

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Sunday, 31st July 2016 at 10.00 a.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice-Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Dr. Ajay Ranga
3. Professor Anil Monga
4. Shri Ashok Goyal
5. Dr. Balbir Chand Josan
6. Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi
7. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
8. Professor Emanuel Nahar
9. Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky
10. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
11. Principal I.S. Sandhu
12. Professor Keshav Malhotra
13. Professor Navdeep Goyal
14. Shri Raghbir Dyal
15. Dr. Shelley Walia
16. Principal Surinder Singh Sangha
17. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) Registrar ... (Secretary)

Shri Jitender Yadav, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Shri T.K. Goyal, Director Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

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

- (1) Mr. Neeraj Chopra, a student of DAV College, Chandigarh, won a Gold Medal in the men's Javelin Throw by throwing the javelin at a distance of 86.48m on July 24, 2016 at the U-20 World Championship held at Bydgoszcz in Poland. He is reported to be the first Indian athlete to set a World record at any level.
- (2) Ms. Anayat Kaur of University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, won Silver Medal in team event during the International Youth Archery Festival held at South Korea from July 21-27, 2016.

These achievements were applauded by the members by thumping of desks.

- (3) Governing Council of the Association of Indian Universities (AIU) at its meeting held on June 30, 2016 considered the notification issued by the University Grants Commission for revision of pay of academic staff of Universities and Colleges. AIU has constituted a Committee to prepare a collective view and place the same before the Pay Committee of UGC. In this regard

AIU has sent an email to this office on July 25, 2016 seeking suggestions/comments on the subject mentioned above so as to reach them by 31.08.2016.

- (4) In response to a suggestion from the Syndicate, an email ID 'support.xen@pu.ac.in' has been created for submission of complaints online to the office of the Executive Engineer for various types of works.
- (5) A copy of the communication sent to the Chairman, UGC, after my meeting with the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource Development, on July 25, 2016 had been sent by email to all the Syndicate members. Such a communication collates together all the documents giving an update on 'Funding situation of Panjab University'. This would be brought to the attention of members of Board of Finance on August 1, 2016. The UGC has nominated Dr. J.K. Tripathy, Joint Secretary (Finance) to attend the Board of Finance meeting on August 1, 2016. The Ministry of Human Resource Development has directed the UGC to participate in the meeting of Board of Finance and also sent the comments to be placed before the Board of Finance.
- (6) Dr. Ashu Khosla, Assistant Professor, Deptt. of Geology, along with an American researcher Spencer G. Lucas, has edited a Volume entitled "Cretaceous Period: Biotic Diversity and Biogeography" on behalf of New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science (NMMNH&S) as its Bulletin #71. Dr. Khosla has also contributed three articles in this prestigious American Journal. The Volume includes Dinosaur papers from India, North America, France, Germany, Spain, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Africa, etc.
- (7) The J. Paul Getty Trust, a philanthropic institution dedicated for conservation of world's artistic legacy, selects every year 10 monuments from across the globe for funding the study of Conservation Management Plan for 'Keeping it Modern' as an initiative. Gandhi Bhawan was one amongst the ten such monuments chosen for the year 2015. The Getty Foundation conducted a three day Workshop at London from Jul 24-26, 2016, to make an assessment of progress of the study being carried out by the participating institutions and exchange of best practices adopted by these institutions. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), our Registrar along with the two representatives of DRONAH presented a study report on Gandhi Bhawan. The presentation received wide appreciation at the London Workshop.

As a feedback, the Registrar has opined that there is a need of making a comprehensive Conservation Management Plan for the Panjab University Campus and its buildings which would include:

- (a) Induction/orientation programme for the employees to be told about their heritage

- (b) Sustainability plan for the buildings and facilities
- (c) Archiving of records
- (d) Erasing of earlier interventions, which could be detrimental for the life of the building
- (e) Incorporation of relevant clauses for contract agreements to ensure conservation of original character of the buildings
- (f) Prepare a Do and Don'ts document for the various stakeholders
- (g) Build community consensus and form a Conservation Management Committee to review the status periodically.

A Conservation Management Committee shall be constituted for the Panjab University Campus to review the status periodically. It would be a part of the IQAC.

