extend the probation beyond two years and the same was brought to the Syndicate for consideration and it was decided that not to convey that his probation has been extended, till they confirm and communicate to him. It was accepted by the Vice-Chancellor and the whole Syndicate that till that time he could retain his lien in Punjabi University, Patiala. If the Vice-Chancellor wants, he could also tell the name of that person. They are preaching something and doing something else.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that so many points have been made. He did not know the facts of the case. As per the discussion that has taken place, he could make some comments. They are having President, PUTA, Dean Student Welfare (DSW), Dean of University Instruction (DUI) and other people nominated to the Senate. When those persons cease to hold those positions, no notification is made that those persons cease to be members of the Senate. They automatically cease to be the members of the Senate. There is no gazette notification or Chancellor's orders. If any of the DUI, DSW or President, PUTA is changed, it is automatically changed. Therefore, the fact that it is necessary for the notification from the Chancellor that when a member ceases to be a member, it is not a rigid requirement. The second thing that he found that if they allow the managements to extend the probation beyond two years, then they are giving them a great tool to victimize the teachers. The rule that if they have not taken action for two years, when a person is automatically confirmed, the University should strictly adhere to and they should not try to hold it down. Even in the University, if somebody is not confirmed for two years, then he/she is automatically confirmed otherwise there will be lot of problems because the people would misuse this provision. Secondly, the facts of the case seem to be that a particular person has been a Principal for more than two years. He is still a Principal. Whether the matter has come to light by anonymous complaint or by a genuine complaint, the facts remain that he is a Principal. He has been a Principal for more than two years. So, automatically he is confirmed as Principal. Morally, he ceases to be a member of the Senate because he is no longer a member of that constituency from which he was elected. He did not know the technicality and legality, but morally he (Principal Bandhu) is not a Fellow. Again the rules say that when the person ceases to be a Fellow if certain things happen. Regarding the notification whether it is to be from Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor or any other body, he did not know the legal position. But morally that person ceases to be the member. If he ceases to be a member, he should not insist for the Fellowship. It is certain that he is no longer a Lecturer, now he is a Principal. As a Principal, he should behave like a Principal. He did not know the background of the differences. There may be motives or may not be motives. But from the facts and all the evidence, he does not qualify to be a Fellow. Secondly, if he had attended the meeting today and had participated in the election process, then somebody could have said that an illegal voter has cast his vote in the election. It is not that simple that if he is allowed to attend the meeting, then what would happen. Technically, they would have a non-member participating in the election in the Senate. And these are things which their own repercussions. Therefore, his request to all the members is that considering the situation, forget the differences and say that morally, at least, he is not a Fellow.

Professor S.S. Johl said that he fully agreed with Professor R.P. Bambah. Not morally, but legally, Principal Bandhu is not a member. There is no doubt on it. The question of the procedure, when he ceases to be a member, there is no idea of issuing any order. But if he is to be terminated, then there has to be an order. There is a difference between these. If he ceases to be a member, then he ceases to be a member.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now they proceed for the election of the two members of Board of Finance. When, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua wanted to speak, the Vice-Chancellor said that it be the last one.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he would not repeat what the members have already talked about. He said that he could not exactly tell the number, but could say that more than 50 cases are pending for approval for more than two years in the College branch. In the absence of their approvals, the Colleges are not confirming those teachers. Could they confirm all those teachers while sitting in this House? If the Vice-Chancellor asked, he could tell the names of the Colleges, but would not do so. The teachers are working there for more than three years. Till date, their approvals have not been sent to the Colleges. In the absence of the approvals, due to any reasons, the management have not confirmed them for the last about three years. Could they confirm those teachers while sitting in this House? If they could not do so, how could they confirm Principal Tarlok Bandhu and say that he ceases to be a member of the Senate. How could they say that a decision has different meaning for different persons and implement the same? If his term ended in August, it was not needed for four months. Now it is due to the election of Syndicate that the action is being taken. If Principal Tarlok Bandhu could be confirmed, the Vice-Chancellor could make a statement that all those teachers waiting for approval, should also be confirmed from the date of their joining as in the case of Tarlok Bandhu. It would mean that they are adopting the same rule for all.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he got a legal opinion in this case. He would form a small Committee with a deadline that in the cases of the College teachers, the University must take a decision. He would take a legal opinion.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that when the Vice-Chancellor is saying about formation of a Committee in those cases, why not in the case of Principal Tarlok Bandhu.

The Vice-Chancellor said that incidentally the Dean College Development Council is a member of the House. Let him respond.

Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council said that the cases are pending because when the Colleges send the cases for approval, they did not attach the copies of required documents like the Matriculation certificate, Degree or template etc. The Syndicate had formed a Committee and a decision in this regard has been taken. The case of Dr. Bandhu came for approval and that was approved well in time and the University sent the approval. In his case, no ambiguity is there. In the pending cases as pointed by Dr. Dua, the University has taken a decision and the minutes have been sent to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would attend to it.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that when the Vice-Chancellor is saying about formation of a Committee in those cases, why not in the case of Principal Tarlok Bandhu.

Professor S.S. Johl said that it is not so, whether the confirmation orders are issued or not, but when the confirmation orders are issued, the same have to be effective from the back date and all the facilities have to be effective from that back date. It is a procedure that it takes time, even up to one year, to issue the orders. But nobody could treat him not confirmed from the date he completes two years. So, he is confirmed. It is a different matter that the letter could not be issued. But when the letter would be issued, that would be effective from that back date.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would attend to the points made by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua as early as possible. He thought that they should have an election for the two members of the Board of Finance. He would have two minutes break



and come back and requested the Registrar to make preparations for the election of two members of Board of Finance on behalf of the Senate.

**XXII.**

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor stated that may he take this occasion to formally introduce Dr. P.S. Sandhu, who has joined as Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor. Dr. Sandhu has served as Registrar of three Central Institutions after his Retirement from the Army. He is not only a B.Tech. & M.Tech., but also Ph.D. in Management. Incidentally, he is also an alumnus of Panjab University because he had graduated from Punjab Engineering College, which was a part of Panjab University. So he is very happy to have an officer of this kind of experience and background to serve this prestigious University. Given the facts that he is an alumnus of this University and having come after serving at three National Institutions, Panjab University is also a National Institution but of a larger and wider dimension. The three Technical Institutes which he has served – one is Indian School of Mines, which is today an IIT, and also NIT, Durgapur. So he would be available to all of them and to the University. He has specifically asked him to help the office of the Vice-Chancellor in discharging additional responsibilities. The Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University has been asked to assume new responsibilities as Chairman of State Higher Education Council for Union Territory of Chandigarh and also has a membership of Punjab State Higher Education Council. A new office is being set up in Sector 32, Chandigarh for the UT State Higher Education Council. Dr. Dalip Kumar, a member of the Senate, has a pivotal role in the UT State Higher Education Council as he has been looking after it since its inception. Dr. Sandhu would work with Dr. Dalip Kumar two hours a day to see that responsibility given to Panjab University is fulfilled efficiently. There is lot of money which will accrue to all the academic institutions in Chandigarh, on behalf of State Higher Education Council, and Panjab University Campus stands included in it, but all these money allocations would have strict time lines. Once the money would be allocated, it would be released in steps and at every step utilization has to be given, and only then the next step would come into play. So he is hopeful that Dr. Sandhu and Dr. Dalip Kumar would work together and would see through the purpose of this money to be made available to the academia in Chandigarh, both the Colleges of Chandigarh and the Panjab University Campus. Another responsibility which Dr. Sandhu is to assume is of the four Constituent Colleges of the University in the state of Punjab as well as three Panjab University Regional Centres, i.e., at Ludhiana, Hoshiarpur, Sri Muktsar Sahib, and Panjab University Rural Centre, Kauni. Dr. Sandhu must make at least one visit to these eight institutions in a semester. He should also make visits to the affiliated Colleges as frequently as he could, given his other responsibilities. At the campus, he has requested him (Sandhu) to see that all the unfinished projects of the University are quickly completed and all the resources in the form of Guest Houses are upgraded towards a narrow band of performance. If the Panjab University Guest House is considered a 'gold' standard, at least all of them must be brought up to the same standard as that of Panjab University Guest House. Panjab University Guest House, of course, should be upgraded, so do the other Guest accommodations of Panjab University– whether at Shimla, Dalhousie, etc. Some construction is pending at Shimla and construction is also to be done at Dalhousie. His (Dr. Sandhu) presence must make difference to that agenda of Panjab University, which he (Vice-Chancellor) has not been able to attend to during last three years. He would be available to all of them as Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor, so that somebody is there on full time in the office of the Vice-Chancellor. Whenever one of them walks into the office of the Vice-Chancellor, it is not that nobody is there at least to take the input, whatever he/she wishes to give. So he is hopeful that with the addition of Dr. Sandhu and the appointment of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra as Chief Vigilance Officer (CVO) of the University, they would have mechanisms in place that the University is seen to be doing better before the next cycle of NAAC review. It is with that thought only, the office of the IQAC has also been strengthened as well as the Research Promotion Cell of the University. They are also aware that the Think-Tank of the University is already operational. They have had one meeting and the minutes of that meeting are available and he would take initiative to send the minutes of the first meeting of the Think-Tank, which they had in the last week of October, through e-mail to all Senate members. They

have also constituted a Committee to look into the other concerns, which came from the Teachers' Association, that one should look at another recommendation/s of the NAAC whether they could have some new thoughts which relate to restructuring of the Governing Bodies of Panjab University. This is just a thought process, because the Act has been created by an Act of Parliament. Any changes which are desired/expected/anticipated on behalf of the Governing Structure, they have to have a broader discussion, after a given Committee has generated some idea/s before they forward the same to the Government of India.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal enquired what is to be done by the Parliament.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that if any suggestions are made, that are of a nature, which require a change in the Act, which only the Parliament can do.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is he talking about the regulations.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the point is that there is a broader Committee which has just been constituted as per the discussion in the Syndicate meeting. In fact, it was desired in the Syndicate that a Committee should be constituted which would evaluate thinking regarding the suggestions which had come from the PUTA. Though *per se*, the item pertaining to suggestions of PUTA was withdrawn from the Syndicate as there was no consensus on that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is simply asking as to what is to be done in the Parliament.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that if some changes are required in the Act, those changes could only be made by the Parliament and not by the University itself. They could do some thinking only. At the moment the next Senate would be constituted, the way the previous Senate was constituted. No changes are anticipated so far as constitution of the Senate for the next term (1<sup>st</sup> November 2016 to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2020) is concerned. Nothing is being contemplated which would amount to changes in the constitution of the next Senate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that it is being said that the 'Registered Graduate Constituency' should be abolished as it is of no use.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that nothing like that is being contemplated. Anyhow, he would put him (Professor Keshav Malhotra) in the Committee. When Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he should also be made a member of the aforesaid Committee, the Vice-Chancellor accepted his request.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that there is a feeling amongst many members that they are having many meetings of the Senate, which are necessary, but very little time is devoted to think to which direction the University should move academically and also its responsibility to the Society. So there is a suggestion that either their Think-Tank or any other Committee might prepare a vision document again and the same should be discussed in the Senate meeting, wherein there should not be any other agenda other than what they wanted to do, what are their responsibilities, in which direction they wanted to move, what are their resources, etc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is okay with it.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he was thankful to the Vice-Chancellor for putting him on the Think-Tank, but in view of what has been reported in newspaper today and he has no hesitation that it has been done at the instance of the official deputed for that particular purpose. The way he has been painted in the newspaper, he may please be allowed to withdraw from the Think-Tank.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would urge him (Shri Goyal) not to go by what is printed in the newspaper as so many things are also being stated about the Vice-Chancellor of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that he has said that at the instance of the official of the University specifically deputed for this particular purpose, and he could prove it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that alright, he does not want to go into that.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that they should work in a spirit that they are going to work together. All of them had full respect and regard for each other. Therefore, they should forget what has happened in the Press. Let them start a new Chapter that the Vice-Chancellor is seeking their cooperation in the interest of the University. Now, there is going to be a thinking as to what the University should do and at the same time give respect to the views of others, and see how the things worked. He would also urge Shri Ashok Goyal to give it a try.

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to inform the House that the decision of the Syndicate pertaining to permitting the change in assignment of Faculties has been struck down by the Court. When certain members thumped the desks, he said that there is no need to do this as the University has earned a bad name.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if whatever Shri Ashok Goyal has said is true, that means, whatever the Syndicate has approved, those electoral rolls have to go back. Hence, they have to give people time, and the elections of the Syndicate scheduled for tomorrow could not be held.

After some further discussion, it was decided that the meetings of the Faculties scheduled to be held on 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> December 2015 be postponed to 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> December 2015, respectively.

### **XXIII.**

After the decision on postponement of the meetings of the Faculties scheduled for 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> December 2015 to 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> December 2015 was taken, Principal S.S. Sangha enquired as to what decision has been taken on the issue relating to termination of Fellowship of Principal Tarlok Bandhu.

**The Vice-Chancellor stated that they have concluded that he (Dr. Tarlok Bandhu) is not in the constituency from which he was elected as Fellow, and if he is not in the constituency from which he was elected, there is going to be an issue – whether in the coming elections he is a valid candidate or not.**

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he simply wanted to make only one submission that it is for his (Vice-Chancellor) consideration irrespective of the fact whatever the legal opinion is. First of all, they have to differentiate between the Government Institutions and the private Institutions. In Government Institutions, “Yes”, one could not have lien with the previous employer as well as confirmation with the present employer, i.e., at the second place. Secondly, his continuance as member of the Senate is not because of his being on probation as Principal; rather his continuance as member of the Senate is on account of his lien on his earlier post with the previous employer and he could give not hundreds, but thousands of judgements on that. His simple submission is that it may please be got re-examined, and if it is found that the decision taken by the University is correct, it can be reiterated, but they should not be saying that “No, No” once excluded is final.

The Vice-Chancellor said, “Okay”, it is acceptable to him, and he would inform the Chancellor’s Office also and would leave it to him. He clarified that after getting this case re-examined, he would pass on all the input, including DVD of Senate proceedings, to the Chancellor’s Office so that the Chancellor could take a call on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the meantime, the Chancellor's Office should be informed that it is being re-examined.

Principal S.S. Sangha and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that he (Principal Tarlok Bandhu) should also be given a personal hearing.

Professor R.P. Bambah enquired as to where Principal Tarlok Bandhu is, and when it was informed that he is in the University Guest House, the Vice-Chancellor said, "Okay", he could meet him after the meeting".

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that in the meantime, the letter issued to Principal Tarlok Bandhu should be kept in abeyance.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Okay", fine no issue at all.

**Item C-14 to C-24 were taken up earlier.**

**XXIV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-14** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-14.** That from now onwards the Principals would be given extension of one year. However, those who had already been given extension of two years, they would continue as such.

**NOTE:** In the meanwhile, the Committee, which has already been constituted, would look into that there no discrimination is done to anybody. Two members, namely Shri Jarnail Singh and Dr. I.S. Sandhu would be added to the Committee.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 6)**

**XXV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-15** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**JC-15.** That following special budget provision, under the Budget Head "Election of Ordinary Fellows", be made in the budgets for the financial years 2015-2016 and 2016-2017, to meet the financial need for conduct of Senate Election in September 2016:

2015-2016	-	Rs.15,00,000/-
2016-2017	-	Rs.1,20,00,000/-.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 20)**

**XXVI.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-16** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-16.** That, in order to implement the decision of the Syndicate dated 04.11.2012 (Para 51) and Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XLIV), steps be initiated to amend the Pension Regulation/s relating to widow/Family pension appearing at pages 181-187 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 21)**

Professor R.P. Bambah enquired about the status of implementation of the widow pension.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, there are very serious issues that are being raised by the Ministry of Human Resource Development, who want to look at the University Pension Scheme *ab initio* because a contempt notice has been served on them asking why MHRD or whatever body is not letting these add-ons happen on the pension. He was in Delhi the day before yesterday and they were asking fundamental questions. The Panjab University Pension Scheme was implemented after 1.1.2004 even though the Scheme was thought of in 1990s but it could not be implemented for a variety of reasons until 31.12.2003, when the Government of India decided that there would be no pension in any of the institutions from 01.01.2004 onwards. The University came up with a proposal that the people who joined after 1.1.2004, they would not get the pension but the previous scheme which was in the process of approval of implementation for a long time that would be implemented. When the decision came to meet the deficit of the University by the Centre, by that time, the scheme was in operation but the date of implementation of the pension scheme was in a state of flux. When the Government gave the undertaking that they would meet the deficit of the University, the date of implementation of pension scheme had been extended a bit. The initial date was earlier; however, few changes had been made. Now, in view of this, the Central Government is asking fundamental question whether the deficit that they are meeting, what fraction of that money is going towards pension. If the members look at the documents, there were serious issues that there are some statements to the effect as if Panjab University Pension would be handled by Panjab University from its own corpus. But the position today is not so. Part of the money that the University gets as a deficit goes towards Pension. Pension for Panjab University employees, like, those for Central Government employees is inflation protected. The pension would also be carried forward in the forthcoming 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. If the salary increases by 26%, so would the pension. That means that the deficit that the Centre has to meet on behalf of the Panjab University is going to enhance to a substantially large extent from the next financial year, vis-à-vis the current financial year and the University is still not clear to what extent their money requirement would be met. The whole thing is open on the table and it is proposed that there would be a meeting of all the stakeholders. He had participated in a similar meeting, when transition was made from deficit for Panjab University being met from the Plan budget of the Centre to Non-Plan budget of the Centre. If they have to continue to have their requirements met from the Non-Plan budget of UGC, then appropriate enhancement would have to be put in the UGC estimates, that the UGC prepares for the next financial year. So, all these questions need clear resolutions, so that it is not so that every year, they face the same situation. The central issue now is to what extent the requirement of the University the Centre is committed to meet, in the background of the statement that the deficit of Panjab University, over and above the income of Panjab University and fixed contribution of Punjab Government, would be entirely met by the Centre. The Centre is asking the question that if the contribution of Panjab University and the contribution of Punjab Government is going towards some salary component of Panjab University, then how that component could be continuously reducing fraction of the total requirement. If the Punjab Government contribution of Rs.20 crores becomes a smaller fraction progressively of the total requirement, this contribution would eventually get reduced to near zero. That means that the entire deficit would be met by the Centre. In UGC criteria, somewhere it says that the ratio of student-teacher has to be 15:1, so Panjab University is an Institution with 1500 faculty members, whose salary has to be met, by MHRD in equilibrium. Whatever be the income of the University today and whatever fraction it be of the total requirement today, if this fraction is also continuously decreasing, eventually almost the entire burden would have to be taken over by the Centre say in 20 years from now. That would amount to the requirement of a central institution whose budget estimate is of the order of 6 new IITs because a new IIT is to have about 150-200 faculty members. Panjab University would be adding into MHRD fold an institution as big as Banaras Hindu University (BHU). The Centre has to take a conscious decision whether they are taking this responsibility from the next year. It could be of the order of Rs.350 crores for Panjab University, if recommendations of the new Pay Commission get implemented. As soon as the Parliament session ends, the budget exercise for the next year would start, as the budget is to be presented before 28<sup>th</sup> February, 2017. So many things have to be quickly done in next two months. As soon

as the Parliament session is over, all the stakeholders of Panjab University ought to start worrying about its financial viability. As of today, this is what he could say as enquired by Professor R.P. Bambah. The Centre is saying that financial implication of every decision taken by the Governing Body of Panjab University has to have the financial sanction. This is how the Central Government functions. Even though in papers, the representatives of the Government are on the Board of Finance of Panjab University, they are not actively participating in the decision making. In the case of the neighbouring centrally funded institution PGIMER, if the meeting of the Governing Body does not get held in Chandigarh, everybody has to travel to Delhi for the convenience of participation of officials who release funds. Probably, such an instrument would have to be created for Panjab University also. The Centre should give the University some broad parameters, as to what kind of decision(s) the University could take and what not. Just passing an item from the Board of Finance is not enough. The decisions that have to be taken to change the regulations, those have to be taken. That is why the Think Tank of the University which is looking into the financial well-being of the University is the most important instrument. Let them see how it proceeds. He would take the suggestions of the members as soon as they have a little clarity, they would have a one-day meeting of the Senate and discuss all these things. The time has come that the well-being of the University has to be the uppermost concern in the minds of all of them. As Shri Ashok Goyal made a suggestion recently that a penny saved is a penny earned. They have to keep all these things in mind, however little bit of differences could be there as there are so many intellectuals involved. It is very difficult to generate consensus among Professors because there are so many Professors in the University. He is conscious of all this. He had lived in a system where egoism was prominent. In Natural Sciences Faculty (of NIFR), where 30 Bhatnagar Awardees were there and 15 of them must have been Fellows of Third World Academy of Science. There were so many Professors and everyone had a huge ego. At the end of the day, a consensus had to be generated. He was used to it. He is always with the members and worked with them on the points on which they agreed, let the disagreement remain in the back, it is in that spirit that they have to work on behalf of the Governing Bodies of Panjab University.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that when the Vice-Chancellor meets the officers of Ministry of Human Resource Development, he should tell them how the Senate is disappointed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when he met Vinaysheel Oberoi, Secretary, MHRD, he said that they were feeling sorry that they were not able to help the premier University of the country. It is what he has inherited in the MHRD. It is not a very healthy situation. Some things are already written. Whatever proposal Professor Bhandari has submitted two years ago and Shri Amit Shukla said that the same was put up to the finance personnel but there is no reply. A reasonable proposal was made two years ago. That could be the starting point but nothing has happened.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that though it could be embarrassing for the MHRD officials but Senate is really disappointed in terms of delay in release of grant.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the MHRD had agreed to release an interim grant of Rs.150 crores. He could again write a letter to the MHRD in this regard.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Punjab and Haryana High Court has ordered that the Syndicate election be rescheduled. He wanted to make a suggestion that unless and until there is a concrete decision received from MHRD or UGC or whatever body, for God's sake, they should not go to the media saying that this is the issue and that within a week the grant would be released because such things work against them.

Professor Akshaya Kumar said that there is a long wait for release of grant. The Senate should pass a resolution that Panjab University is a premier University and they are actually crying for funds and the salaries being held up and therefore this voice should go from this Governing Body.

Some of the members also seconded this proposal.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that let they not make official announcements. As it happened last time, he had also pointed it in the meeting of PUTA also, the Vice-Chancellor or perhaps the Registrar sent a communication to the President regarding the release of grant. In turn, the President, PUTA communicated to the executive members and the executive members to other members. His only concern is that till the date they actually receive the grant, there is no need to officially disclose it. This is what he has proposed, if he is not wrong. It so happened that at one point of time, when the teachers were sitting on Dharna for Central University status, Professor R.C. Sobti used to be the Vice-Chancellor, who received some information and he called on the faculty members that announced that the Central University status is in the pipeline and very soon the University get that status which has never seen the light of the day.

Professor Akshaya Kumar said that the community could not be kept in the dark. The teachers must know as to what the status is. After all, it is a question that concerns all the teachers. If no information is given, then there are complaints that the members have been kept in the dark. If the information is made available, then it is said that it is being made public. They are in a catch-22 situation. Therefore, he suggested that it is not an issue of teachers or non-teaching, Senate is part of them and he would like the Senate pass at least some request if not a resolution.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members could do so and he has personally gone and met the Secretary and they have realized that issues of Panjab University need redressal and clarity on behalf of the Central Government as to what their liabilities are. Till date, no communication has been received. He could ask the Registrar to get the matters expedited.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that whatever has been happening, he agreed with Professor Akshaya Kumar that, the Vice-Chancellor need to share with the faculty all matters.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the way the construct of this University is that it is peoples' University and it is governed by themselves and being an Executive Officer, he has to keep the members informed.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that there was some hope that grant would be released. But when it happened that it is not being released for one or the other reason, as Senator or otherwise, they are disturbed that a public funded institution, whatever be the complaints, the Government should not stop the grants. The consequences of that are not only for the institution but for the society as well. If the grant from the Non-Plan is not received and the funds meant for research are diverted for paying salaries to the employees, then everyone is happy that there were no protests. But the funds diverted from the Plan budget, there would be cost of delay as to from where to bear that. They should feel disturbed on account of such kind of governance that there should not be so much delay. As Professor R.P. Bambah has raised the issues, there are so many such issues. About the issue related with the pension, if the Government wants to know what and how the University has taken the decision, the Government needs documentation for taking a decision. The University should prepare that document. However, he has a fear that the Government might question that the decisions taken by the University are not in accordance with the Government policy and why should the Government accept those.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Government is raising those issues.

Continuing, Dr. Jagwant Singh said that if they are raising those issues, then it is very serious and Senate needs to do a brainstorming session that the structure of the University which has emerged, that is being questioned. Some issues are emerging and some are being answered. Some issues the University could accept. But where the University needs to defend itself, it might not be that the defence might not be at the right

time and they need to try to get those decisions corrected. Then it would be a difficult situation. The point of Government of India is right that Punjab Government gives a grant of Rs.20 crore whereas 60% should be given. Dr. Manmohan Singh had taken a decision since he was from Panjab University and favoured the University. But the share of the Central Government is increasing. He could understand that thinking of the Government that the share of the (deficit) grant to be given by the Government has increased from 60% to 92%, and down the lane, it would go up to 99%. Then it could be said that Panjab University should be made a Central University and the grant of Rs.20 crores being given by the Punjab Government be not given. Otherwise, the Punjab Government should contribute.

The Vice-Chancellor while pointing towards Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the Government says that if Panjab University has to become a Central University, then the non-teaching staff ratio would not be more than 1.2 and Panjab University would have to just get rid of 50% of the non-teaching staff. They do not realize that the Central Universities are not affiliating Universities. There is no central institution which is an affiliating University. How one would justify and provide for the staff of 4000 persons to run the campus? If they talk about the affiliated Colleges, then the Government says that Panjab University is a State University, as are the other Universities of Punjab. How much money does the Punjab Government give to Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar and what fraction is this money of the total requirement of those Universities. The grant of Rs.40-50 crores that the Punjab Government gives to each of these Universities, that is not even 25% of their total requirement. Then the Government starts saying that those counterparts of Panjab University which grew out of Panjab University and took away the colleges which were once a part of Panjab University, if they can generate the rest of their required money, why the parent (Panjab) University is not generating income on its own. He is not able to answer these things.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that it is not the answer to the issues which are emerging. But those departing from the norms and violating the norms, why those are being quoted as examples. They are right, while others are wrong.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when he would get a chance to meet the officers of the Government, he would try to tell them the same thing that in the central institutions, the Government is committed to pay salaries at par with Central Universities. They could not have teachers appointed on a salary of Rs.21,600/- for years together. They have to pay full salary. Actually, a large fraction of the teachers even in the campus as well as in Regional Centres and Constituent Colleges are appointed on yearly basis due to which the teachers are not getting the increment and other benefits. In spite of that, their expenditure is so much. If Panjab University starts doing what the Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University are doing, then Panjab University would not be seen to be conforming to the UGC Regulations, for which the University would be hauled up. They have to put all these things on the table. All these facts must be collected by a Fact-Finding Committee.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that there are so many perspectives and issues on the face of which it seems that they are right. But if it is seen deeply, the things are otherwise. So they need to feel concerned that the issues which the MHRD has raised with the team of the Panjab University and the Vice-Chancellor, brainstorming should be done how to handle those. If they go in parts, then it would not be taken as a considered opinion.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the Government is playing politics with the University. Firstly, the University should write to the Central Government and even if the issues are not sorted out, all the Senate members should hold a protest in front of the authorities of the Central Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said he is not recommending that. The proceedings of the Senate are being watched by media. The proceedings of the meeting would be prepared



in hard copy and are going to be uploaded on the website. They should try to negotiate and resolve the issues.

Professor R.P. Bambah suggested that after a meeting of the Think Tank, a small group of people would propose to the Senate that these are the problems, these are the things and this is the situation. The Vice-Chancellor, whatever he thought possible or desirable, could bring it to the notice of MHRD that the Senate is concerned and upset. The University has a status and the Government ought not to want it to go down the drain. The Local Member of Parliament (MP) could also be involved. The Vice-Chancellor should make it a point that the MP attends the meeting of the Senate. They also should know what is happening, and their support is needed. Something in this way has to be done. Otherwise every month and every year, the Vice-Chancellor keeps saying that the funds are not being released what he could do, how to pay the salaries, etc.

Dr. Dyal Pratap Singh Randhawa said that the local Member of Parliament must be an ex-officio member of the Senate as is the case of the President, PUSA, as a representative of non-teaching employees. At least, the MP could raise the voice in Parliament, where everybody could come to know about the issues.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had already recommended this and could make the recommendation when the next Senate is to be constituted. He could just only recommend but could not implement.

Dr. Dyal Pratap Singh Randhawa said that even during the last session, not even a single issue was raised by the Member of Parliament.

On a point of order, Dr. Kuldip Singh said that since the election to the Syndicate are to be held on 18<sup>th</sup> December, in the meantime a meeting of the Think Tank could be held and after that on 20<sup>th</sup> a meeting of the Senate could be held.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him first follow up and get the grant of Rs.150 crores. He wanted to have no excuse. First he wanted to have the grant of Rs.150 crores. The commitment is there that the second instalment has to be released by 31<sup>st</sup> March. As soon as that money comes, he would hold a meeting of Think Tank absolutely immediately. There is no doubt in it. After the today's meeting, he would hold a meeting of the Think Tank.

Shri Varinder Singh enquired if some selected members could constitute Think Tank, could other members not do this job.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as Dr. Jagwant Singh said that they are not as disturbed as they should have been. Why they were not disturbed because whatever the arrangements they made, they were able to pay the salaries to the employees which has worked in their favour and against them also that if without getting even a single penny, they have been continuing so smoothly for so many months, then the Central Government thinks that the University has lot of reserve funds.

The Vice-Chancellor said that but the Government knows about it how much funds the University is having because the statement of all accounts of the University has been sent to the Government.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if without having received the grants, they have been able to pay the salaries, then at least the Senate should be informed how they have done so. As Dr. Jagwant Singh has said that maybe the research could have been affected. Let them not forget one most important point that the salaries which are to be paid to the employees in hand, only those have been paid and the legal obligation of crediting the Provident Fund (PF) accounts of all the employees has not been discharged which is a very serious concern. More than Rs.25 crores is yet to be paid towards PF accounts and the moment they say something about PF, as all know, it is a settled law

that they could not touch a single penny from the PF. But their stand is that they have only shown in the books, they have not put it there. If they could not touch the PF after putting it there, could they be allowed not to put those in the accounts. If they have deducted the PF from the salaries and shown in their salary slips how much PF has been deducted, which is mandatory as well as non-contributory Provident Fund which they have deducted but where has that amount gone. That amount has also gone to meet the salaries because if the salary is say Rs.100 crores, they have paid only Rs.60 crores and shown in the books as Rs.100 crores. This is a real concern for the employees. As he told that a penny saved is penny earned. Let them not live in fool's paradise that they are able to generate the resources to the extent that they could become self sustained. What he had said was that to convince the Government, whatever best they could do to do the savings to the best of their capability they are doing and after their best efforts whatever resources they have been able to generate they have generated, they could say that now this is the minimum requirement. Probably, on that count also they need to do introspection. Maybe they have been successful in doing this. That is why he has been since last year that he had foreseen that this situation would come. He had said the same in the meeting of the Board of Finance in the year 2015 also that they should be ready with the plan 'B' assuming that they are not going to get the grant and that time also the Vice-Chancellor had assured in the meeting of the Board of Finance on 28<sup>th</sup> February that they would be getting the grant soon and said it only for the sake of saying that it was the assurance he was given. But from February till date, they have not got anything. The crisis has not come by chance, it has progressed slowly. In spite of the fact that they knew they could have, at least for showing it on the surface, that these are the steps they have taken to control the expenditure. Now rightly or wrongly, the message which has been conveyed to the Government, it is other way round. Now if those who do not have any structural support to convey this message that they have succeeded and they, in fact, structured body, a body created under the statute, have failed in convincing them that no, they are not spending like this. This also needs to be thought of by the Think Tank and by the Senate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that as Professor R.P. Bambah has rightly said that it is not a current issue. It has been lingering on for the last so many years. He knew very well that when Professor T.N. Kapur was the then Vice-Chancellor, from that time onwards it started emerging up. Many times issues were raised regarding the structure of the University in terms of financial gains. The issues were taken up with the Punjab Government by the successive Vice-Chancellors, including Professor R.P. Bambah and Panjab University Teachers Association and members of the Senate on their own levels at different levels. The trend was that slowly and steadily, there was a pressure from the Central Government that Panjab University must generate money on its own. They were asking the University to at least tell on paper whether the University has tried to decrease the deficit by some percentage. The problems did not get solved. Ultimately, they are saying how much deficit is going to increase and how much deficit it would be by the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. The Government would definitely ask the University what was the deficit and income before the 5<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. The second point is that they knew very well that the State is rolling back. The State is not coming forward for the higher education and giving all the facilities in hand. The State is not taking care of the social security. They are living in the world which is at least 40 years old and think that everything would come from the Centre. They do not try to increase their own resources. There was opposition and they did that. They did not like to increase considerable amount in that direction. Now the Centre says that why the Punjab Government has frozen the grant of the University up to Rs.20 crores. Since the Punjab Government is supposed to give 40%, why not approach them. How much grant Punjab Government is giving to other Universities? How the other Universities are generating from their own resources? Guru Nanak Dev University is having a surplus of more than Rs.50 crores, how they are showing surplus. The Government argues that Panjab University is having 1500 Professors, 3000 non-teaching employees. They did not know how many affiliated Colleges the University is having. Panjab University is a unique University, the only University in the country with the status of Inter State Body Corporate and this has been lost when Haryana Government has withdrawn the affiliation of the Colleges from Panjab

University. On this account, when they seek funds for pension and try to talk and convince the Centre, there are some issues. They should stop talking in the way as if they could write and make a statement and everything is right with them. As a member of the Senate, they have to think how to generate own resources and talk to the Centre that this is the expenditure and so much grant is needed. It is not that the Centre would not listen, they would listen surely and would ask the University how to foot the bill. They are not on a strong footing because they try to show that their finances are well managed. But what is the University generating? Saving a penny is earning a penny is one thing but is the University earning? How could they save? This is the issue that needs to be discussed.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that the Punjab Government has frozen the grant of the affiliated Colleges. When the managements approached the Punjab and Haryana High Court, the deficit has been released by the Government. As the Punjab Government has fixed the grant at Rs.20 crore, if think proper, they could also approach the Court in the same manner.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Ministry of Human Resource Development has asked him to talk to the Punjab Government officials that they should agree to go to Delhi for the meeting. He would try his level best to see that the Punjab Government officials agree to travel to Delhi. He would have Professor Keshav Malhotra as a member of the Committee to meet Government officials.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-16 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XXVII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-17** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-17.** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 04.09.2015, be approved, with the following modifications in the criteria for the selection of Director/Associate Director, Research Promotion Cell

- (1) A senior Professor having more than 2 years of remaining service shall be appointed as Director (Research Promotion). The candidate can be from any of the Faculties.
- (2) If the Director is from Sciences/Engineering/Pharmaceutical Sciences/Medical Science, the Associate Director shall be from Arts/Fine Arts/ Languages/Social Sciences/Business Management/Law or *vice versa*.
- (3) If, in the first term, Director is from Sciences/Engineering/Pharmaceutical Sciences/Medical Science, the Associate Director shall be from Arts/Fine Arts/Languages/Social Sciences/ Business Management/Law, then in the next term, the Director shall be from Arts/Fine Arts/Languages/Social Sciences/Business Management/Law and the Associate Director from Sciences/Engineering/Pharmaceutical Sciences/Medical Science and the process would continue like this.
- (4) The selection will be made by a Committee comprising the Vice-Chancellor, Dean of University Instruction and three senior-most Professors of the University, including Professor Emeritus/re-employed Professor, but none should be junior to the applicant.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 23)**

Professor Akshaya Kumar referring to clause (4) said that there is an ambiguity. How would they count the three senior-most Professors?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the thing right now is that they are having the re-employment up to the age of 65 years. But this is that somebody who wants to apply for re-employment and somebody is of 60 years of age and they have made him an emeritus Professor.

Professor Akshaya Kumar said that in the Selection Committee, they should keep only three senior-most Professors only.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there was a reason behind this. When they were discussing this item in the Syndicate, the idea was that Professor A.K. Bhandari asked a question that what would happen if the senior-most Professor applies for the post of Director, then who will be the judge. That is why the Vice-Chancellor recommended that a person in the Selection Committee must be senior to the applicant.

Professor Akshaya Kumar said that how would they count the seniority of Emeritus Professor and re-employed Professor?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he agreed with Professor Akshaya Kumar and Shri Naresh Gaur. There was a reason behind this. It needs to be reviewed because under what circumstances it could be so has not been specified.

The Vice-Chancellor said that okay, they could do it.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that the post of Dean Research was created for a very specific purpose. Most of the persons faced problems in getting the grants from funding agencies and in getting the certificates from G&P Section as the section was not sending the certificates to the funding agencies. That was the reason that they should have a Dean Research who should take care of all these things.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Director, Research Promotion Cell (RPC) is supposed to take care of all the duties of Dean Research and many other responsibilities also. There is an Associate Director and other members in the Research Promotion Cell because there are so many dimensions involved.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood asked what are the functions of the Director, Associate Director and what are they supposed to do? If they would face the same problems which were being faced earlier then what is the use of it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not true that there is no improvement. It is clearly written as to what the Director and Associate Director are supposed to do. He could provide the required documents to Professor Akhtar Mahmood. He said that whatever Professor Akhtar Mahmood is making a statement, he (Vice-Chancellor) would have a talk with the Director, Research Promotion Cell and get it substantiated.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that earlier the Dean Research used to be a nominated member of the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Chancellor did it for the present Senate. He did not know what could be the proposal for the next Senate. There is a Director, RPC having a fixed term of two years. They could consider for the next Senate and the Director, RPC could have a term of two years. Earlier, they were having the Dean Research for short intervals even less than one year. Now it is a two years term, really an improvement.

Professor Rupinder Tewari suggested that the term of the Director, RPC should start from the month of December. If Director, RPC could become a member of the Syndicate, that would be good for the University. The term of the Director should not start in other months, maybe part of Senate, but could not come to the Syndicate. It is not that he wanted the Director, RPC to be in the Syndicate every time, but that person should at least be eligible.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could think over it. What Professor Rupinder Tewari is proposing is that when the next Senate commences, when the term of this person would end, it should end in a manner that the person should remain for a whole year as a member of the Senate if the Chancellor accepts to nominate the Director, RPC as a member of the Senate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it seems that if the designation of Dean is not prefixed, people do not do their work. As a teacher if they think that if Dean is prefixed, their work would be done and if not prefixed, the work would not be done. This is the mentality of the people that if they are members of the Senate, then their work could be done otherwise not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had a good experience when the Dean Research remained for a term of two years and hope when they have a Director, RPC for two years, it will be a good thing. They would not only be having the Director, RPC but also an Associate Director, RPC. They have done it in such a way that if one person is from the science background, the other person should from arts background. It is hoped that the things would go fine. If the Associate Director could become the Director, there could be continuity in this office. It is a good experiment. They should give a chance.

Professor Shelley Walia said that since the term of the Director, RPC is not mentioned in the item, it should be clearly mentioned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the term has been specified. It must be there in the recommendations of the Committee. They would have to see all the details.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-17 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XXVIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-18** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-18.** That –

- (1) S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur be asked to refund the money to the UGC;
- (2) the affiliation granted to the College for Industrial Chemistry course, be withdrawn, if not already withdrawn; and

**NOTE:** A Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to visit the College to verify whether the College has the requisite faculty and infrastructure for running the courses offered by it.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 24)**

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, referring to recommendation (1), asked that what relation it has with the University? Since the money has been given by the UGC, the same would be automatically taken back by the University.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood pointed out that in a recommendation (2), it has been written, “the affiliation granted to the College for Industrial Chemistry course, be withdrawn, if not already withdrawn”. That meant, they themselves do not know whether the affiliation has already been withdrawn or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that on the day of the Syndicate meeting, it was not clear whether the affiliation has been withdrawn or not.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that so far as recommendation (1) is concerned, they could not take any action, and could not even write to the College. Under which capacity, they could write to the College to return the money to the UGC. If the UGC wanted to recover the money, there is a procedure in the law and they could recover the same under that procedure on their own.

On a query made by Professor R.P. Bambah, the Vice-Chancellor said that the UGC has granted the status of Autonomous College to S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur, on the recommendation of the University.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that, usually, it is written by the UGC that if the College did not spend the money, the same would have to be refunded to the UGC.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that, in fact, the money has been given for a particular course.

Professor Naval Kishore clarified that it is alright as they have asked the UGC to recover the money. The Committee has inspected the College and has recommended that it be written to the UGC to recover the money and the affiliation for the course should be withdrawn.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that but the item has not been prepared in a right way.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the affiliation granted to S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur, for Industrial Chemistry course, be withdrawn, if not already withdrawn; and
- (2) it be written to the UGC to recover the money granted to S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur, as per the laid down procedure.

**XXIX.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-19** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-19.** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 31.08.2015 the Fee Structure for LL.M (1-Year Course) at Department of Laws and 2-Year course at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, be approved.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 26)**

**XXX.** Considered following amendment in Regulation 11 (D)(ii) at page 138 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 in Chapter VI (B) (revised Regulation for teachers of the University), **(Item C-20 on the agenda) (Syndicate meeting dated 20.09.2015 Para 27):**

Existing Regulation	Proposed
<p>11.(D) Earned Leave</p> <p>(i) xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>(ii) Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall not accumulate <u>beyond 180 days</u>. The maximum earned leave that may be sanctioned at a time shall not exceed 120 days. Earned leave exceeding 120 days may, however, be sanctioned in the case of higher study or training or leave on medical certificate or when the entire leave or a portion thereof is spent outside of India. The competent authority may allow this leave to be availed of, subject to a maximum of 120 days on attaining the age of retirement, if it was applied for in good time and was refused in the interest of the University.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>(ii) Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall not accumulate <b>beyond 300 days</b>. The maximum earned leave that may be sanctioned at a time shall not exceed 120 days. Earned leave exceeding 120 days may, however, be sanctioned in the case of higher study or training or leave on medical certificate or when the entire leave or a portion thereof is spent outside of India. The competent authority may allow this leave to be availed of, subject to a maximum of 120 days on attaining the age of retirement, if it was applied for in good time and was refused in the interest of the University.</p>

**NOTE:** That the following amendment in Regulation 11(D)(ii) has already been recommended by the Syndicate/Senate in their meetings held on 08.09.2012/ 06.10.2012 (Para 3) and 22.12.2012 (Para XXXV), respectively and has also been sent to Government of India for approval, which is still awaited:

“Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall be accumulated and leave encashment be allowed as prescribed by the Syndicate/Senate from time to time. The maximum earned leave that may be sanctioned at a time shall not exceed 120 days. Earned leave exceeding 120 days may, however, be sanctioned in the case of higher study or training or leave on medical certificate or when the entire leave or a portion thereof is spent outside India. The competent authority may allow this leave to be availed of, subject to a maximum of 120 days on attaining the age of retirement. If it was applied for in good time and was refused in the interest of the University.”