Principal S.S. Sangha congratulated the University and the students for achievement in the sports. In the professional Colleges, the students take admission in the sports category but did not take part in the sports. If some sportspersons get positions at national level in the sports, the GNDU waives off the fee of those professionals for that year. Panjab University could also adopt the same scheme.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the fee is already being waived off in such cases.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that during the time of admission, two sports students of Law faced the problem. One student had to go to Korea and the other had to go out of country for participating in Squash. In both these cases, the parents were not allowed to submit the documents at the time of counselling which is held just to show the documents and there was no interview, etc. Both the students had a valid reason. Either they should take a decision or the Dean of University Instruction be directed that if any student is going for international event, it should be allowed so that no student could miss the chance of getting the admission as the student had filled up the form, had appeared and cleared the entrance test.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky suggested that both the students namely, Mr. Neeraj Chopra and Ms. Anayat Kaur should be honoured by the Panjab University.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it is a world record.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Independence Day is nearing and they have invited Lt. Gen. K.J. Singh to be the Guest of Honour on that day. A memento could be given to these students.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that as Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa had pointed out the date of clash of admission and the international event, in such cases, the Dean of University Instruction

be authorized to consider such cases on the recommendation of the Director, Sports.

Professor Keshav Malhotra congratulated on the achievement. They are proud of these students. He said that the participants of youth festivals should be provided the facilities so that they could excel. He pointed out that at one point of time, the Bhangra team of the Department of Evening Studies used to excel. They should organize cultural activities so that the overall development of the students could take place. He said that the contribution of Dr. Surinder Sharma in cultural activities was laudable and he had devoted himself to the cultural activities since the year 1965. He suggested that Dr. Surinder Sharma should also be awarded on the Independence Day for his contribution to the cultural activities.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it is a good suggestion.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he had seen during his days in the Students Council that Dr. Surinder Sharma used to participate in these activities. Besides teaching, he played a very important role in promoting cultural activities.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that in addition to giving an award, Dr. Surinder Sharma be made a special invitee for the Cultural Activities Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Director, Youth Welfare could consult Dr. Surinder Sharma.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired if there is any gradation of sports in the Panjab University for giving the awards.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they could think of giving Lifetime Achievement Awards.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are having Kala Rattan Award which is to be given this year.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he had been a student of Dr. Surinder Sharma from 1980 to 1985.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could send the nominations and the same could be considered by the Committee. There is no issue at all and they could honour Dr. Surinder Sharma on Independence Day. He has also known him as a student.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he would like to congratulate the two students who have excelled in these sports. During the last meetings of the Syndicate/Senate, he had said that the shooting range of the Panjab University is very good.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Raghbir Dyal to raise such issues during zero hour and if deemed appropriate action could be taken. To this, Shri Raghbir Dyal agreed.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what exactly they propose to constitute under item no.6 of the Vice-Chancellor statement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to appoint a Committee and the Committee would orient the employees to the heritage of the University and periodical lectures could be held. The Committee could be formed with the help of the Architect and the XEN identifying the buildings which are heritage. They are having so many heritage buildings like Dewan Anand Kumar Hall, which was constructed at a time when such buildings were not there at all. Then there are buildings such as Student Centre, Library, Chemical Engineering which are very unique buildings constructed on behalf of the University. These are the heritage buildings and some plan has to be adopted to conserve these buildings. Then they would have to worry about the money involved and would have to find the sponsors. If they could activate such people who have graduated from the University and they could expect the alumni to contribute. It is worth doing.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it is not only worth doing but essential in the long run when they see that the University stands for 200/300 years. If they look at the Ivy League University, the amount of money that they spend on preservation of retaining the heritage aspect, no encroachment is allowed. They have to see that for some of the buildings here, they have taken pains to look after their up-keep. It is a wonderful suggestion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to suggest that instead of having a Conservation Management Committee, they could do it in the umbrella of something like Panjab University Heritage Conservation Committee so that the alumni of Panjab University are involved with a message that they are the ones who have to take the responsibility to take care of the heritage. This Committee could comprise the people who are responsible for managing the heritage, raising funds, for having the sentimental and emotional attachment also, everything to be included and then they could include the aims and objectives.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the large purpose of celebrating the birth centenary and organizing Foundation Day lectures is to connect all such things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are having the Panjab University Alumni Association to maintain connection with the people. But keeping the specific thing in mind and it is such a message that even the students who had passed out in 1930 or 1940 would also like to come and see the buildings and try to find out the same bench where he/she used to sit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is in the same sense that so many corporates maintain the roundabouts. The civil society is trying to preserve the things, it is a part of the tradition of this University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Corporation is also having sponsors even to maintain the parks.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the School of Communication Studies and the University Institute of Hotel and Tourism are preparing a documentary 'Heritage Walk of the University'. It is an app having a walk plan which could be downloaded and as per the instructions, one could walk around the campus. It would be useful as the students who had studied in the campus and they did not know