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this amendment has been sent to the Government of India for approval in the year 2012 and now more than three years have passed. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to let them know the status of this amendment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now, the things have started moving a little bit. All these things have piled up with one person in the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India, and he has sent these to Joint Secretary, MHRD. When he talked to him day before yesterday, he agreed that he would process it after this Rs.150 crore mess is sorted out. He has already told President, PUTA, that he needs to go and sit with Joint Secretary, MHRD and Director, Higher Education, and start getting these things done.

Professor R.P. Bambah suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should contract Shri J.D. Gupta, Joint Secretary, and seek his advice.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Okay fine".

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that this item was approved in the year 2012. MHRD said that all the Regulations, including amendments of Regulations, of Panjab University go to the Parliament, and they have not time for the purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that, in fact, they are not saying that all the Regulations/amendments of Regulations go to the Parliament. On some of them, they have to take a call themselves. They are saying that the UGC knows the things better. Secondly, the Panjab University is an Inter-State Body Corporate. So it is a State University so far as UGC is concerned. That is why, they are also being given money. Therefore, they have said that it should be looked by the UGC. They have referred the same to the Joint Secretary, who has so much of work that he could not spare time for the purpose. However, day before yesterday, he agreed that Panjab University people would go and he would sit them and coordinate. The regulations which are very important could be expedited and the other later on.

Continuing, Dr. Jagwant Singh said that, in fact, that they faced problem because though the days have been enhance from 180 days to 240 days and later on 300 days, but the regulation/s has/have not been amended. His suggestion is that because they might face problem again, wherever it is written, "Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall not accumulate beyond 180 days", there it should be written "the number of days fixed/decided by the Government from time to time", so that they did not face such problem in future.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then they would face a very serious problem, which he does not want to discuss with them now.

Professor B.S. Bhoop said that the amendment of these regulations is for the betterment of the teachers as the justice has not been done to them. In the light of the amendments of regulations, which have not been acceded to as yet, his submission is that the amended regulations should be implemented with retrospective effect.

**RESOLVED:** That Regulation 11(D)(ii) at page 138 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 in Chapter VI (B) (revised Regulation for teachers of the University), be amended as under:

Existing Regulation	Proposed
11.(D) Earned Leave  (i) xxx xxx xxx  (ii) Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall not accumulate	No Change  (ii) Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall not



<p>beyond 180 days. The maximum earned leave that may be sanctioned at a time shall not exceed 120 days. Earned leave exceeding 120 days may, however, be sanctioned in the case of higher study or training or leave on medical certificate or when the entire leave or a portion thereof is spent outside of India. The competent authority may allow this leave to be availed of, subject to a maximum of 120 days on attaining the age of retirement, if it was applied for in good time and was refused in the interest of the University.</p>	<p>accumulate <b>beyond 300 days</b>. The maximum earned leave that may be sanctioned at a time shall not exceed 120 days. Earned leave exceeding 120 days may, however, be sanctioned in the case of higher study or training or leave on medical certificate or when the entire leave or a portion thereof is spent outside of India. The competent authority may allow this leave to be availed of, subject to a maximum of 120 days on attaining the age of retirement, if it was applied for in good time and was refused in the interest of the University.</p>
---	---

**XXXI.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-21** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-21.** That the recommendations of the Research Promotion Cell (RPC) dated 17.08.2015 be approved.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 28)**

**XXXII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-22** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-22.** That recommendation of the Interest Committee dated 5.10.2015 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the rate of interest @ 8.70% p.a. as declared by Government of India for the financial year 2015-16 vide Notification No. F.No. 5(1)-B(PD)/2005 dated 20<sup>th</sup> April, 2015, be approved.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 18)**

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, they approved the rate of interest to be paid to the University employees from their Provident Fund, but now it has been learnt that some recovery is being made.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to make the recovery; otherwise, they would be in a serious problem.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that since the rate of interest has been determined in accordance with the Regulation/s, which has/have been approved by the Government of India itself, the recovery could not be made.

The Vice-Chancellor said that alright, then they could challenge it in the Court, if they wished. Since it is directive of the Central Government, they could not decide not to make the recovery. If they did not implement this directive, Rs.150 crores would not be released by the Government. He has to do some compliances to get this money. Any defiance to compliances would jeopardize the release of grant to the University because

this directive has been issued by none other than the Parliamentary Committee. Therefore, they should understand the seriousness of the issue and should not put obstacles in its way.

When Dr. Jagwant Singh said that he understands the problem, but one thing is bothering him, the Vice-Chancellor urged Dr. Jagwant Singh not to ask these tricky questions at the moment.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-22 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XXXIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-23** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-23.** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 6.10.2015 be approved with the modification that recommendation (5) of the Committee be approved as under:

“From now onwards, whenever an advertisement is given for the appointment in the P.U. Constituent Colleges, it may be mentioned in the advertisement that the Principal/teaching faculty appointed in the Constituent Colleges can be transferred to any other Constituent College by the competent authority.”

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 21)**

Principal S.S. Sangha said that *ab initio* Principal is not there at P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now appointment of Principals for the three remaining P.U. Constituent Colleges is being made.

Continuing, Principal S.S. Sangha said that since the appointment of Principals might take time, a senior faculty member of the College should be given financial power to make purchases up to some amount. By chance, he visited P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, and saw that the Mali was watering the plants with the bucket as the Principal has not the power to even purchase the plastic pipe. He, therefore, suggested that some financial power should be given to the person, who is officiating as Principal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. P.S. Sandhu is supposed to visit the P.U. Constituent Colleges shortly and would resolve such problems.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-23 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XXXIV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-24** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-24.** That the report of the Fact-Finding Committee dated 8.8.2015, with regard to complaint received from teachers of GMT College of Education, Ludhiana for their termination from the College without prior notice be accepted.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.09.2015 Para 30)**

Shri Lilu Ram enquired as to what decision has been taken by the University in regard to this College because the teachers are being suddenly asked not to come to the College from tomorrow.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University has taken a reasonably strict stand to protect the rights of the teachers.

Continuing, Shri Lilu Ram said that the College has also proposed to close the College. If the College really wanted to close the College, the College should be closed strictly as per the provisions of the University Calendar and the teachers should be given at least one year's time. It has also been done in the case of Gobindgarh College of Education, but there also the teachers have been relieved by giving three months' notice, whereas the decision of the Syndicate and the Senate is that the teachers should be allowed to continue for one year. The College has not implemented the decision of the Syndicate and Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that after all this, the President of the Managing Committee, who was not coming to meet them (the University Officers) earlier, had recently made a visit. Now, he is willing to compromise and talk to them. Hopefully, some resolution would happen, but at the moment, the University stand is strict that the decision of the Syndicate has to be complied.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that they might face similar problem in the Colleges of Education, so this issue should be tackled/handled carefully.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now, the decision of the Syndicate, which has been reiterated twice, has to be complied with.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that certain other Institutions have also relieved the teachers as they thought that no action has been taken by the University on Gobindgarh College. Though the University had taken the decision, the Managing Committee of the College did not implement the same. Therefore, they needed to be strict.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are doing their level best.

Shri Lilu Ram said that the NOC, which has been given to the College for Five-Year Integrated course, should be withdrawn.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that such Colleges should not be given new courses.

Professor Naval Kishore said that in the case of GMT College, a very strict decision has been taken and an example has been set by withdrawing the affiliation, and the students have been shifted to another College/s along with their fees. Now, the decision of the University has come to the notice of the College Management, and is now begging from the University.

Principal S.S. Sangha suggested that similar action should be taken in the case of Gobindgarh College.

Shri Lilu Ram again said that the teachers have been terminated by giving three months' notice, whereas the decision of the Syndicate and the Senate was that they would continue for one year and would be absorbed in the sister Institution.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the decision of the Syndicate and Senate has been totally violated by the College, and all the teachers have been terminated.

Professor Naval Kishore said that at that time also, he had tried to inform in the meeting of the Syndicate itself that they have submitted to the University before one year that they wanted to close the College from 2015-16 as the B.Ed. course had become of two years. However, the University did not allow closure of the College. The College did not make any admission. Anyhow, in the last meeting of the Syndicate, it was decided

that the salaries to the teachers should be paid out of the Endowment Fund of the College, which is lying with the University.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that, whichever is due to the teachers, should be got paid to them by the College.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that, basically, it is nothing but retrenchment for which the procedure has been laid down. Though certain benefits are due to the teachers, the same are not being given to them.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-24 on the agenda**, be approved.

**Items C-25 to C-30 were taken up earlier.**

**XXXV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-31** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-31** That necessary changes in the existing Policy Against Sexual Harassment (Rules and Procedures) of Panjab University, be incorporated, keeping in view (i) the recommendations of PUCASH dated 18.09.2015 and (ii) a letter of Under Secretary, Govt. of India, MHRD, Department of Higher Education, New Delhi dated 18.09.2015. Both these were discussed in the Syndicate meeting of 18.10.2015.

**NOTE:** 1. That a Sub-Committee of Syndics, including a couple of members of PUCASH, be constituted to recommend changes to be incorporated in the PUCASH ensuring that PUCASH is in consonance with the Central Act.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 9)**

2. Accordingly, committee under the chairmanship of D.U.I. has been constituted and the meeting of the same has been scheduled to be held on 08.12.2015.

**XXXVI.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-32** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-32.** That the following articles of more than the value of Rs.5,00,000/- at Sophisticated Analytical Instrumentation Facility (SAIF), P.U., be written off from the record, as they are beyond repairs or unserviceable on account of non-availability of spare parts:

Sr. No.	Item	Price	Qty	Date of Purchase
1	XRD (PW 1718) & Accessories	6,59,416.00	1 no.	07.07.1983
2.	AAS (ECIL 4139) & Accessories	6,56,556.00	1 no.	21.05.1997
3.	GC-MS (VG 70-250S) & Accessories	57,50,128.00	1 no.	31.05.1988
4.	FT-NMR Spectrometer (Bruker ACF 300) & Accessories	73,65,182.00	1 no.	25.05.1992
5.	Ultracentrifuge (L 8M) & Accessories	35,28,259.27	1 no.	19.09.1982

**XXXVII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-33** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-33.** That the sanction for prosecution of Shri Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent, Pension Cell (now UIPS), be granted.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 20)**

Shri Deepak Kaushik stated that sanction for prosecution of Shri Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent, Pension Cell (now University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences), should be granted as it is good to root out corruption of University System, but no papers have been attached with the item on the basis of which sanction for his prosecution could be given. Secondly, the Investigation Officer, who conducted the investigation, was sent to lines for favouring certain persons, including the accused. Thirdly, the Investigation Officer has also hobnobbed with the main accused and that was why he was sent to the lines. In the end, he pleaded that the papers of the Police on the basis of which sanction for prosecution is to be given should be thoroughly examined so that it could be ensure that no innocent person is punished.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the Registrar to show the papers provided by the Police to Ms. Anu Chatrath and Shri Deepak Kaushik enabling them to be satisfied that injustice is not being done to anybody.

It was clarified that the legal point of view of this case that it is a criminal case and in the criminal case, permission for prosecution is not required. The Police can proceed straightaway as legal opinion to that effect has been given by the Legal Retainer.

Shri Deepak Kaushik pointed out that, earlier, in the case of Professor O.P. Katare, sanction for his prosecution was not given by the Senate. In case they granted the sanction for prosecution of Shri Naresh Sabharwal, and that too, without having the Police papers relating to the charges, it would look as if they are against the Non-Teaching Staff and always favour the Teaching Staff.

Principal S.S. Randhawa, referring to the clarification given, said that the Police could not prosecute him if the sanction for his prosecution is not given.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood suggested that the papers, on the basis on which sanction for prosecution of Shri Naresh Sabharwal is being given, should be shown to Ms. Anu Chatrath and Shri Deepak Kaushik, and the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to grant or not to grant sanction for prosecution of Shri Naresh Sabharwal.

Dr. R.P.S. Josh endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor Akhtar Mahmood.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, Chief Vigilance Officer, would also be called when the Police papers would be shown to Ms. Anu Chatrath and Shri Deepak Kaushik.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that this is a very serious case. Have they conducted enough enquiry to know as to why this has happened. If yes, what action, they have taken.

It was clarified that the Committee is already on. In fact, two Committees have been appointed and one is headed by Shri Amrik Singh Bhatia, who is going to complete the enquiry shortly. The enquiry is not being limited to pension cases alone, and they are also examining the Provident Fund Account and others accounts. One phase is over and other phase is going to be completed soon. He has asked certain questions to the Audit. What compliance they have made, is not known yet. As such, the matter is in progress.

When Professor R.P. Bambah said that it is too serious issue, the Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Amrik Singh Bhatia, who is conducting the enquiry is the senior-most person in the Audit and Accounts Services of India.

**RESOLVED:** That the papers of the Police on the basis of which sanction for prosecution of Shri Naresh Sabharwal is being sought, be shown to Ms. Anu Chatrath & Shri Deepak Kaushik as also to Professor Menakshi Malhotra, Chief Vigilance Officer.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Senate – whether sanction for prosecution of Shri Naresh Sabharwal is to be given or not.

**Items C-34 to C-36 were taken up earlier.**

**XXXVIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-37** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-37.** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 09.11.2015 (constituted by the Syndicate dated 20.9.2015), be approved, including that-

- (a) All complaints pertaining to sexual harassment of the women employees at workplace will be forwarded to be handled by the PUCASH, constituted by the Syndicate/ Senate.
- (b) Notwithstanding anything above, in case the complaint/ grievance of any nature is against the Vice-Chancellor or a member of the Senate, then it will be processed by appropriate University/Statutory Committee(s) duly constituted, and the findings/outcome of the findings of the Committee(s) will be directly conveyed to the Chancellor by the Chairman of the Committee.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 6)**

**NOTE:** The Syndicate at its meeting held on 20.9.2015 vide Para 18 considered the issues arising out of Professor Rajesh Gill's Letter dated 24.8.2015 addressed to and forwarded to the Hon'ble Vice-President of India and Chancellor, P.U. and has resolved that let Committee(s) chaired by Professor A.K. Bhandari and including other members of the Syndicate be constituted to resolve issues relating to the particular case as well as generic issues pertaining to framing of guidelines for dealing with such matter(s) in future.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood, referring to recommendation (b) of the Committee, enquired by whom the appropriate University/ Statutory Committee(s) would be constituted?

The Vice-Chancellor stated that there were two Committees in the Panjab University, one is PUCASH Committee which the employer has to constitute, then there was another Committee as per the University Calendar, that was the Standing Committee.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood enquired whether the Committee/s would be constituted by the University or...?

The Vice-Chancellor stated that so far as the composition of the Standing Committee is concerned, it has been mentioned in the Panjab University Calendar. The PUCASH Committee is to be constituted by the Employer. That Committee requires the sanction by the Syndicate and then by the Senate. Now a new thing has come to fore, i.e., if the Vice-Chancellor or the Senators are involved in the Sexual Harassment Cases, then who would be the authority to take note of it. The Vice-Chancellor is appointed by the Chancellor and the Senate is under the control of the Chancellor too. Hence the report of the PUCASH if it pertained to the Vice-Chancellor or the Senator/s, it would straightway go to the Chairman of the Senate, i.e., Chancellor. If anybody other than Vice-Chancellor or the Senator/s, then the report would go to the Syndicate and Senate. This was the situation as was of now.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that, to that he agreed, but he is just wondering that this Committee would be constituted and if the complaint is against the Vice-Chancellor or the Senator, then who would constitute the Committee. This is what he is asking.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the Statutory Committees are formed irrespective of the fact as to whom they shall have to deal with. In the case of University, they should have the sanction of the Syndicate and Senate and once constituted, everybody will be under them. But the output of the Committee would go to the Chancellor if involvement of Vice-Chancellor, Senators or Syndics is there. It was between the Chairman of the PUCASH and the Chancellor. Similarly, in case of the Standing Committee, if the report is about the Vice-Chancellor, the same would also go to the Chancellor's office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first of all, he did not have the proceedings of the Committee whose recommendations were considered by the Syndicate, i.e., the recommendation of the Committee dated 9<sup>th</sup> November 2015. These are not here with them though these were there in the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the recommendation of the Committee must have been given to the members.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the recommendations of the Committee might be in the pen drives provided to the members. They may be informed as to how to use the pen drives. He suggested that their TA/DA for attending three meetings of the Senate should be kept by the University and in lieu of that the members be provided the laptops to use the pen drives. In this way, a lot of papers would be saved. Those who could not use the pen drives, should be provided the hard copy of the agenda. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to think about it.

Professor Ronki Ram said that nowadays even the children know how to operate the pen drives, and if the Principal/s could not, it is a different matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that they have to be inclusive. In fact, it has been done because some of the members had said that they could not carry the bulky agenda. So, they would ask everybody via e-mail and those who wished to have soft copy of the agenda papers would be provided the same in pen drives and those who opted for hard copies, would have to inform them and they would be provided the hard copies as per the old practice.

This was agreed to.

When the recommendations of the Committee dated 9.11.2015 were shown to Shri Ashok Goyal, he stated that he had expressed his reservation in the Syndicate also but still it has been brought as recommendations of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the report of the PUCASH Committee is going to be the life time record of the University, it has been written in the report of the Committee that the quorum of the Committee was not complete and even the report of the Committee has been submitted to the Syndicate for consideration and it has been stated that the concurrence of all the members has been taken. These proceedings have now come to the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that complete record of the minutes of the Committee be handed over to Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the proceedings of the Committee are available at pages 454 and 455. Anyhow, he could speak without record.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all his reservations stand recorded.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to reiterate because it has come in the form as if Syndicate has recommended it. He still wanted to pose a question to the Senate for its consideration, that could a Committee without having a complete quorum could send the proceedings and those proceedings are considered by the Syndicate by way of majority and are brought and could be considered by the Senate? And some people who were sitting over there said that they have taken their consent before recording of the proceedings.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the office people to provide the complete record of the minutes to Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he could still say that they would not be able to justify the things if the Committee recommended something without having complete quorum.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have already discussed this question in Syndicate in great detail.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that alright, but this has to be discussed in the Senate also as it has been brought to the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "okay, fine".

Secondly it was very clearly clarified that recommendations were in two parts i.e. in part (a) and part (b). There were two types of complaints. One is of sexual harassment and other is for other grievances for which the Standing Committee was already there. It was clearly clarified by the Chairman of the Committee which met without the complete quorum under the Chairmanship of Professor A.K.Bhandari, that as far as the sexual harassment cases against the Vice-Chancellor or the Senator/s are concerned, this Committee did not say that those complaints would be dealt with by the PUCASH and report thereof would be sent to the Chancellor. They only said that all the complaints regarding sexual harassment would be dealt with by the PUCASH. It was not the recommendation of the Committee that all the sexual harassment complaints whether it relates to Vice-Chancellor, Senator/s or any other employee of the University, shall be dealt with by the PUCASH Committee. The Chairman of the Committee was very much present in the House and this point may be got clarified from him and that was what was discussed in the Syndicate also.

He further stated that to his surprise, it has been given to understand that a letter has been written to the Chairperson of the PUCASH Committee that as per the decision of the Syndicate, she has to enquire into that matter. He wondered as to whether they had taken any such decision or whether they could have taken any such decision. According to him, as per the letter received from the MHRD on 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2015, which was circulated in the Syndicate agenda, therein they have clearly said that in the case of Vice-Chancellor, they will have to approach the Chancellor for the constitution of a Committee. Now as the Syndicate was also aware of it and in the light of that letter and



in the light of the clarification made by Professor Bhandari who was the Chairman of the Committee to which he (Ashok Goyal) objected that the proceedings of the Committee were not fair as the quorum of the Committee was torpedoed. Anyway it was preferred to be brought to the Senate in the same form as the quorum was not complete. He had expressed his apprehension that tomorrow it would be looked as if that the PUCASH is competent to look into the cases of Sexual Harassment of the Vice-Chancellor and the Senators. It was stated that it was nothing to do with PUCASH and thereafter a letter has been sent by the Registrar to the Chairperson of the PUCASH that she has to enquire the allegations. The second objection that he had raised that the Chancellor was not the employer of the Senate, he could understand that Chancellor was the employer of the Vice-Chancellor but the Chancellor was not the employer of the members of the Senate and the members of the Senate cannot be included into it. He pointed out that they will have to go by the provisions of the Sexual Harassment Act if there was any complaint against the members of the Senate. As far as other complaints are concerned, where a statutory Committee has been constituted and he had expressed last year also that Committee is for a particular purpose. It is not for any kind of complaints and against anybody that the Committee could take note of, in his opinion it was not such. It were the complaints of the students regarding examination, relating to malpractices, relating to some corruption charges, it was about that. He stated that he wanted to share his feelings that it has now been started that without laying down the guidelines about what would be the role of the CVO, the CVO has been appointed. It is not that whatever complaint comes, it should be routed to the CVO. CVO has a limited scope, rest of the officials have not become redundant after the appointment of the CVO. The cases which have the vigilance angle, those are to be dealt with by the CVO. But contrary to this, he has been given to understand the even routine complaints are being routed to the office of CVO as if she was a punishing authority, or the disciplinary procedure authority, or may be the controlling authority for everything, or may be the monitoring, in his view, it was not for that purpose.

He further stated that though this was discussed in the Syndicate also that as to whether the Syndicate or the Senate could go beyond what the Ministry of HRD directed in this particular case and in general cases wherein they have said that this was to be constituted by the employer, Senate is not the employer of the Vice-Chancellor, Chancellor is not the employer of the members of the Senate, so they shall have to see in that line. Now he had been given to understand another thing that in continuation of letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2015, the University has received a reminder also which has not been shown to them. It has not been shown to the Syndicate nor it has been brought here in the Senate as to whether they had approached the Chancellor to constitute the Committee or not and he has been given to understand further that in response to those letters they have responded by saying that the Syndicate had constituted and had ordered that the PUCASH would hold the enquiry into the allegations against the Vice-Chancellor and the report of that Committee would be sent to the office of the Chancellor. To his view that was not the decision. So much so he had been given to understand that a letter had been written to the Chandigarh Police that P.U. Syndicate had taken such and such a decision which would be ratified by the Syndicate in its meeting on such a such date, which was that day. Now what they were trying to project, as to whatever would be brought to the Senate, were they sure in advance, it would be ratified by the Senate. It could have been written that it would be taken to the Senate but instead it has been written that it would be ratified. So in his opinion, in the light of this, this needs to be re-examined. Let they proceed only in the manner prescribed in the law, only in the manner as directed by MHRD and only in the manner to ensure that nobody is embarrassed.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the letter of 18<sup>th</sup> September came to them, copy of the MHRD communication to Registrar, P.U., via the office of the Chancellor saying that the University shall have to deal with it. So the letter was placed before the government of the University, namely, Syndicate. What was the purpose of the letter of MHRD? That the matters get addressed, which somebody needs to address on behalf of this nation, and the law of the land must address. They should be addressed by bodies or the

Committees, for whatever they were there. In these the system must have confidence, that it was being done appropriately. And, these were not violative of what the other peer institutions were doing in the country. So in that spirit, Panjab University had been asked to do certain things, in the background of a very specific case of involvement of a member of the present Senate/Syndicate and the present Vice-Chancellor of this University. So, they have to have a mechanism in place in which the system must have confidence. In that background, Syndicate/Senate had constituted PUCASH Committee as per PUCASH Policy Document which was approved by the Syndicate and the Senate. Now, it was said that the policy document is to get a validation in the Senate. They are wanting that validation in the Senate. All this is to go in to that document. The Committee is yet to hold its meetings for that. So what is needed at the moment is that the Senate's approval is needed as per MHRD's directive and the Chancellor's directive that the matter must get addressed by the University within their own operative system. Who is the custodian of the operative system at P.U., the custodian of the operative system is the Senate! On behalf of the Senate, Syndicate handles matters at the first instance, before they come to the Senate, because the Syndicate is designated as the government of the University. So at the moment, this is where the matters were. MHRD wants a redressal, redressal by a Committee and the Committee must have the sanctions and sanctions of whom, sanctions of this governing body as well as the concurrence of the Chancellor, because without the concurrence of the Chancellor also, there could be a problem. Inquiry reports of all the complaints, which are with the PUCASH, in which the Vice-Chancellor or the member of the Senate is involved, would go to the Chancellor's office. In the case of non-involvement of them; the sexual harassment cases involving others would come to the Senate. Grievances of any kind other than the Sexual harassment, involving the Vice-Chancellor or the Senate members, the output of the Standing Committee/s or the competent body of the University, would also be referred directly to the Chancellor, in the spirit of the PUCASH. So without getting into greater technicalities, in principle, this was what was the meaning of number one and number two. He invited that in case he has not clarified anything, Professor A.K. Bhandari would add to the clarification.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that the only committee that has been constituted as per the provisions of the Sexual Harassment Act, can take the complaints about the sexual harassment. No other Committee constituted by any mechanism can look into such cases, and by whatever name it is called, i.e., Local Committee, Complaint Committee or it may be PUCASH Committee. All other complaints could be dealt with by the procedure which has been recommended by the Johl Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that in case the involvement of Senate Members and the Vice-Chancellor was there, then the matter would go straight to the office of Chancellor. Output of that would go straight to the Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that 'No Sir', this is the difference. Output of that or the matter would go to the Chancellor? He further stated that the letter of MHRD very clearly stated that first of all the Committee which has been constituted whose proceedings has been placed before the Syndicate and now before the Senate, it has recommended about the complaints of generic issues against highly placed persons and it does not say anything about the sexual harassment cases and it did not talk of the issue, which is at the moment at hand, it did not say anything about the letter issued by the MHRD. MHRD says that in case of the Vice-Chancellor is involved, the Committee would be constituted by the Chancellor who was the employer of the Vice-Chancellor.

On the point of order, the Vice-Chancellor stated that the Chancellor has formally forwarded this letter to the University saying to handle it as per University provisions.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that and handling is to be done by requesting the Chancellor that you are being requested to constitute a Committee. That is the handling.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University has handled it in a certain way, but if this House says, "No", this is not the spirit in which it should be handled, let the Chancellor constitute a Committee.

Reiterating Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that House has no discretion to take such a decision, they shall have to go by the Act and to his opinion, it was the employer who had to constitute a Committee and the employer, Govt. of India says "as far as the employer is concerned the disciplinary authority of Vice-Chancellor is the Chancellor and they say in view of the above you are therefore requested to take up the matter of the constitution of the complaint committee with the Chancellor".

The Vice-Chancellor stated that that the Chancellor had himself forwarded this letter to him (Vice-Chancellor) to handle, to deal with it.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Chancellor could not say such and he (the Chancellor) could not escape his responsibility.

On this the Vice-Chancellor termed it as it might be the opinion of Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, "No", then he (Vice-Chancellor) should ask the Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "alright", he would ask him (Chancellor) in the background of the discussion which has taken place.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath stated that, to her opinion, the disciplinary authority might be the Chancellor, who in case if the Vice-Chancellor is found guilty of any misconduct, then the punishing authority might be the Chancellor but it did not mean that the fact finding process is to be orderly dealt with by his office. The punishing and the disciplinary authority is the same.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that probably he thought that the Vice-Chancellor might have read it and Mrs. Anu Chatrath must also have read it. He says the employer and the disciplinary authority are one and the same.

On the proposition of Shri Ashok Goyal that the Vice-Chancellor should contact the office of the Chancellor in the case, the Vice-Chancellor stated he would do so in the light of the discussion being held in Senate and the Chancellor had asked him to place it before the government of the body, i.e. the Syndicate and they have been empowered to do so.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired whether they have the power to discuss this matter?

The Vice-Chancellor said, 'yes', the Chancellor has asked him to place it before the Governing Body.

On this Shri Ashok Goyal stated that let he be shown the letter of the Chancellor in which it had been desired that the sexual harassment case be dealt with by the University by constituting a Committee. When confronted by a couple of members, he enquired how could they? He (Vice-Chancellor) has been making such statements which are not in existence.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, that is why, their grants have been stopped. They could not be against the Ministry of Human Resource Development. That is why they faced problems. **(This statement had been made by Professor Keshav Malhotra when Shri Ashok Goyal was speaking)**

**The Vice-Chancellor had also said that Professor Keshav Malhotra has not sought his permission to speak.**

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that it might be possible that the office of the Chancellor might have stated this telephonically.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that if any letter comes from the MHRD, that could not be ignored.

The Vice-Chancellor stated there might be so many technicalities and he would respond to them and the technicalities must be respected by the members.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that as for as he remembered Act only says the Chancellor can appoint the Vice-Chancellor. The Act did not empower the Chancellor to punish the Vice-Chancellor and determines his terms of service. The Act did not give any powers to the Chancellor to punish the Vice-Chancellor. In the spirit what is to be done, he suggested that all employees of the University, other than the Vice-Chancellor and as the Senate members are not the employees, the PUCASH should take care of the procedure what was to be done. In the spirit of these things, he suggested that as for the fellows of the University are concerned, they could have Ethics Committee of the Senate. As for as the Vice-Chancellor is concerned, it should be the prerogative of the Chancellor to take any decision that he did want to take because the Act is not the employer and the employer was the Government of India. As the Chancellor is not the punishing authority, he could not pass such an order. He is the virtual head of the family. In case of the Vice-Chancellor, it should be left to the Chancellor to take any action whatever he thinks desirable. The Chancellor may appoint a Committee, he may give responsibility to a person in the Standing Committee. They could not bind him and it should be left to him (the Chancellor) to decide whatever procedure he decided to prescribe to enquire into the complaint. In case that is done, the Chancellor's office would have a reliable Committee to find the solution.

The Vice-Chancellor read out the contents of the letter of Chancellor which the University received via Chancellor's office which stated that it is requested that the University may kindly examine the issue raised in this letter and take appropriate action in this regard, as required and the copy of the response be sent to the Chancellor's office.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that this they could write to him (Chancellor) that the University has no mechanism to go into this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, 'okay'. If he (Chancellor) wants to constitute a Committee, if he wants to endorse the present PUCASH Committee, it is up to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he did want to state exactly the same thing as has been suggested by Professor R.P. Bambah.

The Vice-Chancellor read out the letter of 21<sup>st</sup> September, 2015 which says that the University may kindly examine the issue raised in the letter and take appropriate action in this regard as required and the response may be directly sent to the applicant with a copy of response marked to this office. That was what they were doing. Forwarded to the meeting of the Syndicate of October, 2015 in cover, sent a copy of this to the PUCASH, DUI and Syndicate members. The letter dated 14.9.2015 was sent bypassing the VC Office, because when this letter was sent directly by a faculty/Senate member to the Chancellor, it was not sent first to the Vice-Chancellor's office.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that the Chancellor being the Head of the University and the Vice-Chancellor being Chief Executive Academic Officer of the University and the Senate would leave the matter to the Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said, 'okay, fine'.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that in that case, as per the Chancellor's letter, whatever understanding it was made of, the process was done and now the matter has come to the Senate and the Senate is of the view that this matter was not within the jurisdiction of this body. Now after the deliberation on the report which came to the

Syndicate and the Senate, the Senate is of the view that it was better that the Chancellor would constitute it and in his opinion, let him to decide, if he wants to decide.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the same Committee would do it or he (Chancellor) wants to form a new Committee.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the letter which the Vice-Chancellor had read received from the Chancellor's Office, she has also received a copy of the same. This is not just one letter, but there are several such letters which were placed by the Registrar in the Syndicate meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> September. It was not just one letter, but three letters were received from the Chancellor's office. Now, it is interpretation of this letter. There is a set language which was in this case and also in the earlier case, the set language that appropriate action may be taken and the applicant may be informed directly and copy be sent to this office. It is a standard language which comes from the Chancellor's office. How could they interpret it like this that the Chancellor wants the University itself to handle the situation?

The Vice-Chancellor said that because somewhere it says that the entire management and superintendence of the University is with the Senate. So if the entire management and superintendence of the University is with the Senate including the Syndicate. Syndicate is 15 members body and is supposed to handle day-to-day affairs of the University. Syndicate is constituted by the Senate. All matters decided at the level of the Syndicate are to be placed before the Senate. They have four meetings of the Senate in a year. The University must have the confidence that it could handle all the matters pertaining to it including self. Framers of the Constitution did not say that the Constitution that they are making would not apply to them. Framers of the Constitution did everything for the citizens of India. So, everything that is for the citizens of India, also applies to them. Whatever the Senate decides, and which a given Vice-Chancellor presides in the absence of the Chancellor, the members must have the confidence to handle things on their own. Otherwise, they are sending a message to the Chancellor that this body comprising so many eminent people, of which a Chief Minister is an ex-officio member, Chief Justice of Punjab & Haryana High Court is an ex-officio member, Advisor to the U.T. Administrator is an ex-officio member, two members of the Punjab Legislative Assembly are ex-officio members, Directors of Higher Education, Punjab and Chandigarh are ex-officio members and so many other ex-officio members, a body in which the Chancellor nominates 36 members on the Senate to guide the University. How can this body abdicate their responsibility? That they would send a simple matter to the Chancellor, just because of the technicality, that the Chancellor has to constitute a Committee. If it is the view of the Senate that they would not rise to the occasion and frame some suggestions to him (Chancellor), it is fine with him. The discussion of all this would be transcribed and as they all agreed a little while ago, the matter with the video recording and the written recording of this, he would send to the Chancellor and say to please act, because the Senate desires that only the Chancellor's action can clinch the issue.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if the Senate thinks in some cases, it is incapable of doing things, the time has come that the Chancellor has to do, it because the Senate is not in a position to decide on its own. Let this message be given to the Chancellor.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that the Vice-Chancellor is not subordinate to the Senate. The Vice-Chancellor is the Chief Executive Officer of the Senate and the Senate is under his supervision. Since the members are subordinate to the Vice-Chancellor, they could not give the judgment against the Vice-Chancellor. Chancellor is the only person who is superior to the Vice-Chancellor and in the set up. He added that the Chancellor is the only person who has moral responsibility and the power to make enquiry after satisfying himself that something is wrong or not. He thought that for the Senate it will be in difficulty if the subordinate body sits on the judgment against the Presiding Officer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the subordinate body is not sitting over the Presiding Officer. That is why the report is going to the Chancellor. The entire discussion is being recorded and he would have the video recording of this session sent to the Chancellor and let him take a call.

Professor Rupinder Tewari said that he wanted to make a small suggestion and fully endorses that they are making a mockery of the Senate and all the University Professors. If a message goes to the Chancellor that they could not handle the situation, the Chancellor is not free for all this work of theirs. That is why Chancellor is sending so many representatives and nominees to the Senate. What they could do is that if in addition to Vice-Chancellor and few Senators, let them take 3-4 members from the social community, maybe Army Officers, Retired IAS Officer and constitute a Committee by the Senate. If there is any such issue, that could be taken to that Committee. Why do they need to go to the Chancellor?

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now, they have to go to the Chancellor because the MHRD, the provider of funds to the University has made a point.

Professor Rupinder Tewari said that this could be done. Let them try to solve their problems. He is sorry to say that the Chancellor's office is just like a post office, the letters are received there and are forwarded with the direction that the complaint has come and reply be given to that. Are they serious about it?

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that when he was the Vice-Chancellor, there were some complaints about the re-evaluation, in which some of the offices/officers of the University, including the Vice-Chancellor, were involved. Then the Syndicate took the decision that in these cases the re-evaluation should be done under the guidance of the Chancellor. His daughter had also applied for the re-evaluation. Then he wrote to the Chancellor that since his daughter is involved, a Committee should be appointed or the re-evaluation process should be done through his (Chancellor) Office, and he did that. Ultimately, his daughter lost one point and came down in the merit. This was accepted as a right procedure. It is not that they or the Senate assigned any responsibility to the Chancellor, but it is done to have credibility. He was sure that this matter pertained to an unfortunate incident, perhaps it might have been resolved amongst themselves through goodwill, but if it is not possible, they should do something which has some credibility, and the credibility is that it is to be looked into by the people, who are not under the influence of anybody locally. Therefore, he thought that the Chancellor is the right person to do this.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that some of the Syndicate members had assumed the responsibility to try to resolve the matter, but no output happened. **However, the suggestion put forth by Professor R.P. Bambah is accepted and the Chancellor's Office would be apprised of everything.**

**This was agreed to.**

**(The following discussion took place one-to-one between Professor R.P. Bambah and Professor Rajesh Gill):**

Professor R.P. Bambah said that if some of the members of the Senate could get together and resolve it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, Sir, members who wrote against her at that time?

Professor R.P. Bambah requested her to tell which lady members could.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, Sir, the lady members wrote in his (Vice-Chancellor) favor at that time, because he is chairing, he is the boss. She is a mere complainant and the persons who wrote letters against her are citing the IAS officers should decide. Please Sir, She is also a human being. He is sitting in that chair higher than her.

**XXXIX.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-40** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-40.** That as per criteria followed in the case of “TEQIP project, a separate Bank Account, be opened in the name of Director, UIET at State Bank of India, UIET Campus, Sector 25, Chandigarh for financial accounting of the project, “National Initiative for design Innovation”.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 26)**

At this stage, Professor B.S. Bhoop said that he wanted to make a very pertinent point with regard to item C-36 & C-38.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these items are over as the decisions on them have already been taken.

Professor B.S. Bhoop said that he just wanted to make an important point. In item C-36, they have proposed the conferment of awards of Udyog Ratna and Gian Ratna, but in item C-38 they have proposed ‘Panjab University Khel Ratna and Panjab University Kala Ratna’. Why they have adopted two different kinds of nomenclatures.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that the words “Panjab University” would be incorporated before Udyog Ratna and Gian Ratna and these awards would be known as “Panjab University Udyog Ratna” and “Panjab University Gian Ratna”.**

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-40 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XL.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-41** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-41.** That the minutes dated 30.03.2015 (**Appendix-I**) of the meeting of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 08.03.2015 (Para 9) after making necessary correction in the wording of the proceedings dated 16.01.2015 (**Appendix-I**) as well as in the appended *pro forma*, noted by the Syndicate dated 31.5.2015 (Para 36(vii)) (**Appendix-I**), be approved, with the modification that the word Regulation as mentioned in the minutes of the said Committee be deleted and the provision of the Child Care Leave be made a part of rule in P.U. Calendar, Volume III.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.03.2015 (Para 9) while approving the minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 16.01.2015 with regard to prepare Regulations/Rules for adoption of ‘Child Care Leave’ to the University female employees (teaching and non-teaching) has constituted a Committee which would examine/ made necessary correction in the wording of the proceedings of the Committee as well as *pro forma* appended with the proceeding **and authorized the Vice-Chancellor to approve the minutes after modifications, on behalf of the Syndicate and it be placed before the Syndicate in one of its meeting as an Information Item.**

2. A copy of circular issued, in this regard vide No.14320-14470 dated 9.7.2015 along with Leave application proforma is enclosed **(Appendix-I)**.
3. The Resident Audit Officer, Panjab University, Local Audit Department, Chandigarh Administration vide Memo No. RAO/ 2015/777 dated 17.8.2015 **(Appendix-I)** has raised certain objections.
4. The Legal Retainer has opined that the Rule in question framed by the Syndicate requires the approval of the Senate. There is no need of sending the same for approval to the Central Government mainly for the reason that the resolution is not inconsistent with the Act. Legal opinion is enclosed **(Appendix-I)**.
5. There is a provision of Adoption Leave and Paternity Leave in the rules appearing at page 99 of P.U. Calendar, Vol. III, 2009, which is in pursuance of Punjab Govt. Notification dated 11.6.1998 and 9.4.2002 duly adopted by the Syndicate dated 7.12.2002 (Para 8) and 26.10.2002 (Para 29), respectively. Copies enclosed **(Appendix-I)**. **Accordingly, the leave is being granted and there is no objection of the Audit.**
6. Similarly, the Child Care Leave should be the part of Rule and be incorporated in P.U. Cal. Vol. III, as in the case of Adoption Leave and Paternity Leave.
7. The decision of the Senate will be applicable retrospectively to cover the pending cases of Child Care Leave.