the heritage of the campus. Once it is successful, it would be implemented for Chandigarh Tourism also and when it is ready, it would be something very nice.

Professor Shelley Walia said that they have to check what the other Universities are doing that they announce campaigns for raising the funds otherwise this would remain as conversation.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that once they have made such kind of set up for retaining the heritage, the detailed aims and objective should be made at the earliest. It should become a comprehensive plan.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is why the Committee is being formed and whatever they have discussed would be recorded and the Committee would come to know what they have to do and in which background the Committee is formed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Registrar might not be able to have the idea.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is why the Registrar came forward and said that let them take it forward.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the people should know that they were campaigning for particular heritage preservation. As an immediate impact, he had one little paragraph, when immediate conditions come, they have to act upon it apart from conversations, debates and lectures. He had got this from the Ivy League University which immediately goes into action for raising funds. It is an announcement sent out to everyone. He read out a few sentences in brief which read "We will have to raise more than 2 billion for the heritage fund to keep our University going. Can you give us the donation of any size? Click here to donate tonight which meant that any alumni sitting anywhere could donate even 10 dollars and he/she does it. You can also donate by cheque. Please include your e-mail address on your cheque". This was an advertisement sent by the Cambridge University.

Professor Anil Monga said that the people are interested to donate. But so far they have not identified the funds like the Research Promotion Fund.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the Committee do all such things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let it be resolved today that Panjab University Heritage Conservation Committee is constituted with the Vice-Chancellor as its ex-officio Chairman. Let it take the structured shape and a Committee be constituted to suggest the other names who could be included in the Committee while including Professor Shelley Walia as he had a proposal.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the recently elected Shimla Municipal Corporation has started and created a chart plan of the history of the building, when it was constructed, what was the importance during the British time, post-British time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that all these things would be included in the agenda of the Committee.

At this stage Vice-Chancellor asked Shri Raghbir Dyal that he was wanting to share something earlier he may do so now.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that in democracy one could find that there might be some people who would not toe the line. But generally there is a difference between a statesman and a leader. About 10 minutes ago, he just wanted to say that they have got a very good shooting range. He has talked about this earlier also. It would be better if they could computerize it to which the Vice-Chancellor said that it is a matter of zero hour, the suggestion could be given later. He understood that Shri Ashok Goyal is a very senior member and other members including Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and Dr. Ajay Ranga also have spoken and so many suggestions have been given. The Vice-Chancellor had listened to all of them. It might be that the Vice-Chancellor realized that Shri Raghbir Dyal was not allowed to speak. This is a difference that the statesman takes all of them together. If there is any dissent, even then he takes them along. He said that after this he did not think that he had anything to say. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to proceed.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Mr. Neeraj Chopra, a student of DAV College, Chandigarh, on having won a Gold Medal in the men's Javelin Throw at the U-20 World Championship held at Bydgoszcz in Poland and reportedly to be the first Indian athlete to set a World record at any level;
 - (ii) Ms. Anayat Kaur of University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, on having won Silver Medal in team event during the International Youth Archery Festival held at South Korea;
 - (iii) Dr. Ashu Khosla, Assistant Professor, Deptt. of Geology on having edited, along with an American Researcher Spencer G. Lucas, a Volume entitled "Cretaceous Period: Biotic Diversity and Biogeography" on behalf of New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science (NMMNH&S) as its Bulletin #71 and having contributed three articles;
- (2) Panjab University Heritage Conservation Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, under his Chairmanship;
- (3) Mr. Neeraj Chopra, Ms. Anayat Kaur and Dr. Surinder Sharma be honoured on Independence Day;