**XLI.** The information contained in **Items R-1 to R-28** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**R-1.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the contractual appointment of Dr. Rakesh Khullar, Additional C.M.O., Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, P.U., after his retirement (30.09.2015), initially for the period of six months with one day break on 01.10.2015 or till the post of 'Medical Officer' is filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, on fixed emoluments on the basis of half of salary last paid (excluding HRA, CCA & any other special allowance) rounded off to nearest lower 100, as was done in the case of re-employment (on contract) of Dr. B.S. Lal.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 33(vi))**

**R-2.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Hira Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College Guru Har Sahai (Ferozepur) w.e.f. 25.07.2015 and due amount be paid to him after deducting one month salary from the period he has worked in the College in lieu of one month notice under rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 33(x))**

**R-3.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Tulika Gupta, Sr. Lecturer in Anatomy, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U. with immediate effect, by waiving off the condition of three months notice, as a special case.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 22(xiv))**

**R-4.** That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Board of Studies in Chemical Engineering, Food Technology & Energy Studies dated 19.08.2015 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the regulations for Bachelor of Vocational (B.Voc.) (Food Processing and Preservation) under National Skills Qualification Programme of UGC, w.e.f. 2014-15.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 33(ii))**

**R-5.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed that the No Objection Certificate, be issued to the following Colleges in respect of subjects/courses mentioned against each for forwarding the cases to the Education Officer (NSQF), University Grant Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi under the UGC scheme of Deen Dayal Upadhyay Centres of Knowledge Acquisition and Up-gradation of Skilled Human Abilities and Livelihood (KAUSHAL KENDRAS) during XII Plan period:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the College</b>	<b>Subject/courses</b>
1.	Devki Devi Jain Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana	(i) B.Voc.(Banking, Insurance and Retailing) (ii) B.Voc. (Fashion Designing and Information Technology)
2.	G.G.D.S.D. College, Hariana, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Voc. Programme in Banking Insurance & Retailing and Software Development
3.	D.A.V. College, Chandigarh	(i) Bachelor of Vocational in Medical Lab Technology

		(ii) Bachelor of Vocational in Organic Farming and Post graduate Diploma/ Degree in Organic Farming (iii) Bachelor of Vocational in Cosmetology and Beauty Care (iv) Bachelor of Vocational in Software Development and Web Technology (v) Bachelor of Vocational in Computer Hardware and Networking (vi) Bachelor of Vocational in Food Services operations and housekeeping (vii) Bachelor of Vocational in Health nutrition and adolescent care
4.	Dev Samaj College for Women, Sector 45-B, Chandigarh	(i) Fashion Designing & Visual Merchandising (ii) Banking & Financial Service (iii) Beauty & Wellness
5.	Guru Nanak National College, Doraha, Ludhiana	1 B.Voc Programme in (i) Auto Electricals and Electronics (ii) Fashion Technology 2. Community College Programme in (i) Computer Hardware and Networking (ii) Milk Processing
6.	R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City	(i) Bachelor of Retail Management and Information (ii) Bachelor of Computer Hardware and Networking
7.	Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City	(i) Global Professional in Beauty & Aesthetics (ii) Textile & Fashion Technology (iii) Software Development (iv) Hospital Administration & Management
8.	Khalsa College, Gardhiwala, Hoshiarpur	(i) Mechanic Agricultural Machinery Certificate Course (ii) Mechanic Agricultural Machinery Diploma Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (iii) Mechanic Agricultural machinery Diploma Course 2 <sup>nd</sup> year
9.	Swami Ganga Giri Janta Girls Raekot, Ludhiana	(i) B.Voc. Degree in Fashion Technology (ii) B.Voc. Degree in Retail Marketing
10.	S.C.D. Govt. College Ludhiana	(i) Bachelors/Masters in Microbiology (Hons.) (ii) Bachelor/Masters in ITES
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 33(vii))</b>		
11.	G.H.G. Khalsa College, Ludhiana	(i) Software Technology (ii) Banking, Finance & Insurance (iii) Tourism & Hospitality
12.	DAV College for Women, Ferozepur Cantt.	B.Voc. Degree Programme in Beauty and wellness
13.	Devki Devi Jain Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana	(i) Banking & Insurance (ii) Retail Management & IT (iii) Beauty Aesthetics & Wellness (iv) Hospital Administration & Management
14.	R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City	(i) Bachelor of Retail Management and Information Technology (ii) Bachelor of Computer Hardware and Networking
15.	G.H.G. Khalsa College, Ludhiana	(i) Software Technology (ii) Banking, Finance & Insurance (iii) Tourism & Hospitality
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 22(x))</b>		

**R-6.** In accordance with the “Panjab University Policy against Sexual Harassment” approved by the Syndicate dated 24.08.2013 (Para-4), the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation dated 31.07.2015 of APEX Committee Against Sexual Harassment (ACASH) and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the following members of Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH) for the term of two years w.e.f. 01.08.2015 to 31.07.2017:

- |     |  |             |
|-----|--|-------------|
| 1.  | Professor Nishtha Jaswal, Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh                                     | Chairperson |
| 2.  | Professor Navdeep Goyal, D.S.W., P.U., Chandigarh  | Member      |
| 3.  | Dr. Vishal Sharma, Warden, Boys Hostel No.6, P.U., Chandigarh                                      | Member      |
| 4.  | Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur, Warden, Girls Hostel No.9, P.U., Chandigarh                                  | Member      |
| 5.  | Ms. Puneet Kaur, Research Officer, Department of Women Studies, P.U., Chandigarh                   | Member      |
| 6.  | Dr. Upneet Lalli, Deputy Director, Institute of Correctional Administration, Sector-26, Chandigarh | Member      |
| 7.  | Mr. Amar Kulwant Singh, Member, NGO, #3229, Sector-15, Chandigarh                                  | Member      |
| 8.  | Mrs. Sabina Salim, Associate Professor, UILS, P.U., Chandigarh                                     | Member      |
| 9.  | Mrs. Suraksha Sobti, Assistant Registrar (Secrecy), P.U., Chandigarh                               | Member      |
| 10. | Mrs. Neelam Kumari, Assistant Registrar, Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh                      | Convener    |

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 33(viii))**

**R-7.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the following recommendations of the Committee dated 07.09.2015 with regard to change of nomenclature of MBE to M.A./M.Com./MBA (Business Economics), as per gazette notification of Government of India:

1. The students should be given option to shift to M.A. (Economics) or M.Com. Courses in the Colleges.
2. Colleges be allowed to start M.Com. (Business Economics) or M.Com. in lieu of MBE, if they wish, for the session 2015-17 and those students, who wish to join M.Com. (Business Economics) be allowed to do so.
3. Those students, who wish to join any other courses in a University Department/College and have merit above the cut off marks of the last student admitted in that course (in that category), be allowed to do so.

4. In case UIAMS, Panjab University, Chandigarh is able to run the course of MBA (Business Economics) for the session 2015-17, then the students be also given an option to join this course by paying the fee already prescribed for other running MBA courses in UIAMS. To run the course as MBA (Business Economics) in UIAMS the first semester syllabus will remain unchanged and restructuring from second semester onwards be done on priority basis.
5. Wherever, student(s) shift, additional seat(s) in the course will be created to accommodate student(s).

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 33(ix))**

- R-8.** That the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name, in anticipation of the approval of the Senate:

Professor Akshaya Kumar Department of English & Cultural Studies Panjab University, Chandigarh	1. Arts 2. Science 3. Design & Fine Arts 4. Dairying, Animal Husbandry & Agriculture
--	---

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 19)**

- R-9.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the proposed fee structure for Foreign National/NRI candidates, seeking admission to M.Phil. Course in Economics, in the Department of Economics for the Session 2015-16.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 22(ix))**

- R-10.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accorded sanction for payment of honorarium to Committee members (other than University officers/officials) by enhancing the existing amount/rate @ 15% i.e. Rs.1725/- per sitting (minimum to be paid Rs.23,000/- and maximum to be paid Rs.46000/-) plus TA/DA as admissible, to investigate the extent of misappropriation of funds by scrutinizing all the previous records of Pension Section and also ascertain the involvement of other employees and audit staff accomplices.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 22(xi))**

- R-11.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has enhanced the following proposed rates @ 15% for remuneration/payment to the Inquiry Officers/Presenting Officers other than University Officers/Officials who engaged from time to time to conduct enquiries in the various cases of the University:

**ENQUIRY OFFICERS**

Category	Per-Sitting	Minimum to be paid	Maximum to be paid
Retired/working Judges & Secretary of the Govt. & above. Any other person so appointed, other than University Officials	Rs.1725/-	Rs.23,000/-	Rs.46,000/-

**PRESENTING OFFICERS**

Category	Per Sitting	Minimum to be paid	Maximum to be paid
Advocates	Rs.1150/-	Rs.5,700/-	Rs.11,500/-

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 22(xii))**

- R-12.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accorded sanction for payment of honorarium to Justice Mr. Harbans Lal, Former Judge, Punjab & Haryana High Court appointed as Enquiry Officer and Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, Ex-F.D.O. appointed as Presenting Officer as mentioned below against their names, in the case of misappropriation of funds by Ms. Pooja Bagga, Daily Wages Clerk in Pension Cell of the Accounts Branch, P.U.:

1.	Enquiry Officer	Justice Mr. Harbans Lal, Former Judge, Punjab & Haryana High Court	Rs.80,000/- + TA/DA as admissible to a person of his stature  (This amount is enhanced one, from Rs.70000/- + TA/DA already paid to Enquiry Officer Justice Garg, as admissible to Judge of the High Court, on account of inquiry pertaining to College Branch).
2.	Presenting Officer	Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, Ex-F.D.O.	Rs.1150/- per sitting (minimum to be paid Rs.5700/- and maximum to be paid Rs.11500/- + TA/DA as admissible)  (This amount/rate of honorarium has been increased @ 15%).

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 22(xiii))**

- R-13.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the Regulations/Rules and course structure for Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences w.e.f. the academic session 2015-2016, as per authorization given by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.7.2015.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 22(xv))**

- R-14.** To ratify the following decision of the Syndicate dated 31.05.2015 (Para 3) that the words 'Branch' and 'Registrar', be added in the resolved part (modification/addition) of Syndicate decision dated for channel of referring the grievances/ complaint of any aggrieved members of the staff (Teaching and Non-teaching):

Decision of the Syndicate dated 31.05.2015 (Para 3)	Ratified Decision
<b>RESOLVED:</b> That the recommendations of the Johl Committee dated 15.5.2015, be approved, as per Appendix, with the following additions/modifications to	<b>RESOLVED:</b> That the recommendations of the Johl Committee dated 15.5.2015, be approved, as per Appendix, with the following additions/modifications to

<p>strengthen the internal grievance redressal mechanism to the satisfaction of all:</p> <p>1. Before the Chancellor is approached, the issue must be attempted to be addressed within the University system. Firstly, the issue be addressed at the department level and the Head of the Department should try to resolve the issue within 15 days time. If the issue could not be addressed at the Departmental level, it be referred to the Dean of University Instruction, who should resolved the issue within 1 month's time. In case the issue is still not resolved, the matter be referred to the Standing Committee, for which the upper limit of the time is 2 months. However, if the matter still did not get addressed, the Syndicate has to take a call on the same in its subsequent meeting.</p> <p>2. xxx    xxx    xxx</p> <p>3. xxx    xxx    xxx</p> <p>4. xxx    xxx    xxx</p>	<p>strengthen the internal grievance redressal mechanism to the satisfaction of all:</p> <p>1. Before the Chancellor is approached, the issue must be attempted to be addressed within the University system. Firstly, the issue be addressed at the Department/<b>Branch</b> level and the Head of the Department/<b>Branch</b> should try to resolve the issue within 15 days time. If the issue could not be addressed at the Departmental/<b>Branch</b> level, it be referred to the Dean of University Instruction/ <b>Registrar</b>, who should resolve the issue within 1 month's time. In case the issue is still not resolved, the matter be referred to the Standing Committee, for which the upper limit of the time is 2 months. However, if the matter still did not get addressed, the Syndicate has to take a call on the same in its subsequent meeting.</p> <p>2. xxx    xxx    xxx</p> <p>3. xxx    xxx    xxx</p> <p>4. xxx    xxx    xxx</p>
---	--

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 33(xii))**

- R-15.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies as Dean of International Students w.e.f. 12.11.2015, till further orders, under Regulation 1 at page 109 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(i))**

- R-16.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Harish Kumar of U.I.E.T. as Honorary Director, Centre for Skill Development and Entrepreneurship, Panjab University, w.e.f. 12.11.2015 till further orders, in place of Professor Suresh Kumar Chadha of University Business School.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(ii))**

- R-17.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Prashant Kumar Gautam, Associate Professor, UIHTM, as Honorary Director of the University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management, Panjab University, with immediate effect, till further orders.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(iii))**

- R-18.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Professor Ashutosh Kumar, Department of Political Science, Panjab University, as Honorary Director of

Coaching Centre for IAS & other competitive Examination for SC/ST & other categories, P.U., as additional charge for a period of two years w.e.f. 30.10.2015.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(iv))**

- R-19.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Dr. Deepak Kaushik as Medical Officer (Full-Time) purely on contract basis against the vacant post in B.G.J. Institute of Health, P.U. on fixed emoluments of 45000/- p.m., initially for the period of six months w.e.f. the date he joins his duty & further extendable upto two years by giving one day break after every six months upon satisfactory performance, with the following stipulation:

“That the above appointment is being made purely on contract basis & for the period as mentioned above. It is understood that you will have no claim whatsoever for regular appointment after expiry of term of contractual appointment & your appointment shall be terminated without any notice. Your appointment shall come to an end automatically on completion of contract appointment as stated above.”

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(vii))**

- R-20.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the meeting of Committee dated 07.11.2015, for appointment of following persons as Director, Associate Director and members of the Research Promotion Cell (RPC), for the period of two years, with immediate effect:

- |    |   |   |                          |
|----|---|---|--------------------------|
| 1. | Dr. O.P. Katare, UIPS   | : | Director, RPC            |
| 2. | Dr. Ramanjit Kaur Johal,<br>Department of Public Administration | : | Associate Director, RPC  |
| 1. | Dr. Rajat Sandhir,<br>Department of Biochemistry                | } | As members<br>of the RPC |
| 2. | Dr. C.N. Kumar,<br>Department of Physics                        |   |                          |
| 3. | Dr. Ashutosh Kumar,<br>Department of Political Science          |   |                          |
| 4. | Dr. Anju Suri,<br>Department of History                         |   |                          |

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(viii))**

- R-21.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Col. P.S. Sandhu, (Retd.) and Ex-Registrar, National Institute of Technology, Durgapur, as Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor, with effect from the date he offers to join on or after, November 16, 2015, till further orders, in the office of the Vice-Chancellor, on the last pay drawn minus pension, with facilities as provided to Shri R.L. Kapoor, Ex-Advisor & Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor as per rules/regulations of the University (except accommodation on the Panjab University Campus). His salary will be paid against the vacant post of Secretary to Vice-Chancellor.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(xiii))**

- R-22.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has allowed to treat the nomenclature of the post of Assistant Professor for P.G. Diploma in Advertising and Public Relations, School of Communication studies to that of Assistant Professor, School of Communication Studies.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(x))**

- R-23.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Hardeep Singh, Assistant Professor (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Ferozepur, w.e.f. 22.09.2015 after considering one month notice period from 22.08.2015 to 21.09.2015, required under Rule 16.2 given at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(ix))**

- R-24.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Yogesh Mishra, Assistant Professor, Department of Botany, w.e.f. 26.11.2015 (A.N.), under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009, due to his selection as Assistant Professor in the Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(xiv))**

- R-25.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Mr. Kapil Dev, Assistant Professor in English (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Ferozepur, w.e.f. 22.10.2015, as he has given one month notice from 22.09.2015 to 21.10.2015, under rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(xv))**

- R-26.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Shri Shaminder Singh, Assistant Professor in Physical Education (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, Moga, w.e.f. 19.08.2015 (A.N.), as he has given one month salary of Rs.47412/-, under rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(xvi))**

- R-27.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Mr. Pardeep Kumar Arora from Senior Technical Assistant (G-II) to Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) in the Department of Microbiology, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400 with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant post in the said department.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(xvii))**



**R-28.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved that the following Fellows be assigned to the Faculties as mentioned against their name:

Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar Director of Higher Education U.T. Administration U.T., Chandigarh	1. Languages 2. Medical Sciences 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Dairying Animal Husbandry & Agriculture
Shri T.K. Goyal Director of Higher Education, Punjab Chandigarh. SCO 66-67, Sector 17-D, Chandigarh	1. Languages 2. Medical Sciences 3. Dairying Animal Husbandry & Agriculture 4. Design and Fine Arts

When Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out to the table agenda, i.e., **Sub-Item R-28**, the Vice-Chancellor said that this actually should go to the Syndicate. Let it go to the Syndicate and there is no issue at all.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that so far as affiliated Colleges are concerned, earlier, they used to require 7 acres of land, thereafter the UGC came out with the plan of 5 acres of land only, and the University also has adopted the said UGC Regulations, and has reduced the land requirement from 7 acres to 5 acres. Now, the UGC has permitted in the hilly areas, that the requirement of land is 5 acres, but the land can be at separate three places within the radius of 2 k.ms., because in the hilly areas, it is very difficult to have 5 acres land. Since they also have in their jurisdiction, semi-hilly area, which is known as kandi area, keeping in view those UGC Regulations, they should also allow the Colleges in such backward area/s, where they have 5 acres of land (separately at maximum three places) within the radius of 2 k.ms., so that they are able to encourage the opening of College/s in the hilly area/s. This is strictly as per the UGC Regulations, but since they had not clarified it at the time of reducing the land requirement from 7 acres to 5 acres (Syndicate of 2010) as at that time they did not specifically mentioned that in case of semi-hilly area/s, the land can be at three separate places. Now, they can do this.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Goyal to give an item, the same would be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would give it in writing.

The Vice-Chancellor, **referring to Sub-Item R-28**, said that this issue would be taken to the Syndicate but the assignment of Faculties to Director Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh and Director Higher Education, Punjab, should be allowed to be implemented, so that no negative impression goes because otherwise also they usually do not attend the meeting of the Syndicate and Senate. Earlier also, they had allowed Dr. Gurdial Singh.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, he (Vice-Chancellor) does not know the background in which he is saying and the Vice-Chancellor also does not know the idea behind the seeking of assignment of Faculties at this stage. In fact, both the Directors Higher Education (U.T., Chandigarh and Punjab) have not joined just a couple of weeks before.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no issue at all. However, they should try to let them in the Faculties as early as possible, because their non-participation is causing a lot of issues.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that otherwise also they have already taken a decision that the elections would be held strictly in terms of the electoral rolls, which existed before the meeting of the November Syndicate, i.e., 22.11.2015.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they had not taken any such decision.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the elections of the Syndicate, which have now been scheduled for 18<sup>th</sup> December 2015, would be held as per the orders of the Court.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the elections of the Syndicate on 18<sup>th</sup> December would be held in accordance with the electoral rolls which existed before 22.11.2015, only if the Court ordered as such.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the Court has not endorsed the decision of the Syndicate dated 22.11.2015, then the old electoral rolls would prevail.

At this stage, a din prevailed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter is expected to go to the Syndicate first. He has not placed the matter before the Syndicate; rather it has been brought to the Senate directly. The house members have sharp differences amongst themselves. It should go to the Syndicate first, and let there be no division of votes on this.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that, in future, no item should be brought to the Senate directly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then what is the purpose of discussing and taking decisions on many issues, which they take *suo moto* where there is a large consensus. He (Professor Malhotra) is doing this because somebody would quote that he/she would not allow this. Only one person says that they would not allow this and the whole thing collapses.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he 100% agrees with the Vice-Chancellor that once they start flouting the rules/regulations in one particular case, then everybody has the right to say why it was done in that case. That is why, he says why should they flout the rules/regulations at all. If it is to be routed through the Syndicate, let it be routed through the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he had just told them about his concern that they had earlier allowed Dr. Gurdial Singh to choose the Faculties even without routing through the Syndicate. Anyhow, this issue about the assignment of Faculties would be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that probably, Professor Navdeep Goyal is not sure about the orders of the Court. One is that the Court must have ordered postponement of the elections; and maybe it also has upheld the list.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have already decided that the elections will be held on 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> December 2015 and by then the judgement of the Court would also be available.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the information contained in Items **R-(1) to R-(27) on the agenda**, be ratified; and
- (2) so far as **Item R-28** is concerned, the same be placed before the Syndicate first.

**XLII.**

The information contained in **Items I-1 to I-36** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**I-1.** That the Syndicate has felicitated the following:

- (i) MCM DAV College for Women, Chandigarh, for having been awarded 'Star Status in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Expert Committee meeting to review College supported under Star College Scheme of the Department of Biotechnology, Ministry of Science & Technology, Government of India on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2015.
- (ii) Professor Sudesh Kaur Khanduja, former Professor of Department of Mathematics, Panjab University on her having been awarded Professor Vishnu Vasudeva Narlikar Memorial Lecture (2015) by the Indian National Science Academy (INSA), New Delhi.
- (iii) Air Marshal Jagjeet Singh, Air Officer Commanding-in-Chief at Headquarters Maintenance Command and P.U. alumnus on his having been appointed as Honorary ADC to the President of India.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 1(i))**

- (iv) Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar, UGC Professor of Physics, Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on his appointment as Vice-Chancellor of Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar for a period of three years.
- (v) Dr. Balram K. Gupta, former Professor and Chairperson, Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on his joining as Director, Chandigarh Judicial Academy, Sector 43, Chandigarh.
- (vi) Professor B.S. Ghuman of the Department of Public Administration, P.U., on his appointment as Chief Finance and Economic Adviser to Government of Punjab.
- (vii) Professor Suman Bala Beri of the Department of Physics for having been awarded Emeritus Fellowship by the University Grants Commission for a period of two years (2015-17).
- (viii) Professor Archana R. Singh, School of Communication Studies on winning the Best Research Paper Award for her paper entitled "Semiotic analysis of tweets: A study of 'Nirbhaya and Delhi gangrape'" at the 4<sup>th</sup> Annual International Conference on Journalism and Mass Communications (JMComm 2015) held at Singapore on 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> October, 2015.
- (ix) Dr. Anurag Kuhad, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on receiving UGC Research Award and a research grant of Rs.3 lakh for a period of two years.

- (x) Dr. Neha Miglani Vadhera, who completed her Ph.D. from the School of Communication Studies (SCS), on having been awarded 'Post Doctoral Fellowship for Women for the year 2015-16 by UGC.
- (xi) Five students, viz., Ms. Sandeep Kaur, Ms. Kiranpreet Kaur Saggu, Mr. Gagandeep Goyal, Ms. Richu and Ms. Harjot Kaur from PU's 'Centre for IAS & Other Competitive Examinations' have qualified in the Haryana Civil Services (HCS) (Judicial Branch)-2015.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 1(i))**

**I-2.** That the Syndicate has noted the following information given by the Vice-Chancellor:

- (i) Project Approval Board (PAB) constituted under the scheme National Initiative for setting up of Design Innovative Centres by the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Department of Higher Education has approved the establishment of Design Innovation Centre (DIC) at Panjab University, Chandigarh; for three years. Panjab University is one of the three institutions which have been approved this year, the other two being IIT Kanpur and School of Architecture, New Delhi. This project was submitted by Panjab University with cooperation from several other institutions like Punjab Engineering College and Central Scientific Instruments Organization. A grant of Rs.10 crores has been given for this project.
- (ii) MCM DAV College for Women, Chandigarh, has been awarded 'Star Status in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Expert Committee meeting to review College supported under Star College Scheme of the Department of Biotechnology, Ministry of Science & Technology, Government of India on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2015. The Expert Committee has awarded this status with one-time non-recurring grant of Rs.10 lakhs and recurring grant of Rs.3 lakhs per year for a period of three years.
- (iii) Panjab University, Department of Mathematics is organizing a National Seminar on the occasion of 90<sup>th</sup> Birthday of Professor R.P. Bambah, former Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2015. Eminent Mathematicians are scheduled to give lectures at Panjab University Campus on that day. All the former Vice-Chancellors are also expected to join in felicitating Professor R.P. Bambah on that day.
- (iv) Professor Kamaljeet Singh Bawa, Distinguished Professor in Biology at University of Massachusetts, Boston and fellow of Royal Society (FRS) London, will

deliver the 4<sup>th</sup> Panjab University Foundation Day Lecture on October 19, 2015.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 1(1, 2, 3 & 5))**

**I-3.** That the Vice-Chancellor has:

- (i) accepted the resignation of Dr. Rupinder Tiwari as Honorary Director, Central Instrumentation Laboratory w.e.f. 09.09.2015.
- (ii) ordered that Professor S.K. Mehta, Department of Chemistry is to assume charge as Director, Central Instrumentation Laboratory from Dr. Rupinder Tiwari with immediate effect and discharge this duty until further orders on the earlier terms and conditions.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 34(ii))**

**I-4.** Since, the interim orders dated 28.05.2015 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and Another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP (16977 of 2015) have now been adjourned to 02.09.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Reena Bhasin, Professor of Economics, University School of Open Learning be allowed to continue till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 34(iv))**

**I-5.** That the Vice-Chancellor has given the additional charge of Director (Hony.), Coaching Centre for I.A.S. & other Competitive Examinations for SC/ST & Other Categories, P.U., to Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean University Instruction, P.U., with immediate effect till further orders.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 34(v))**

**I-6.** Since the interim orders dated 30.06.2014, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (18228 of 2015) have now been adjourned to 28.10.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Professor Pankaj Mala Sharma, Department of Music be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 23(i))**

**I-7.** Since the interim orders dated 30.06.2014, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (19389 of 2015) have now been adjourned to 28.10.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Dharam Bir Rishi,

Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 23(ii))**

- I-8.** Since the interim orders dated 07.08.2015, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (16311 of 2015) have now been adjourned to 02.09.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Karan Vashisht, Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

**NOTE:** The next date of hearing has been fixed for 28.10.2015.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 23(v))**

- I-9.** That –

- (i) the following faculty members, be re-appointed afresh purely on temporary basis for the period mentioned against each (with one day break as usual) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., under Regulation 5 (b) at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation	Proposed date of Break in 2015 & 2016	Proposed Extension	
				From	To
1.	Dr. Amandeep Kaur	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
2.	Dr. Prabhjot Kaur	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
3.	Dr. Amrita Rawla	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
4.	Dr. Vandana Gupta	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
5.	Dr. Rajni Jain	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016

6.	Dr. Monika Nagpal	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
7.	Dr. Manjot Kaur	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
8.	Dr. M.K. Chhabra	Reader	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
9.	Dr. Rajiv Rattan	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
10.	Dr. Ruchi Singla	Senior Lecturer	10.11.2015 (Holiday) 11.11.2015 (Holiday) 12.11.2015 (Break Day)	13.11.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.10.2016
11.	Dr. Rosy Arora	Senior Lecturer	10.11.2015 (Holiday) 11.11.2015 (Holiday) 12.11.2015 (Break Day)	13.11.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.10.2016
12.	Dr. Prabhleen Brar	Senior Lecturer	10.11.2015 (Holiday) 11.11.2015 (Holiday) 12.11.2015 (Break Day)	13.11.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.10.2016
13.	Dr. Vivek Kapoor	Senior Lecturer	10.11.2015 (Holiday) 11.11.2015 (Holiday) 12.11.2015 (Break Day)	13.11.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.10.2016

- (ii) the process for filling up the faculty positions at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital on regular basis, be initiated.
- (iii) At the same time, the process for filling up the faculty positions at P.U. Constituent Colleges, be also initiated; and
- (iv) Similarly, the process for filling up the faculty positions at P.U. Regional Centre at Sri Muktsar Sahib and P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, be also initiated.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 4)**

**I-10.** To note the Legal Notice dated 26.09.2015 received from Shri Raghav Sharma, Advocate, Chamber No.10, District Court Complex, Hoshiarpur (Punjab), on behalf of his clients Major Bakhtawar Singh S/o Shri Jaswant Singh, VPO Bhullewal Rathan, Tehsil and District

Hoshiarpur and Shri Harbans Rai S/o Shri Bhagat Ram Chauhan, Shahidan Road, House No.53, Ward No.2, Mahilpur, Tehsil Garhshankar with regard to the issues against SGGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur, District Hoshiarpur (Punjab).

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 23(iii))**

- I-11.** To note Status Report of misappropriation of pension corpus fund of the University to tune of Rs.2,08,74,993/- during the last three years.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 34(i))**

- I-12.** That Vice-Chancellor has approved the minutes of the Committee dated 22.9.2015 constituted, in view of the discussion in the Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 (Para 33 (ix)), in order to determine the suitability and feasibility of offering MBA (Business (Economics)) at the P.U. Campus for the session 2015-2017.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 23(vii))**

- I-13.** As per authorization given to the Committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.4.2015, the following Colleges have been granted temporary extension of affiliation for certain courses/subjects as mentioned against each for the session 2015-16, subject to the fulfillment of the conditions as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/s Survey Committee and the College shall pay the salaries to all the staff members as per UGC/Punjab University, Chandigarh norms by 31.10.2015:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Colleges</b>	<b>Name of the Courses/Subjects</b>
1.	Nightingale College of Education V.P.O., Narangwal, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Ed. 1 <sup>st</sup> year (2-years) course-100 seats
2.	Satyam College of Education Ghall Kalan, Distt. Moga (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course-1 <sup>st</sup> Year (Four units-200 seats) and affiliation in the new course i.e. M.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (50 seats)
3.	Bajaj College, V. Chauki Mann, Ferozepur Road, Ludhiana-142024	B.Com Course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (semester) (ii) B.C.A.-1 <sup>st</sup> year (iii) B.B.A. 1 <sup>st</sup> year & (iv) B.Sc. (Fashion Designing)-1 <sup>st</sup> year
4.	Syon College KM-7, Hanumangarh Road Tehsil Abohar, Distt. Fazilka (Punjab)	BA-I English (C&E), Punjabi (C&E), Elective Hindi, Physical Education, History, Economics, Sociology and Political Science; and (ii) B.Com-1 <sup>st</sup> year (one Unit)
5.	Mata Baljinder Kaur Memorial Educational Society, Jalal Road, V.P.O. Samadh Bhai, Distt. Moga	(i) B.Com-I (one unit) (ii) B.A.I English(Compulsory)-Two units & English (Elective)-one unit, Punjabi (Compulsory)-Two units & Punjabi (Elective)-one unit, Economics (one unit), Mathematics (one unit), Hindi (one unit), Physical Education (one unit), Political Science (one unit), Sociology (one unit) and History (one unit)
6.	MBBGRGC Girls College of Education, Mansowal, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (100 seats)



<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Colleges</b>	<b>Name of the Courses/Subjects</b>
7.	J.S.S. Asha Kiran Special School & Teacher Training Institute, V.P.O. Jahan Khelan Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Special Education (M.R.) 1 <sup>st</sup> year (30 seats)
8.	Rayat Bahra College of Education Bohan Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (100 seats)
9.	SGGS College of Education, Beghpur Kamlooh Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (200 seats)
10.	Guru Nanak College of Education, Village: Dalewal Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (200 seats)
11.	D.A.V. College of Education Fazilka (Punjab)	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year Two units (100 seats)
12.	Jyoti B.Ed. College, Fazilka (Punjab)	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year Two units (100 seats)
13.	BKM College of Education Balachaur SBS Nagar (Punjab)	(i) B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year Two units (200 seats) (ii) M.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year one Unit (50 seats)
14.	M.D. College of Education, Hanumangarh Road, Abohar (Punjab)	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year Two units (100 seats)
15.	Rayat College of Education Railmajra (Nawanshahar) SBS Nagar (Punjab)	(i) B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year Four units (200 seats) (ii) M.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year One unit (50 seats)
16.	Kenway College of Education, Hanumangarh Road, Abohar (Punjab)	(i) B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year Four units (200 seats) (ii) M.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year one unit (50 seats)
17.	Guru Ram Dass B.Ed. College Jalalabad (W), Distt. Fazilka (Punjab)	(i) B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year Four units (200 seats) (ii) M.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year one unit (50 seats)
18.	HKL College of Education Guruharsahai Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab)	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year Two units (100 seats)
19.	Dev Samaj College of Education for Women, Ferozepur City (Punjab)	Post Graduate Diploma in Guidance and Counselling (40 seats)
20.	Govt. College of Yoga Education and Health, Sector-23, Chandigarh	(i) B.Ed. Yoga; (ii) Post Graduate Diploma in Yoga Therapy; (iii) Basic certificate course in Yoga Education; and (iv) Advance certificate course in Yoga Education
21.	A.S. College of Education, Kalal-Majra, Distt. Ludhiana, (Punjab)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year-(100 seats)
22.	Bhutta College of Education, Bhutta, Distt. Ludhiana (Pb)	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year-(100 seats)
23.	Regional Institute for Mentally Handicapped, Sector-31, Chandigarh	B.Ed. Special Education (Mental Retardation)-1 <sup>st</sup> year (30 seats) and M.Ed. Special Education (Mental Retardation)-1 <sup>st</sup> year (15 seats)
24.	Guru Nanak College of Education, Ludhiana-Malerkotla Road, Gopalpur Distt. Ludhiana (Pb.)	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (200 seats)

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Colleges</b>	<b>Name of the Courses/Subjects</b>
25.	Nankana Sahib College of Education, Kot Gangu Rai Distt. Ludhiana (Pb.)	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (100 seats)
26.	Guru Gobind Singh College of Education for Women, Kamalpura, Tehsil-Jagraon Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (200 seats)
27.	Brahmrishi Yoga Training College, Sector-19, Chandigarh	B.Ed. (Yoga) 1 <sup>st</sup> year (20 seats)
28.	Dev Samaj College of Education Sector 36-B, Chandigarh	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (100 seats) & M.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (50 seats)
29.	GHG College of Education, Goindwal, Raikot, Distt. Ludhiana (Pb.)	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (100 seats)
30.	Baba Mangal Singh Institute of Education, Barnala Road, Bhugipura, Distt. Moga (Punjab)	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (two unit i.e. 100 seats)
31.	Babe-Ke College of Education, V.P.O.- Daudhar Tehsil & Distt. Moga (Pb)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (four units i.e. 200 seats)
32.	Lala Hans Raj Memorial College of Education, Near Bhugipura Chowk, VPO-Talwandi Bhangerian Distt. Moga (Pb.)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (two units i.e. 100 seats)
33.	Lala Lajpat Rai Memorial College of Education V.P.O. Dhudike Tehsil & Distt. Moga (Pb.)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (four units i.e. 200 seats)
34.	Moga College of Education Near P.S. Sadar, GT Road Moga (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (four units i.e. 200 seats) and M.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (50 seats)
35.	Tagore College of Education Jallandhar Road Fatehgarh Korotana Distt. Moga (Pb.)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (two units i.e. 100 seats)
36.	Partap College of Education Hambran Road Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (4 units-200 seats) (semester) and M.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (1 unit-50 seats) (semester)
37.	Sri Guru Ram Das College of Education, V.P.O. Halwara Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Ed. course – one unit (50 seats) (Two Year course)
38.	Muktisar Institute of Higher Education, Jalalabad Road Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (two units i.e. 100 seats)
39.	J.D. College of Education, Bathinda Road, Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (two units i.e. 100 seats)
40.	Shree Satya Sai B.Ed. College V.P.O.- Karaiwala Tehsil- Gidderbaha Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (two units i.e. 100 seats)
41.	Shukdeva Krishna College of Education for Girls Ferozepur Road V.P.O.- Ghall Kalan Distt. Moga (Pb.)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (four units i.e. 200 seats)

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Colleges</b>	<b>Name of the Courses/Subjects</b>
42.	Sant Baba Bhag Singh Memorial Girls College of Education, V.P.O. Sukhanand, Distt. Moga (Punjab)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (two units i.e. 100 seats)
43.	B.C.M. College of Education Urban Estate, Sector 32-A Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Ed. course- 1 <sup>st</sup> year (3 units-150 seats) (semester), M.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (1 unit-50 seats) (semester) and B.Ed. Special Education (Learning Disability)-1 <sup>st</sup> year (30 seats) (semester)
44.	Dasmesh Girls College of Education V.P.O.-Badal Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	M.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (50 seats)
45.	Bawa Nihal Singh B.Ed. College Bawa Nihal Singh Street Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (three units i.e.. 150 seats)
46.	D.D. Jain College of Education Kidwai Nagar Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (2 units- 100 seats)
47.	Sant Darbara Singh College of Education for Women Lopon Distt. Moga (Punjab)	M.Ed. course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (50 seats)
48.	Mata Gurdev Kaur Memorial Shahi Sports College of Physical Education, Jhakroudi, Samrala Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.P.Ed. 1 <sup>st</sup> year course (100 seats)
49.	Govt. College for Girls Jalalabad (W) Distt. Fazilka (Punjab)	B.A. I, II & III- one unit (History, Political Science, Physical Education)
50.	Guru Gobind Singh College of Education Dabwali Road, Malout Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (Two Units i.e. 100 seats)
51.	Saint Sahara College of Education, Ferozepur Road Near Power Grid Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (Two Units i.e. 100 seats)
52.	Guru Gobind Singh College of Education, Giddarbaha Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (Four Units i.e. 200 seats) & M.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (50 seats)
53.	Maharaja Ranjit Singh college Burjan Bye-Pass Malout-Abohar Road, Malout Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	(i) B.A.-I, II & III- Economics, Punjabi (C), History & Public Administration & (ii) New Course i.e. B.Sc.-1 (Agriculture) One unit
54.	Shree Satya Sai B.Ed. College, V.P.O. Karaiwala Tehsil-Gidderbaha Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (Two units i.e. 100 seats)
55.	DAV College of Education Fazilka, (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (Two Units-100 seats)
56.	Jyoti B.Ed. College Fazilka (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (Two Units-100 seats)
57.	M.D. College of Education Abohar (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (Two Units-100 seats)
58.	BKM College of Education Balachaur, SBS Nagar (Punjab)	(i) B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> Year (Four Units-200 seats) (ii) M.Ed. Course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (One Unit-50 seats)

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Colleges</b>	<b>Name of the Courses/Subjects</b>
59.	Surjeet Memorial College of Education Malwal, Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (Two Units-100 seats)
60.	Guru Ram Dass B.Ed. College Jalalabad (W), Fazilka (Punjab)	(i) B.Ed. Course-1 <sup>st</sup> Year (Four Units-200 seats) (ii) M.Ed. Course-1 <sup>st</sup> Year (One Unit-50 seats)
61.	Lala Jagat Narayan College of Education Jalalabad (W), Fazilka (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (Two Units-100 seats)
62.	Kenway College of Education Abohar (Punjab)	(i) B.Ed. Course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (Four Units-200 seats); and (ii) M.Ed. Course-1 <sup>st</sup> Year (One Unit-50 seats)
63.	HKL College of Education Guruharsahai, Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course- 1 <sup>st</sup> year (Two Units-100 Seats)
64.	Babe Ke College of Education Mudki, Ferozepur (Punjab)	(i) B.Ed. Course-1 <sup>st</sup> Year (Four Units-200 seats) (ii) M.Ed. Course-1 <sup>st</sup> Year (One Unit-50 seats)
65.	Rayat College of Education Railmajra (Nawanshahar) SBS Nagar (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (Four Units-200 seats); and (ii) M.Ed. Course-1 <sup>st</sup> Year (One Unit-50 seats)
66.	Guru Nanak College Ferozepur Cantt (Punjab)	(i) B.A. I, II & III (Sociology); (ii) B.C.A. I, II & III; (iii) B.Com. I, II & III; (iv) PGDCA; (v) M.A. I & II (Punjabi); (vi) M.A. I & II (History); and (vii) M.Sc. I & II (Maths.)
67.	Dev Samaj College for Women Ferozepur City (Punjab)	(i) M.Sc. I & II (Chemistry) (ii) M.Com. I & II (iii) M.Sc. II (Physics) (iv) B.Com. I, II and III (2 <sup>nd</sup> unit)
68.	Rayat Bahra College of Education Bohan District Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (100 seats)
69.	SGGS College of Education Beghpur Kamlooh District Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (200 seats)
70.	MBBGRGC Girls College of Education Mansowal, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (100 seats)
71.	Sant Baba Hari Singh Memorial College of Education, Mahilpur District Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (200 seats)
72.	Guru Nanak College of Education Village Dalewal District Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Course 1 <sup>st</sup> year (200 seats)
73.	J.S.S. Asha Kiran Special School & Teacher Training Institute V.P.O. Jahan Khelan District Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. Special Education (M.R.) 1 <sup>st</sup> year (30 seats)
74.	Baba Kundan Singh College V.P.O. Muhar District Ferozepur (Punjab)	(i) M.A. II (Punjabi), (ii) M.A. II (Political Science) (iii) M.A. I (History), (iv) M.A. I (Hindi) (v) B.A. I (Computer Applications) (vi) B.Com. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year
75.	Sant Hari Singh Memorial College for Women Chella-Makhsuspur District Hoshiarpur	(i) B.A. I, II and III (English (General & Elective)), Hindi, Economics, Pol. Science, History, Punjabi (General and Elective), Home Science, Computer Science, Physical Education, (ii) BCA I, II and III (One unit) and (iii) B.Com I, II and III (One Unit)

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Colleges</b>	<b>Name of the Courses/Subjects</b>
76.	Tarawati Memorial Degree College Bringali District Hoshiarpur	(i) M.A.-I (Punjabi)-One unit (ii) M.A. I (Hindi)-One unit and (iii) B.A. I (Education)-Elective
77.	Guru Nanak Khalsa College for Women, Shamchaurasi District Hoshiarpur	(i) B.A.I, II and III (Computer application) (ii) BCA-I & II (One Unit) and (iii) PGDCA-40 seats
78.	S.P.M. Mukerian District Hoshiarpur	(i) M.Sc. II (Chemistry)-40 seats (ii) M.Sc.-II (Physics)-40 seats (iii) M.A. II (Political Science)-60 seats, (iv) M.Sc.I (Mathematics)-40 and (v) M.Com. I (One unit)
79.	Siri Guru Har Rai Sahib College for Women Chabbewal District Hoshiarpur	(i) B.A. I, II & III (English G & E, Computer Science, Mathematics, Environment Education) (ii) B.Sc. I, II & III (Computer Science) (iii) B.C.A. I, II & III (one unit) (iv) B.Com. I, II & III (one unit) (v) PGDCA (one unit)
80.	BAM Khalsa College Garhshankar District Hoshiarpur	(i) M.Sc. II (Chemistry)-40 seats and (ii) M.A.-II (History)-60 seats
81.	DIPS College of Education Rarra Morr, Jalalpur, Urmar Tanda District Hoshiarpur	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (100 seats)
82.	DAV College, Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.Sc.-IV (Agriculture)-4 years course & B.A./B.Sc.-I, II, III (Agriculture)-E, (ii) B.B.A. I, II, III (iii) PG Diploma in Fashion Designing (iv) PG Diploma in Mass Communication (v) M.Com-1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (one Unit) (vi) B.A.-II (Sociology) (vii) M.A. 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year (History)-One unit
83.	S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.Sc.-IV (Agriculture), (ii) B.Sc.-III (Medical)-one Unit, (iii) B.A. III (Sociology)-E, (iv) B.A. III (Music)-E (v) B.A. III (Gandhian Studies)-E (vi) B.C.A. I, II and III (One Unit) (vii) M.Sc. I and II (IT)-40 seats (viii) D.P.Ed.-I and II (50 seats in each year), (ix) B.P.Ed.-1 <sup>st</sup> year (Two year course)-50 seats
84.	Regional Institute for Mentally Handicapped, Sector-31, Chandigarh	B.Ed. Special Education (Mental Retardation)-1 <sup>st</sup> year (30 seats) and M.Ed. Special Education (Mental Retardation)-1 <sup>st</sup> year (15 seats)
85.	Guru Gobind Singh College of Education for Women, Kamalpura Tehsil Jagraon, Distt. Ludhiana (Pb.)	B.Ed. course (1 <sup>st</sup> year)-200 seats
86.	A.S. College of Education, Kalal Majra Khanna-Samrara Road District Ludhiana (Pb.)	B.Ed. course (1 <sup>st</sup> year)-100 seats
87.	Bhutta College of Education, Bhutta District Ludhiana (Pb.)	B.Ed. course (1 <sup>st</sup> year)-100 seats
88.	Govt. College of Yoga Education and Health, Sector-23, Chandigarh	(i) B.Ed. Yoga (ii) Post Graduate Diploma in Yoga Therapy (iii) Basic Certificate course in Yoga Education and (iv) Advance Certificate course in Yoga Education

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Colleges</b>	<b>Name of the Courses/Subjects</b>
89.	Baba Kundan Rural College of Education, Kullainwal, Jamalpura District Ludhiana (Pb.)	B.Ed. course (1 <sup>st</sup> year)-100 seats
90.	GHG College of Education, Gondwal Raikot, District Ludhiana	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (100 seats)
91.	Guru Nanak College of Education Ludhiana-Malerkotla Road, Gopalpur District Ludhiana (Pb.)	B.Ed. course-1 <sup>st</sup> year (200 seats)
92.	Brahmrishi Yoga Training College, Sector-19, Chandigarh	B.Ed. (Yoga) 1 <sup>st</sup> year-20 seats
93.	Mata Gurdev Kaur Memorial Shahi Sports College of Physical Education Jhakroudi, Samrala District Ludhiana (Pb.)	B.P.Ed. 1 <sup>st</sup> year (Two year course)-100 seats

**I-14.** That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Affiliation Committee constituted by the Syndicate, has granted temporary affiliation/extension of affiliation to –

- (i) A.S. College for Women, Khanna, Ludhiana for Advance Diploma Add-on-course in (i) Computer Based Accounting (ii) Communicative English as allowed by UGC/under self-financing scheme for the session 2015-16.
- (ii) DAV College for Women, Ferozpur Cantt. for Advance Diploma course in (i) Fashion Designing (ii) Computer Based Accounting as allowed by UGC/under self-financing scheme for the session 2015-16.
- (iii) Kamla Lohtia Sanatan Dharam College, Daresi Road, Ludhiana for Diploma Add-on-course in (i) E-Commerce (ii) Entrepreneurship Development as allowed by UGC/under self-financing scheme for the session 2015-16.
- (iv) Arya College, Ludhiana for Diploma Add-on-course in Human Rights & Value Education as allowed by UGC/under self-financing scheme for the session 2015-16.
- (v) Arjan Dass College, Dharamkot (Moga) for Foundation course in Human Rights Education under plan approved by UGC for the session 2015-16.
- (vi) Gujranwala Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Ludhiana for Add-on-course in Certificate course in Bank Management under UGC scheme of Career Oriented Courses for the session 2015-16.
- (vii) MCM DAV College for Women, Sector 36-A, Chandigarh for P.G. Diploma in Cosmetology & Beauty Care under Innovative Programme for the session 2015-16.
- (viii) DAV College, Malout, Sri Muktsar Sahib for Diploma Add-on-course in (i) E-Banking and (ii) E-Commerce as allowed by UGC/under self-financing scheme for the session 2015-16.