- (4) the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Serial Nos.(3), (4), (5), and (6) be noted and approved; and
- (5) the action taken reports on the decisions of the of Syndicate meetings dated 14th March 2016 and 1st/15th/28th/29th May 2016, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

Promotion from Assistant Professors (Stage-2) to Assistant Professors (Stage-3), under the CAS, in the Department of Geology

2(i). Considered minutes dated 04.07.2016 (**Appendix-II**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professors (Stage-2) to Assistant Professors (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Geology, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professors (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professors (**Stage-3**), in the Department of Geology, 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.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|------------|
| 1. Dr. Ashu Khosla | : | 07.11.2014 |
| 2. Dr. Parampreet Kaur | : | 07.11.2014 |
| 3. Dr. Gurmeet Kaur | : | 19.03.2016 |

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under (CAS) in the Department of Environment Studies

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 04.07.2016 (**Appendix-III**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Environment Studies, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Rajeev Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **8.11.2014** 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 post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under the CAS, at UIET

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 04.07.2016 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the Ms. Hema Setia be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **09.01.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

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

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 04.07.2016 (**Appendix-V**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Amit Sobti be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**), at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **01.10.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under (CAS) in the Department of Philosophy

2(v). Considered minutes dated 04.07.2016 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Philosophy, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the Shri Lallan Singh Baghel be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Philosophy, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **24.11.2011**, 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 (**subject to decision in CWP No. 17953 of 2005**); the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under (CAS) at Institute of Educational Technology & Vocational Education

2(vi). Considered minutes dated 04.07.2016 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Institute of Educational Technology & Vocational Education, P.U. Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Kalpana Thakur be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at Institute of Educational Technology & Vocational Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **14.09.2015**, 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 post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That letters of promotion to the persons promoted under Items C-2(i) to C-2(vi), be issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Audit report relating to Pension Account

3. Considered, the audit report relating to Pension Account submitted by Shri Amrik Singh Bhatia, IA&S.

The Vice Chancellor stated that in addition to the agenda Item 3, there are certain more papers. So this is the report of Amrik Singh Bhatia Committee. The report came on 15th of July and he, considering the seriousness of the report and the issues involved, convened a meeting of few colleagues on 18th of July 2016. Since the First Information Report (FIR) already stands filed and the investigation is on, on behalf of the Economic Offences Wing, this report was forwarded to the Economic Offences Wing as also to the U.T. Administration. A copy of the report was also sent to the Finance Secretary, U.T., Chandigarh as well as to the Inspector General of Police (IGP). The report pertaining to the Pension Scam is very detailed, and it calls for some action. Hopefully, whatever has to happen as a consequence of the FIR filed, investigation done, the guilty would get consideration by the Law, and its outcome would eventually be placed before the Syndicate for consideration. The process is on, and it is not that they have put the matter under the carpet. Then there are many other related issues, which are there as part of the report. According to him, procedures needed to be corrected and many other things needed to be done, so that the University employees in particular, but society in general, have confidence that they are managing the affairs properly. The pensioners, of course, feel very anxious that some money has gone out and it would affect the disbursement of pension. The way the pensions are disbursed in their system at the moment, there is pension Fund, the interest of which is added on to the income of the University. So Pension Fund *per se* is not being used to pay pension only as its interest is part of the University income. The total salary bill of the University has many components. So the burden of pension is on the Non-Plan Budget of the University, and so long the people are getting their salaries, pensioners are as secure as the salaries are. The Government of India has agreed to this arrangement for the disbursal of pension, on behalf of the University, even though the Pension Scheme was introduced in the University a little later than 2004, but in fact, the Pension Scheme of the University had been conceived long ago in 1990s. However, for variety of reasons, it is unfortunate that the Pension Scheme could not be implemented in the 90s. It should have been implemented when the 5th Pay Commission came, but he does not know as to why it could not be implemented. As of now, there is a Pension Scheme in place, which has the sanction of Government of India. Pensions *per se* are as secure as the salaries are. If the salaries are stopped, then the pensions would stop. He does not think unilaterally it would happen that pensions are stopped and the salaries are not stopped. As of now, his understanding of the situation is, the Government commitment to salary and pension is at the same footing. But that does not mean that they have not to introduce the changes in the way they are doing the financial management of the University. Double Entry System was not in place, though they had intended it to put in place. Had it been put in place, probably this fraud might not have happened. Anyhow, now it (Double Entry System) is in place. At the moment important thing is that as a consequence of the report, there are certain changes planned, introduced and monitored so that for a few years it should be monitored, and then brought back to the Governing Body meeting, so that safe and secure processes are introduced; otherwise, what to talk of the society, their own confidence would be in doubt. If they do not have confidence in their system, what could they expect from the

society? The other disturbing things which come out of this report are, statements like that their auditors have not been carrying out the job assigned to them as per their (University authorities) anticipation and as per their job of auditing, because the Resident Audit Officer says that they have not carried out the audit for a long time, which also disturbs Shri Amrik Singh Bhatia. Firstly, they said that they had not done the post audit after 1998, but later on they said that they have not done it after 1978. It could not be digested because if the yearly audited reports are not audited, then what else they have done. So this is matter which they have to take into account and take it up with the U.T. Administration in a formal way. Informally, he has talked to the Advisor, but formally they have to take it up with them. He shall take it up with the U.T. Administration with their authorization, only after today. He had expected the Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh, to be present in this meeting of the Syndicate, but he has not come. So this is needed to be taken up with the Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh and also with the Finance Secretary. Hopefully, these Officers would come to the meeting of the Board of Finance and he would take this issue with them. So all this, that related to the Pension Scam, and there is another set of documents, which have been supplied to them today. He does not expect them to read through these documents as it is a huge bundle of documents. It would take time to read through these documents by them. As members of the Governing Body, they need to read through these documents. Maybe, they have to have another sitting to consider this report, and it is not that everybody should be present, it could be of the members of the Syndicate, who could be easily reached because they come to the next meeting of the Syndicate. After reading through all these documents, they should have in their mind as to what all is to be done as part of this exercise. They have asked their own officers to tell them as to what they have to say on the basis of this report. They have also asked the administration people, namely the accounts people and have also had a meeting with the Assistant Registrars and Superintendents of the administrative office namely Accounts. Though the scam is in the Pension, there are so many other dimensions as they have separate accounts for salary, pension, etc. To have some kind of financial discipline, algorithm, they have to see that the Accounts Manual is followed in letter and spirit. When Professor Shelley Walia enquired that have they taken measures to see that they have a very successful model, the Vice Chancellor said that 3-A has come today and the same is before them. Unless the report is discussed with all of them, he could not do anything because he could not bypass all of them.

Professor Shelley Walia said that what he means to say is, 2-3 months before they implement this on their own with the help of Finance & Development Officer to ensure that all things are according to the Accounts Manual and are managed in a manner, not that it is vogue.

The Vice Chancellor said that first of all, they do not have a special financial cadre. At the moment, anybody could be posted in the Accounts Branch. They have to take a decision whether to have a separate financial cadre. If they have to have a financial cadre, they could not create a financial cadre by recruiting more people, and the financial cadre has to be created out of the existing staff keeping in view their background, and even for that also an algorithm is required. The Syndicate could appoint a Sub-Committee for the purpose, and it is not necessary that it should comprise of only Syndicate members.