- (ix) Dev Samaj College of Education for Women, Ferozpur City for Post Graduate Diploma in Guidance and Counseling (40 seats) for the session 2015-16 subject to fulfillment of the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee visited College for the purpose.
- (x) Khalsa College Garhdiwala, Hoshiarpur for Add-on-course Diploma in Information and Communication Technology for the session 2015-16.
- (xi) Government College for Girls, Ludhiana for Diploma in Beauty and Wellness under UGC Scheme of Community Colleges for session 2015-16.
- (xii) S.D.P. College for Women, Ludhiana for Add-on-course as allowed by UGC/under Self financing Scheme for the session 2015-16.
- (xiii) D.A.V. College, Abohar for Foundation Course (2-3 months) under the UGC scheme of Human Rights Education for session 2015-16.
- (xiv) Government College for Girls, Ludhiana for Diploma in Beauty and Wellness under UGC Scheme of Community College for the session 2015-16.
- (xv) S.D.P. College for Women, Ludhiana for Add-on-Course as allowed by UGC/under Self financing Scheme for Certificate Course in Cosmetology for the session 2015-16.
- (xvi) Khalsa College, Garhdiwala, Hoshiarpur for Add-on-course Diploma in Information and Communication Technology for the session 2015-16.
- (xvii) D.A.V. College, Abohar for Foundation Course (2-3 months) under the UGC Scheme of Human Rights Education for the session 2015-16.

**I-15.** That the affiliation committee has not acceded the request of Principal Regional institution of cooperative Management, Sector-32, Chandigarh for opening a new college as the Management has only 1.84 acre of land whereas as per U.G.C. requirement, 5 acres land is required for opening a new College.

**I-16.** That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Affiliation Committee constituted by the Syndicate, has granted temporary extension of affiliation to Government College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh for M.Phil. Clinical Psychology and M.Phil. Psychiatric Social Work courses for the session 2015-16 (**for maximum number of students allowed to be admitted 08**) subject to the condition that the College will obtain the mandatory approval from the RCI in case of M.Phil. in Clinical Psychology and will make admission in the course/subject thereafter.

**I-17.** That the Vice-Chancellor –

- (i) in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors (already working on temporary

basis) up to 30.06.2015, at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U. Chandigarh:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Faculty Member</b>	<b>Designation</b>
1.	Ms. Twinkle Bedi	Assistant Professor in Computer Engineering
2.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	Assistant Professor in Mathematics

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 33(i))**

- (ii) has re-appointed afresh the following as Assistant Professor at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date of start/started of the classes for the academic session 2015-16, or till the regular posts are filled in through regular selection whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2014-15:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Faculty Member</b>	<b>Designation</b>
1.	Ms. Twinkle Bedi	Assistant Professor in Computer Engineering
2.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	Assistant Professor in Mathematics

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(vi))**

- I-18.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor at Centre for Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering and Excellence Biomedical Science, for the academic session 2015-16 w.e.f. 06.07.2015 to 30.04.2016, purely on temporary basis, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, on the same term and conditions, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 33(iii))**

- I-19.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of following persons as Assistant Professors (purely on temporary basis) at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Una Road, Bajwara w.e.f. the date they started work as such for the session 2015-16:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Branch/ Subject</b>
1.	Shri Kanwalpreet Singh	CSE
2.	Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur	CSE
3.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	CSE
4.	Ms. Shama Pathania	CSE
5.	Ms. Monika	ECE



6.	Shri Anish Sharma	ECE
7.	Ms. Harman Preet Kaur	ECE
8.	Shri Gurpinder Singh	IT
9.	Ms. Divya Sharma	IT
10.	Ms. Ritika Arora	IT
11.	Ms. Tanvi Sharma	IT
12.	Shri Ajay Kumar Saini	Mech.
13.	Shri Gurwinder Singh	Mech.
14.	Shri Ramandeep Singh	Mech.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 22(ii))**

**I-20.** In continuation to the office order No. Estt./15/7568-71/Estt. dated 20.08.2015, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved appointment (afresh) of the following Associate Professors/Readers and Senior Lecturer/Assistant Professors at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 02.07.2015 to 01.06.2016 with one day break on 01.07.2015 or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

**(i) Associate Professors/Readers**

1. Dr. Shipra Gupta
2. Dr. Lalit Kumar
3. Dr. Vishakha Grover

**(ii) Senior Lecturer/Assistant Professor**

1. Dr. Poonam Sood
2. Dr. Neha Bansal
3. Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal
4. Dr. Sunint Singh
5. Dr. Puneet
6. Dr. Rose Kanwaljeet Kaur

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 22(iii))**

**I-21.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has re-appointed afresh the following persons as Assistant Professor in the Department of Biotechnology, P.U., for next academic session 2015-16 w.e.f. 06.07.2015 to 30.04.2016, purely on temporary basis 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 Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

1. Dr. Monika Sharma
2. Dr. Baljinder Singh Gill

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 22(iv))**

**I-22.** In continuation to this office order No. Estt./15/6277 dated 16.07.2015, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Dr. Manoj Kumar, Assistant Professor, purely on temporary basis at Centre for Public Health, IEAST in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP of Rs.6000/- plus two increments (allowed during the academic session 2014-15) plus allowances as per University rules w.e.f. the start of classes for academic session 2015-16 or till the regular

posts are filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which he was working during the academic session 2014-15.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 Para 22(v))**

**I-23.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has constituted the IQAC Cell for a period of two years with the following members:

<b>Teachers</b>	1. Dr. Rajiv Lochan 2. Dr. Archana Bhatnagar 3. Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar 4. Dr. Akshaya Kumar 5. Dr. Dinesh Khurana 6. Dr. Anil Kumar 7. Dr. Gunmala Suri	Director, IQAC Cell Associate Director, IQAC Cell Professor, Department of Physics Professor, Department of English Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences Professor, University Business School
<b>Administrative/ Technical Staff</b>	1. Col. G.S. Chadha 2. Shri Guldeep Singh 3. Shri Ravinder Kumar	Registrar System, Manager, MIS Cell ASO, DUI Office
<b>Students</b>	1. Shri Vineet Keshwa 2. Ms. Prinka Garg	Ph.D. Scholar, History M.Sc. Biochemistry
<b>Management Representatives</b>	1. Dr. Ronki Ram 2. Dr. Karamjeet Singh	Member Senate Member Senate
<b>Alumni</b>	Dr. Satya P Gautam	Professor (Retd.), Centre for Philosophy, JNU, New Delhi
<b>Stakeholder/ Representative of Community</b>	1. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal 2. Shri Satyapal Jain	Prominent Citizen Prominent Citizen
<b>Employers of University Product/ Industrialists</b>	Shri R.M. Khanna	Former President, CII, Chandigarh
<b>External Expert</b>	1. Prof. Jai Rup Singh 2. Prof. Paramjit S. Judge	Former Vice-Chancellor, Central University of Bhatinda, Punjab Professor, Sociology, GNDU and Dean and I/C IQAC Cell, GNDU, Amritsar

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 33(xi))**

**I-24** To note the notification No. 8/19/2013-4C1/576065/3-10 dated 28.08.2015 received from Special Secretary, Higher Education, Government of Punjab, with regard to implementation of the orders passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 2891-2900 of 2015 (arising out of SLP (CIVIL) NOS 36023-36032 of 2010) P. Susheela & Ors. V/s University Grant Commission & Ors., regarding requisite qualifications of the Lecturers/ Assistant Professor, in Govt./Non-Govt. College and Universities.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 Para 34(vii))**

- I-25.** That Dr. Vishal Agrawal, Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, be re-appointed afresh purely on temporary basis, for the academic session 2015-16 or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5(b) at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which he is working earlier at Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 13)**

- I-26.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has –

- (i) re-appointed (afresh) the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 06.07.2015 for the academic session 2015-16 or till the regular posts are filled in through regular selection whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2014-15:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the faculty member &amp; Subject</b>
1.	Ms. Inderjot Kaur Assistant Professor in Law
2.	Shri Hardip Singh Assistant Professor in Punjabi

- (ii) Dr. Rajnish Kumar Mutneja has appointed as Assistant Professor at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib on part-time basis w.e.f. 08.07.2015 for the academic session 2015-16, or till the regular post is filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours a week).

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(v))**

- I-27.** That the Vice-Chancellor has appointed Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, University Business School as Chief Vigilance Officer, Panjab University, Chandigarh, w.e.f. the date she accept responsibility, from 12.11.2015 till further orders, as the University needs an Officer to perform the responsibility as CVO at the present juncture.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 31(i))**

- I-28.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI) has approved the re-employment of Dr. Daya Nand Garg, Professor (Retd.), Department of Law, on contract basis up to 14.09.2017 i.e. the date of attaining the age of 65 years, as per rules/regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF.

**NOTE:** Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus usual one day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 31(iii))**

**I-29.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI) has approved the re-employment of Dr. Sukhwant Bajwa, Professor (Retd.), Department of Education, P.U. on contract basis up to 13.10.2017 i.e. the date of attaining the age of 65 years, as per rules/ regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF.

**NOTE:** Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus usual one day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2009 will be applicable.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 31(iv))**

**I-30.** That the Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned an honorarium of Rs.3500/- p.m. to Professor R.K. Singla, Department of Computer Science & Applications, for performing additional duties of Director, Computer Centre w.e.f. 25.07.2014 till further orders during the leave period of Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar, under the Rule 35 clause (iii) of Calendar Vol.-III at pages 92-93. The amount of the honorarium be paid against the post of Director, Computer Centre.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 31(v))**

**I-31.** Since the interim orders dated 08.10.2015, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (18228 of 2015) have now been adjourned to 26.11.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Rehana Parveen, Professor of Urdu, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 31(vii))**

**I-32.** Since the interim orders dated 24.08.2015, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (17435 of 2015) have now been adjourned to

28.10.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Professor Raj Kumari Gupta, Department of Education and Professor Anuradha Bhandari, Department of Psychology, be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

**NOTE:** The next date of hearing has been fixed for 26.11.2015.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 31(viii))**

- I-33.** That the Vice-Chancellor has appointed Dr. (Pali) Bhupinder Singh as Associate Professor in the Department of Indian Theatre P.U. against the post lying vacant there, purely on temporary basis, for one year in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP Rs.9000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 (a) at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 and he has been permitted to retain the lien for a period of one year, against his substantive post of Assistant Professor in USOL, P.U.

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

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 31(xiii))**

- I-34.** That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India, and Panjab University, Chandigarh, be executed for implementation of Scheme "National Initiative for Setting up of Design Innovation Centres (DIC), Open Design School & National Design Innovation Network". The Director, University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Panjab University, Chandigarh, would be the contact person for the purpose.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 5)**

- I-35.** That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), between (i) University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, and Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA), and (ii) University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh and ISDC Services India Pvt. Ltd., be executed. Professor Karamjeet Singh would be the contact person for both the MoUs.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 27)**

- I-36.** As per the directions of the Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.16004 of 2015 & the Bar Council of India issued vide No.BCI/D/4628/2015 (Writ) dated 29.09.2015, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has allowed to create an additional seat on medical grounds, as a special case, at University Institute of Legal Studies, for admission of Mr. Tushan Rawal in 3<sup>rd</sup> semester of B.A. LLB (Hons.).

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2015 Para 30(xii))**

**Referring to Sub-Item I-13**, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that this item pertained to the authorization given by the Syndicate to a Committee constituted by itself for grant of affiliation to the Colleges for new courses. In fact, this item should not be for information, but for consideration. The Inspection Committees visited the Colleges in the months of February/March. That meant, the Committees are formed well in time and sent by the Dean, College Development Council. The reports of the Committees are also being received by the University by the month of April. For the last 2-3 years, a Committee of the Syndicate is being appointed and thereafter, another Committee/s is/are being appointed. Now, this has come to them for information and it related to the courses, which have already been started and the classes are being held since August. If they wish to give some input to the University or wish to deliberate on it, how could they do so? In the morning, they have also discussed the item pertaining to Pension, especially in view of the repercussions of 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. In fact, even the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission's recommendations have not been implemented by some of the affiliated Colleges. In all the cases, the recommendations are that the affiliation is granted, though he did not want to name of any of the College because everybody is familiar with the situation of the Colleges. Earlier, the recommendations of the Committee were being evaluated and it was seen – whether full salary is being paid to the teachers, how much Dearness Allowance is being paid, etc., but in the case under consideration, nothing about this has been mentioned. The representatives of the Colleges present here must see whether the recommendations of the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission are being implemented by the Colleges so far as salary component is concerned. Without all this, everything has been recommended. The Colleges are in worst condition as even the minimum salary, i.e., Rs.21,600/- is not being paid by any of the Colleges. Though new courses are being demanded and should be given to the Colleges, but they must do monitoring.

The Vice-Chancellor said that somebody has to take call. If the minimum salary is not being paid, it has been mentioned therein. The point is as to how many Colleges could be closed down.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua intervened to say that, that meant, they should leave them to do whatever they wished to. There must be some deliberation here on the issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Shri Dua) should give him an agenda item, he would process the same. Strict compliance of everything means, half or  $\frac{3}{4}$ <sup>th</sup> of the Colleges have to be closed down. It is good to point out and it is equally good to tighten the things. He is not saying that they should not tighten, but strict compliance has this danger that they have to start closing down a large part of the higher education on behalf of this University and also on behalf of both the other major Universities of Punjab. If their Colleges are not paying the full salaries, the Colleges affiliated to other Universities are also not paying the full salaries. The Punjab Government has legalized that they should pay only Rs.15,600/- + Rs.600/-. He agreed that he did not make an issue into it. It is his personal opinion because he has an eye that when 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission would come, everything would be double. The salary which is now Rs.15,600/-, it would become 226%, which would automatically become Rs.50,000/-.

When Professor Akshaya Kumar said that faculty is to be increased, the Vice-Chancellor asked him to tell him what should they do? He is not supposed to do anything. In fact, he is supposed to do what they would tell him. Now, tell him (Vice-Chancellor) as to what is to be done. When Professor Akshaya Kumar said that it is to be done by the Dean, College Development Council, the Vice-Chancellor enquired as to what is to be done by the Dean, College Development Council. The Dean, College Development Council had formed the Committee and the Committee had done that. The Committee had closed its eyes to strict compliance of all things relating to payment of full salary, including full D.A., etc., only in the interest that if they do strict compliance,  $\frac{3}{4}$ <sup>th</sup> of the Colleges have to be closed down. Now, tell him (VC) as to what is to be done?

On a point of order, Dr. Kuldip Singh said that they should not encourage at least those Colleges which are violating the norms/rules/regulations of the University, and this is under their control. Why they are giving new courses to such Colleges?

Professor Naval Kishore said that the concern shown by Dr. Kuldip Singh is right, but he would like to inform the House that a meeting of this Committee had been held on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2015 and one of the recommendations of the Committee is that if at the time of inspection for new course/s, the Inspection Committee finds certain discrepancies, a two-member Committee would re-visit the College again. The report of the two-member Committee would be presented to the main Committee for consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this point be noted and given to the Committee referred to by Professor Naval Kishore as a handout so that they are empowered to make the recommendation/s.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the point is that if a post is advertised in any of the Colleges situated in Chandigarh or in the University campus, maybe 20 or more best candidates apply, but if a post is advertised in Muktsar not even a single candidate applies, and the reason for the same is that the Colleges do not pay full salary to the teachers. He (Vice-Chancellor) is right that the Colleges are not to be closed down, but they should not be given any new courses unless and until they fulfil the conditions of the University. He suggested that a list of defaulting Colleges should be prepared and no officer of the University should go to any of such Colleges as a Chief Guest; otherwise, the staff of such College/s is encouraged. They, in fact, show that they had links with the University high ups. Even if they did something wrong, nothing would happen to them. It is the factual position that the teachers are being paid by certain Colleges between Rs.6,000/- and Rs.7,000/- p.m. In the end, he said that if any of the Fellows recommend the case of such Colleges to the Dean, College Development Council, he should disclose the name of the Fellow/s to the Vice-Chancellor.

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in **Items I-1 to I-36 on the agenda**, be noted.

### **XLIII. ZERO HOUR**

Shri Varinder Singh stated that he would like to talk about 14 acres of land at Nathuwals, District Moga, which has been given to the University in the year 2014. Earlier, it was estimated that for minor construction an amount of Rs.1 crore is required, but for full construction at least an amount of Rs.10 crore is required. Rs.1 crore was being given by the people of the village, who had donated the land and Rs.2 crore was promised by the Member of Legislative Assembly (MLA) of the area, which was to be provided by either by him himself or was to be collected from the area. That meant, they have a sum of Rs.3 crore. He pleaded that this land should be utilized either by constructing building for the Regional Centre or a College or the land should be returned so that the people concerned could take up the matter with other University.

It was told that there is a dispute as of now. They have won the case in the Lower Court, but the other party has filed an appeal in the Higher Court, which is scheduled for in near future. The University has appointed a Counsel for the purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the central issue which he (Shri Varinder Singh) is raising is that there is a purpose for which the land has been given, and they have not to lose sight of that purpose. If that purpose is still alive, then somebody has to provide facilities for Higher Education in that area. If tomorrow the litigation is finished, what ground work they have done. He asked the Registrar to take Shri Varinder Singh into the fold and make a concrete plan for

the purpose. The Vice-Chancellor clarified that some land was given to the University, which later on went into the litigation. The land is there and the purpose has been defined as to how the things would happen. They required additional resource and a nuclear amount of that resource is being offered by the well-wishers and the local MLA, but they required amount about 3-4 times more amount, which must be committed from somewhere. Either the University commits it from somewhere or they persuade the Punjab Government; otherwise, they want that the land should be returned to them and they would take up the matter with somebody else.

It was clarified that the dispute is on the title of the land itself. When Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the title of the land is in the name of the donor and has it been transferred in the name of the University, it was clarified that somebody has claimed his/her right on the title of the land, but the land has been transferred in the name of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that meant, they are the title holders and somebody else says that it should not have been given to the University. Not that he is saying that he is owner of the land, but is saying that the land has been given to Panjab University without his consent. Now, the question is that they have yet to decided whether they would be able to use that land or not, but they are only taking care of the litigation going on in the Court. Finally, if they won the case that they are the owner of the land, then what would they do? So if they feel that it is of no use of keeping the land with them in view the financial constraints and they do not have any kind of vision from where from they are going to raise the finances, is there any technical difficulty in returning the land to the donor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is the decision, which they have to take.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could not take any such decision, because they do not know the background of the entire case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the purpose of the zero hour is to raise concerns, which could be followed up, and brought to the Syndicate or to have some Committee to look into it and prepare an agenda item.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that whatever property comes to the University, they have to plan for its utilization. If the person is not there, but he had made some commitment that the land should be used for educational purposes, if the University did not use it, then the entire purpose is defeated. Just by saying that they did not have funds, they should throw it away or return it to the donor, did not make any sense. Today, they are facing the financial crunch, but tomorrow they could have surplus funds with them, which they could use for any purpose/s, including promotion of higher education. So they must contest the case to the last end, and if they won the case in their favour, they could further decide as to what is to be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is – right now it is wishful thinking, and the wishful thinking is that the Punjab Government is very keen to promote vocational agenda in the rural Colleges. If they could open a College of that kind by taking money from the State Higher Education Council of Punjab of which he (Vice-Chancellor) is also a member, then also they could implement that agenda. They could serve the purpose for which the offer was initially made. So he is willing to work with them.