Few Syndicate members could volunteer, so that a meeting could be called out of the members of the Senate and Professors of the University, including Public Administration and Management. So they have enough resource internally that they should be able to attend to it, but it has to happen only with the authorization of the Syndicate. The matter is before them and at the end of the meeting it would be before everyone. He thinks well before the minutes are finalized and so on and so forth, they should authorize a Committee to start working on it and start holding meetings with the officers of the University. The Registrar has the responsibility to talk to all the officers in the background of these two reports, so that the image of one and all is protected. They could have a dialogue with the officers and see whether they could come out with self correcting measures. So with the participation of the members of the Syndicate, the Registrar has to work on the plan as to what is to be done. They could record, at the moment, the Syndicate concern that the system has the weaknesses and these things happened. The report says that this should have been done, but it did not happen. It is possible that the report has concluded and if their officers have something to say that this should not have been done. Or the report has concluded something, which should not have happened.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he thinks that both the reports have to be read together. Of course, having gone through the contents, he just wants to understand, probably the earlier report, it has found space in the media also.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had a meeting on 18th of July.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal enquired has the first report been submitted to the Vice Chancellor without having been routed through the main Committee?

The Vice Chancellor said, "Yes", this came to him directly.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they have to be very careful so far as procedures are concerned. Systems and procedures, especially in any financial institution are, in fact, the backbones of the financial system. In this case under consideration, he has just gone through that there is a Committee of six people, including Deputy Registrar (Estt.) as Convener, which has recommended for conduct of re-audit through the Institute of IPAI, but the minutes of that meeting of the Committee are not annexed. There are only one minutes, which are annexed, are of the earlier report submitted by Shri Amrik Singh Bhatia, i.e., the minutes of meeting of the Committee held on 8th October 2015. It is written that the Committee met so many times, where are the minutes of those meetings of the Committee, what did they decide, and when this audit started, because in the minutes of 8th October it has been written that the re-audit or audit is already in process. So when did they recommend, when the fraud took place, when the Vice Chancellor approved, when the audit started. He does not know under what circumstances, in most of the reports which have been placed on the tables, of course to the reason best known to the office, why these reports were not ready on the day when the audit report was ready. If these have been subsequently written because it says that the report has been prepared on 26th July, whereas two of the signatories have written 30th July and two of the signatories have not mentioned any date, and there they are saying that the audit

report is annexed. These gaps clearly say that these have been sent to them without the signatures, which are on the last page, and last page has been prepared separately, and on last page the signatures have been obtained. There are initials of only one person, and those are probably of Shri Bhatia on the rest of the report. He knows that anybody could say, especially from academic circles, that let they should not go into these technicalities, but unfortunately in financial system, only and only the technicalities have to be looked into, and to avoid any kind of financial embezzlement. He knows that it would not be possible to respond just now. He suggested that these gaps should be looked into. He has just had a glance and that is why he is pointing out to them, but having said that he would just like to know as to what is latest status in this case. Like he (Vice Chancellor) was saying that they have referred the case to the Police.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had filed an FIR.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if FIR has been filed, he thinks that this report could also be sent to the Police.

The Vice Chancellor said that the first report which they had discussed on 18th July 2016, a copy of the same has already been sent to the Police. If they wish, a copy of this report could also be sent.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is the need of sending this report to the police.

It was clarified that this is enquiry report, whereas the earlier report was only an audit report.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Right", but what is purpose of sending this to the Police.

It was told that the Police have asked after completing the enquiry, they should give the report to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let him tell them that the Police have no *locus standi* to ask them as to what is their internal report. Then what they are supposed to be doing. At the most, they could tell them (Police) that as per their preliminary investigation, fraud amounting to this much amount has taken place, because they have to adopt the criminal procedure as per the CrPC, whereas they (University) have conducted preliminary investigation as per their own departmental procedure. Now, in every case the Police are saying that they should give their internal enquiry report to them. In the preliminary enquiry, any statement given has no value. If somebody approaches him to give statement, he is very much within his right to say that he would not give his statement. They could record that he was called, and he has not given anything in writing, but he could tell everything verbally and they could record the same. As is case therein, if one has to give statement in Section 161, it is not necessary that the same should be got signed. As such, this difference has to be taken into account. However, he has no objection, if they want to send this report to the Police, they could do so, but then they should wait for the outcome of the Police report, and should not simultaneously do except to take the preventive steps to ensure that such kinds of things do not recur.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could bring in improvement in the system.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that improvements in the system are to be made by them, and for that Police or no Police, improvements of course have to be brought into.

It was said that in any case they could not take any disciplinary action, because it is sub-judice. Both the case of Shri Naresh Sabarwal and Ms. Pooja Bagga is in the Court. So they could not proceed any disciplinary action against them.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired why not.

It was said that because Shri Naresh Sabarwal has represented, because they were proceeding as per Justice Harbans Lal, that they should complete the enquiry. He (Sabarwal) has said that since his case is already in the Court, the enquiry could not be done at two places. Hence, they have stopped this enquiry.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to who told them (the University authorities) to stop the enquiry.

It was said that Justice Harbans Lal has said that since it is already there, and he has also quoted some reference of a Judgement that if similar charges are there at two places, it might not be carried out.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is totally different procedure in Criminal Court and as far as disciplinary proceedings as per their service rules, and there is a settled Law that both the enquiries could be conducted simultaneously. Secondly, even if someone is acquitted or discharged after the criminal trial, they have all freedom to proceed against him/her as per the service conditions, and they could even dismiss him/her. So he does not know who told them that both the enquiries could not be done simultaneously. On such things, they must refer to the settled Service Law. Their Legal Retainer and Law Officer must be knowing about it. He is sure that the Enquiry Officers must have charge sheeted the accused. Though he does not want to make any comment, but he must have known this thing that continuation of criminal trial does not debar the employer to continue with the departmental enquiry. He did not want to make any comments but the Enquiry Officer should have known at least this thing that continuation of criminal trial does not debar the employer to continue with the departmental enquiry. Of course, the employee had a right to say such things. The only defence which could be taken and of course the person must have taken, whatever defence documents the person had to present there, the same needed to be produced in the departmental enquiry also and if it is allowed to be conducted the criminal trial could be adversely affected. That is the stand that person must have taken. But that stand has to be overlooked unless and until that person is able to get orders from the court that they could not proceed against him. This is his (Shri Ashok Goyal) personal opinion. He would like to see the file. He would like to tell why the simultaneous enquiry could be conducted because in the courts, the trial takes so many years, then the appeal and then the second appeal and by then the person would retire. In the instant case, they were facing a situation in which a daily wage worker has been placed under suspension.

It was informed that since the term of the employee was for 89 days, the same was not extended. The enquiry is to be conducted against Mr. Naresh Sabharwal who is a regular employee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the basic purpose is that pending the criminal trial, the employer should not suffer on account of pending disciplinary proceedings.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that the purpose is different. The enquiry is regarding the job. If the person is proved guilty in the enquiry, the person could be placed under suspension or dismissed. That is a stricter punishment.

It was informed that they were bothered about the recovery. They have recovered Rs.93 lacs and the remaining is to be recovered and pursuing that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as far as recovery is concerned even if they dismiss somebody, they could file a suit for recovery and that they could do even if the criminal case is pending and for that a civil suit could be filed.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that the police could recover the money.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University had got recovered so much money by adopting some measures. This is also against the settled law that once a fraud has come to the notice and they did not initiate any action on the plea that they were trying to recover the money that would not save them. In such cases what is done that the last page is left and ask the person to sign otherwise action would be initiated so that it could be said that the moment it came to their notice, they had acted. The period of hidden action is not brought on the surface. In this case what happened is that a fraud has come to notice and the University has gone on record in defending that they were trying to recover the money which is against law. In future, it should not be delayed. This is all what happens in financial matters otherwise what is the defence with them that when they came to know of the fraud, even then the person was allowed to attend the office.

It was informed that they had conducted a preliminary enquiry.

Shri Ashok Goyal cited an example of a person who was a cash officer in a bank and used to take out the money from the cash and give to some wholesalers in the night and next day when it was returned, the same was deposited in the bank. The whole cash was at his disposal because he was the custodian. Finally, when it came to taking action, the CGM said that he would have to take action against the supervising persons also and he did not want to take the action. That person did not stop this practice and when after one month the CGM said that this person is not stopping this practice then he said that why the CGM had not placed that person under suspension to which the CGM said that there is no replacement and had no workforce. He said that if the workforce was not available, it meant that this person was given the consent to do whatever he wanted. Finally, the matter was reported in the newspapers and that person was placed under suspension and said that how grave injustice has been done to him and said that he has not committed any crime by

using the papers of the bank and did not result in any pecuniary loss to the bank. They would be surprised to know that finally the matter was reported at all the levels and during investigation it was found that this practice had been going on for a long time. The disciplinary authority who was to place under suspension the employee was placed under suspension on the plea that why he delayed the action. So these are the nitty-gritty of finances.