Professor Naval Kishore said that the land in question is in Nathuwala Village. It has also been promised that an amount of Rs.3 crore would be given for construction, but it did not materialize. Since the University had not the funds, they could not construct the buildings. Had the financial crunch been not



there, the University might have constructed the building and started offering certain courses.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the U.T. Administration has opened a new College by taking money from the State Higher Education Council. Why could they not do so? They should at least submit a proposal to the Punjab Government for obtaining funds from the State Higher Education Council so that they could open a Vocational College in that rural area.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that their (donors) purpose is that 4 years have passed and something like Educational Institution should be opened because Baba Farid University of Health Sciences is approaching them for having the land for opening a Nursing College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no harm in setting up a meeting. The Vice-Chancellor of Baba Farid University of Health Sciences, Dr. Raj Bahadur, is co-incidentally had been a member of their Senate. He would set up a meeting with Dr. Raj Bahadur. Their only purpose is that they must provide something to that reason, and if that is the demand of the public, they should not stand in their way. They have to serve the purpose of the people of that area, and if need be, they could also have a MoU with Baba Farid University to promote education in that area. Anyhow, he would talk to Dr. Raj Bahadur.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they have some prime land at Shimla, Dalhousie, Amritsar and Panipat. He suggested that a committee should be constituted to suggest ways and means for utilizing the land in the best possible ways.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that the issue, which he is going to raise, is a bit chronic and unfortunate. Whatever a little remedy they have made is very slow? It was in relation to queries posed to the Hon'ble Registrar regarding questions to be raised in the zero hour. He sent few questions and the first was about the chronic issue of replacement against the transfer of Dr. Jasbir Singh, which was made from P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni. He remembers that before this House, he withdrew from all the Committees. He would like to inform this August House that in the last two months, he has withdrawn himself from various Committees, Board of Studies in Applied Science, Committee to discuss the differential fee structure, Regulations Committee, Flying Squad/s, Selection Panel, etc. He has also sent an e-mail to him (Vice-Chancellor). Dr. Jasbir Singh was transferred from P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2015 as per the answer received from the office of the Registrar. 10 months down the line has already passed, but no replacement has been provided, despite his repeated observations and walkouts and withdrawal from various Committees as a matter of protest. Still they have not moved an inch. He has got a letter from the Director, P.U. Regional Centre on 18<sup>th</sup> November requesting to fill the post. So for the last 9 months, they have not moved an inch. Secondly, in the year 2014, a sum of Rs.1 crore was sanctioned as a seed money for construction of P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar, and the University has admitted that a sum of Rs.1 crore was sanctioned. It is unfortunate that during the last about two years, they have just been indulging in soil test to check the bearing capacity. In some meetings of the Syndicate, it was raised by some members that to begin with they should construct the boundary wall. So for the last two years, no progress has been made. Thirdly, he has been repeatedly making the case of Constituent Colleges that they did not have faculty there. He had just raised the question for the reasons for not making the appointment of faculty. Whether the University has not got grants from the Punjab Government or the P.U. Constituent Colleges fund account is running into bad deficit. Whether they are not able to advertise the posts due to these reasons? The reply which he has got from the office of the Registrar is that the appointment of Assistant Professors could not be considered due to non-

finalization of qualifications for Assistant Professors and transfer policy. Whether they needed a transfer policy for making appointment of guest faculty? Whether they do not have a template for appointment of Assistant Professors in P.U. Constituent Colleges or Teaching Departments of Panjab University? So repeatedly time and again, he has been raising this point on the floor of the Senate. He did not know whether he has been raising un-academic issues or any un-academic question has been raised by un-academic person or academic question raised by un-academic person or the vice versa. Tell him as a chairman of the Senate as to what should he do? A member could only stage a walkout from the House and withdrew from the membership of various Committee, etc. where he could have contributed a little bit being a member of the teaching faculty for the last 26 years. Just guide him. Often people have been objecting that he has been taking a lot of valuable time of the House as he is in the habit of going into the details of the case/s. It would be worthwhile as a chairman of the Senate to tell guide him as to what should he do?

The Vice-Chancellor, clarifying the position, stated that first of all, he sincerely regretted the delay in responding to the needs of P.U. Constituent Colleges as well as the delay in following the construction of the building for P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar. It is because of that concern or his (Shri Dyal) repeated voicing the concerns of these things from supposedly those areas of Punjab where the higher education is not there of a quality, which ought to be. One of the first tasks which he told Dr. P.S. Sandhu, Secretary & Advisor to the Vice-Chancellor, is that this entire agenda is to be done. He has been following up that the guest faculty should be given in these Constituent Colleges at the earliest. He wanted to tell that he has now got, after a lot of persuasion, the finalization of the advertisement for the posts of Principals of three P.U. Constituent Colleges, and at least 6-8 faculty members would be provided in each of these Constituent Colleges and also Assistant Professors in P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni. He has also promised, after the visit of Dr. Sandhu, to visit Muktsar himself. He has also promised to meet the Chief Minister of Punjab that they would go ahead with the construction of P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar, in two phases. In Phase-II, the permanent building should be there, but in the initial phase. They have drawn up a plan that they should have pre-fab structure put in place, for which they would use Rs.1 crore and whatever little more money from other sources. They would have pre-fab structure in place while the construction of the building has to be there. He has also talked to Shri Nirmaljit Singh Kalsi, Additional Secretary, who has been given the responsibility to carry out the construction of such many other educational institutions during next one year. So he is in touch with him and he has a meeting in his office. He is seriously following with Shri Nirmaljit Singh Kalsi. While they install the pre-fab structure, the permanent structure would be there. To see that he (Shri Dyal) is kept in loop, he (Vice-Chancellor) would form an Advisory Committee for P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar, P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni and P.U. Constituent Colleges, and make sure that he (Shri Dyal) is in the decision making of the region for which he is continuously expressing his concerns. He asked Dr. P.S. Sandhu to give his tour programme to Shri Raghbir Dyal, and let him with him (Dr. Sandhu) during his visit to P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar and P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni.

Shri Raghbir Dyal remarked that the Vice-Chancellor's words are very well taken. He is ready to go any extra mile. His only simple question is why they have to take one full year to appoint just guest faculty. In fact, this is a normal/administrative process.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is why, he wanted to have permanent Principals in the Constituent Colleges so that they did not face such problem anymore.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that the Registrar has visited all the Constituent Colleges and P.U. Regional/Rural Centres and has got all the records. His only humble submission is why they have taken one year to appoint guest faculty. Apart from this, he wanted to raise one more important issue. Recently, he had got an opportunity to visit their Shooting Range, which is very good. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to make some parts computerize so that they could hold international competitions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Shri Raghbir Dyal is well taken.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they have the Shooting Range of international standard, and their request the Dean of Student Welfare through to him (Vice-Chancellor) or whosoever is taking care of that, that even if they have to collect a sum of Rs.5 or Rs.10/- from the students as sports fund, they should do that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no issue at all.

Continuing further, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that their aim should be to make the entire Shooting Range computerized. If they could not do it in one go, they could do it in parts so that they could have international competitions there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could have a Detailed Project Report (DPR) made and start implementing the DPR. He further said that no issue at all because the Shooting Range is not only to be used by the Panjab University alone, but all the people in this region.

Professor Akshaya Kumar stated that there are two issues – one is that their V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur, is in shamble, and they seemed to give up, which is his impression.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have not given up. There are that many things, which are to be attended to by urgency by few people. All of them could not pitch in to attend to the whole agenda. That is what, he is trying to do. The progress might be slow because he has spent large part of his last six month just for getting the funds released from the Government. They could themselves imagine how visits and phone calls he had made and how many letters he has written. They could not imagine how much efforts he has put in so see that the financial future of the University is secured. It is not so easy as the Secretaries kept changing, and even then he has kept liaison with them.

Professor Akshaya Kumar stated that a Committee on the same lines should be formed so that after all it is their own Institute. The second issue, which is in his mind is – of course, they do not say that every teacher needs to be promoted and the CAS is his birth right, but one of their colleagues appeared in the interview recently, and she has written him a letter complaining that the experts in the Selection Committee were not from the core area. They were, in fact, from the Faculty of Education, but she belonged to Community Education and Disability Studies. Since it is a different Department, there should be a different set up for them. How could they have same experts for Education as well as Community Education and Disability Studies? She has requested and he is also requesting that since she has requisite number of points, the interview should be held again.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the interview could not be re-held. The interview could be re-held after a certain interval. The candidate knows her weaknesses. Professor A.K. Bhandari was there in the meeting of the Committee and he knows how poor the performance of the candidate was. The point is that

after all it is a selection and a quality judgment. He requested Professor Akshaya Kumar not to question the selection. There is no bias, malice against the candidate. Professor Akshaya Kumar could ask Professor A.K. Bhandari about the performance of the candidate and whether any injustice was done to the candidate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that recently the NAAC Team visited the Colleges and the Colleges could not fair well in the research dimension. Since December, 2013, there is no Research Centre in the Faculties of Arts and Commerce & Business Management not even in a single College. But in the Faculty of Science, they are having Research Centres in many Colleges. Even they did not have approved Ph.D. teachers for supervising the Ph.D. students in the Faculty of Commerce & Business Management. There is an immediate need, whatever the conditions or regulations the University imposes, if they qualify for those, those should be given to the College teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could have a meeting of the Research Promotion Cell of the Colleges and point out the issues which are hanging. Professor A.K. Bhandari is also aware of these things. Let them have a meeting to be convened under the chairmanship of Professor Bhandari involving persons from the RPC of the Colleges, Director and Associate Director, Research Promotion Cell to attend to these problems. He has received similar complaints not only from Dr. Dalip Kumar but also from S.D. College and other Colleges also. They must attend to these issues.

Dr. Dalip Kumar supplemented his statement that the Research Promotion Cell in the College is already there but there is a need to empower the Cell. He along with Professor Mukesh Arora had proposed a resolution which was discussed in the meeting of Syndicate in 2014 and a Committee under the chairmanship of Professor B.S. Bhoop was constituted. The meeting of the Committee has not been held since February 2015. Recently in U.T. Chandigarh and Punjab, about 65 teachers have been elevated to the post of Professor under CAS. He wanted a concrete decision that the meeting of the Committee should be held.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he understood the concern shown by Dr. Dalip Kumar and a meeting of the Committee would be held without waiting for the restructuring.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in September 2014, he had written a letter to the Vice-Chancellor that there is a provision of CAS promotion from Stage-5 to Stage-6 under UGC Regulation 6.4.10. After that, he had submitted a resolution in November 2014. However, he has not received any communication in this regard. This provision is only for the 10% of the existing faculty. There are clear-cut guidelines.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor A.K. Bhandari had made enquiries about it. None of the Colleges has adopted the regulation of UGC for promotion from Stage-5 to Stage-6.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that he would submit the report.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would send a reply to the queries made by Dr. Dalip Kumar.

Dr. S.S. Sangha said that the resolution regarding reservation of seats for rural students, everything had been done positively. Last year, this information could not be got printed in the prospectus as the Vice-Chancellor had said that there were some legal issues involved in that. It had been approved by the

Committees of the DPI (Colleges) and also by the Syndicate. A final decision should be taken in this regard so that this provision could be inserted in the prospectus for admissions in the year 2016-17.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into the matter.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the legal opinion has been received. The only thing to be done is that they should not make any distinction on geographical basis but include the rural areas anywhere in India and it would be finalized shortly.

Professor Krishan Gauba raising the issues of Dental College stated that he was equally concerned with the Dental College and he is well aware of the fact that the Vice-Chancellor was also doing things in this direction but over the years nothing has happened. In his view, there were two types of problems, one is that there was no promotion policy of the faculty in the Dental College and second thing was that the staff working there have got extension for more than 15 times and they were working on *ad hoc* basis for a period of more than 10 years, they were doubly exploiting them, no increments are being given to them, they have crossed the age bar to be considered anywhere. In his opinion, it was a human exploitation and it was the high time to redress all these issues of the Dental College within a specified time frame.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he has got the issue, a plan has struck to him, he was already working on a plan, and he will attend to it and share with him.

Stating further, Professor Gauba wanted that justice should be done to all. According to him, by now certain things have been added. At the time of their entry in service, the things were different from today, those should be taken as the base-line. He stated that directly he had no concern with the dental college but that institution was his baby.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that Professor Gauba is the Dean of Faculty of Science and he is also the Chairman of the IDA, Chandigarh and in this way, the issues concerning Dental College were his own.

Dr. Kuldip Singh stated that the issue of Research Centres in the Colleges and the supervision by the College teacher for Ph.D. candidates which has been discussed so many times, now needs to be clinched finally. He suggested that a comprehensive Committee should be constituted to resolve the issue. He further stated that he has so many complainants of the teachers with him. He cited the example of a teacher of the subject of History, who had applied three years ago and have given 6 reminders to the Department but they are reluctant to decide his case. He desired that the issue be resolved by constituting a Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that all the things should be given to him in a file.

Dr. Kuldip Singh stated that every time assurances are given by the Vice-Chancellor but on the ground reality level nothing concrete happened. This time too, he will supply all the things to the Vice-Chancellor but even though, he is not sure as to whether there would be any advancement in the matter. He further stated that Dean University Instruction is very much there in the House and adding Dean Research and two three fellows, a Committee may be constituted to resolve the issue.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Dr. Kuldip Singh not to be so pessimistic that nothing would happen. He further stated that if he (Vice-Chancellor) had taken such type of attitude, then he would not be able to bring any money from the Government. How many times he happened to go to Delhi and how many times he happened to approach the same person for the same thing. He questioned as to why he was doing all these things, one would have to be a die-hard optimist and he (Vice-Chancellor) believed that he (Dr. Kuldip Singh) was a die-hard optimist, otherwise he would not have been coming to the Senate meetings. He (Dr. Kuldip Singh) might look at his attendance record. It would be cent-percent. He had prepared a list of the attendance of the Senate members.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said he wanted to tell Dr. Kuldip Singh that a lot of work has been done in this direction and the issue has been raised 2-3 times during the meetings of the Chairpersons and many of the Chairpersons have done it. In several departments like Hindi, there was some problem which has now been solved. If there is some problem with 1-2 departments, that would also be sorted out at the earliest.

Principal S.S. Randhawa said that he had pointed out in the last meeting of the Senate as also Shri Raghbir Dyal has talked about the Constituent Colleges. He did not know under which Rules/Regulations, Mr. Kamaljit Singh has been appointed as the Coordinator of the Constituent Colleges. Mr. Kamaljit Singh, a person of the rank of Associate Professor is asking for comments from the Principal, who is of the rank of Professor. There are other higher authorities in the University like the Registrar, Dean College Development Council and Dean of University Instruction which could ask for the comments. As earlier also, it has come on the agenda that a junior person could not seek the comments from a person higher in rank. It is not known what functions the Coordinator is supposed to perform.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he wanted to make the appointment of the Principal in the Constituent Colleges. He failed to do so because of the things which all of the members are aware. As soon as the appointment of Principals is done, the role of the Coordinator is over. This is an intervening period of 1-2 months and the matters will be resolved.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that only a higher authority could seek the explanation, if any, and not the lower authority.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had received a letter from the Under Secretary of the Government of India. What he could tell? Should he not reply to that letter? This attitude is not correct. Even a Section Officer sends the letter to him. It is his duty to comply with that wherever he is supposed to.

On a point of order, Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that she wanted to add one thing. As earlier Professor A.K. Bhandari said that legal opinion has been sought in a matter. Being a member of the Syndicate and Senate, she has also observed that legal opinions are being sought on so many matters. They are having 3 Law Officers in the University whether they are not competent to give opinion on interpretation of the statute. Since the University is passing through a financial crunch, is it proper to seek the legal opinion from a third person by making a payment of big amount. They could think of some Advocates, who must be interested to provide their services free of cost to the University. Since they are having their own Law Officers who are equally competent and qualified, they must get the things clarified from them. In this way, if they are able to save some little amount, these savings could become a big amount.

Dr. Dyal Pratap Singh Randhawa said that the services of senior Professors of Law could also be sought in this regard.

Principal S.S. Randhawa said that a decision was taken in the Syndicate to provide a golden chance for improvement to the students. That should be looked into. Secondly, the Executive Engineers and Sub Divisional Officers of the Construction Office are working on the same post for the last 15-16 years, it could be thought of providing some promotional avenues to those persons.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter is already under consideration.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he had two issues to discuss. First is regarding the news item reported in The Tribune. Though there is freedom of the Press and of speech, he did not want to comment about that. But definitely, one of their own members is saying that something distinguishing some members as non-academician and academician, then definitely he has the right to say and argument and right to convey to that member as a brother that it does not suit to the spirit of the House. Here, they all are equal. Definitely, they could say that some of the members are not teachers. The members could consider them as non-teachers but quoting them as non-academics, at least he could not digest it.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that she fully agreed what Dr. Randhawa is saying.

Continuing, Dr. Randhawa said that he is not easy with this. He did not want to tell about the achievements of the non-teachers in the House. Those members are contributing a lot and could contribute, if not less, but at par with the teachers. He is not questioning the media. His question is to his brother members. Secondly, any wiser statement or suggestion could come from any person from any walk of life. So just considering that those who are delivering lecture from the books to the students and imparting education does not mean that they are the only persons who could say themselves as academicians. This is his viewpoint. The other specific issue with regard to the Ph.D. students for Gandhian and Peace Studies as this subject is not at the undergraduate level. When he was student in the University, at that time any student from social sciences subjects from Faculty of Arts could join Ph.D. in Gandhian and Peace Studies.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not only from social sciences, but any student could join the Ph.D. in Gandhian and Peace Studies.

Continuing, Dr. Randhawa said that there was a time when the subjects of medicine and engineering had collaboration in multidisciplinary subjects. When the Vice-Chancellor asked Professor Bhandari to look into the matter, Dr. Randhawa said that this matter is already in his knowledge. He said that he is talking about the Ph.D. students, who have gone to NATO and other international conferences and specifically spoken on the peace studies. The student is from Political Science background and has done Masters and M.Phil and UGC NET, but the candidate is not being allowed to do Ph.D. in Gandhian and Peace Studies. He did not know what are the reasons. His submission is that, the Gandhian and Peace Studies being such a vast subject, if they see Gandhiji from political science, sociological, historical or law aspect, that the Dean of University Instruction must take personal interest so that the student could be admitted in Ph.D. when one of the teachers is already ready to guide the student.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that actually the condition for doing Ph.D. in Gandhian and Peace Studies is that students from any discipline could join Ph.D. There is no problem. Somehow, the Department took a decision that anybody who wants to pursue Ph.D. should qualify the entrance test in Gandhian and Peace Studies of the University. But that candidate has qualified the UGC NET in the subject of Political Science and not the entrance test in Gandhian and Peace Studies. He said that they are taking it up with the Department.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the entrance test is just like a filter.

Some of the members said that the candidate might not get the increments for Ph.D.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members should understand the University does not produce graduates just to get jobs as teachers in the society. The number of graduates which is passing out, for example, if it is 100, the number of people who ultimately end up as College teachers where NET is compulsory is 1-2% of the total. What about the remaining 98% of the students? Those students are going and doing jobs where there is no need of NET. So, they could not just make decision like that. If a student does not get the job of a College teacher, that is his/her problem.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that otherwise also it is an associated subject, and the candidate has to do Ph.D. through entrance test, if the candidate has qualified the NET in the subject of Political Science, that could also be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said why could the students having NET in science subject be not allowed to pursue Ph.D. in other subjects? It is not a correct approach and they should rise above narrow considerations. Wherever they could do, they should do.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he joined his first service in the Department of Gandhian and Peace Studies. At that time the qualification for joining as Lecturer in Gandhian and Peace Studies was M.A. in any subject with specialization either in Gandhian or Peace Studies. He was selected as Lecturer. Then somebody from the Department of Gandhian and Peace Studies filed a case in the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court against two teachers who were selected. The High Court gave the decision in favour of the petitioner. The Panjab University approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Supreme Court has made the judgment in line with the Department that it is a feeling whether the University would decide to whom to take and the Court should not interfere. So, they were reinstated. But now, after that, the Department of Gandhian and Peace Studies has its own M.A. in Gandhian and Peace Studies. Those students who have done M.A. in Gandhian and Peace Studies, and are not being absorbed in History, Political Science, Economics, Sociology because the Colleges do not have the subject of Gandhian and Peace Studies at graduate level, could say where they could go.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not ask the people to come here and do this. It is not a correct approach in life. It is the choice of the people. The University is not producing graduates just to become teachers in the Colleges.



Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the subject is not mentioned in the Ph.D., only the Faculty is mentioned. If the candidate has NET in the subject of Political Science and the supervisor is from Gandhian and Peace Studies, the degree would be issued of the Faculty of Arts.

G.S. Chadha  
Registrar

Confirmed

**Arun Kumar Grover**  
**VICE-CHANCELLOR**