It was informed that in this case they had done a preliminary enquiry and issue the show cause notice. They proceeded with the disciplinary procedure and did not delay the matter. After issuing the show cause notice, the charges were to be proved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that suspension and removal are two different things.

It was informed that in case the competent body is not satisfied with the reply, then the employee has to be placed under suspension.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no need of reply and a person could be placed under suspension and no reason has to be given because the time did not allow to issue the show cause and wait for the reply. If a person is caught red handed, he is to be placed under suspension. If later on it is found that he is innocent, he could be reinstated and suspension is no punishment. He did not know whether these things needed to be said here or not. Anyway it is out of his own experience.

The Vice-Chancellor said that to summarise, he would form a Committee requesting few of the members of the Syndicate to join, few Senate members and few University Professors and let a system be in place and they should come back to the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the Finance and Development Officer and Controller of Examinations should also be associated with this Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be to strengthen the system and the procedure of finance model of Panjab University keeping in view the Accounts Manual, the Regulations and the Rules or various decisions of the Syndicate and Senate. That would help the Committee. In case any new rule is to be incorporated that should be suggested by the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they would discuss both the items (3 and 3A) in the next meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as the members had said that there is no need to send item 3A to the police.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that if the challan has been submitted, there is no need to send item 3A to the police.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now it is resolved that a Committee would be constituted which would be coordinated by the

Registrar and he would request few members of the Syndicate, Senate and faculty members to come forward and help in putting the processes in place relating to how to create a cadre and how to have the Accounts Manual implemented and the University Regulations adhered to. Whatever they want to do, would be placed in the next meeting of the Syndicate and in the meanwhile, the members could go through both 3 and 3A. Then they would set aside half an hour or so to discuss as to what they have to do. This is not a matter which could be left for months together.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That since the members have not got enough time to go through the report of the Committee, the consideration of the Item 3 and 3(A) on the agenda, be deferred till the next meeting. In the meanwhile, a Committee, comprising few Syndics, Senators and University Professors along with the Registrar, be constituted to put in place a procedure for strengthening the system and implementation of financial model at Panjab University, keeping in view the Accounts Manual, Regulations, Rules, various decisions of the Syndicate and Senate, etc. The recommendations of the Committee be placed before the next Syndicate meeting.

Enquiry report

4. Considered the enquiry report submitted by the Committee constituted to look into the leakage of paper of Law Entrance Test Examination 2014.

Giving the background, the Vice-Chancellor said that it is a case of paper leakage of law entrance. Conducting an examination is one of the oldest jobs that any University in India performs. What the University started they conducted the entrance examination so that the school students could join the Colleges. This is their oldest job, the conducting the examination. So far as, Law is concerned, the Department of Laws of the University is older than the Government College. At one time, most of the income of the University used to come from the examination. When the University was to be recommenced after independence, it was a Law member of the Syndicate, Justice Teja Singh who took the initiative. Classes were restarted in the Panjab University first in Law, in other subjects, this happened later. The classes for Law were started in Shimla itself in 1947. It is of primary importance as far as the University is concerned. So, what is to be done, what is not to be done, even if there are no rigid rules. There are norms in place and the process has gone as long as one can imagine. On behalf of this law entrance examination in contemporary times, the job is performed by a Faculty member with the cooperation of other colleagues and an unfortunate happening occurred in June 2014. Nobody wanted to believe that the paper had leaked. It took a while to take cognizance of it to establish whether the paper had leaked or not. Once leak was established, they had to see that the leaked paper got conducted again. The paper was re-conducted. Thereafter, the entrance examination for Law has been conducted in the years 2015 and 2016 as well. The Committee was constituted to investigate the 2014 matter and a process should be put in place so that these things do not happen again if there were some lacuna. The University could not accept that the primary responsibility that has been done by the University, people see something wrong in it. It is a serious issue. It is in that background, the Committee was formed. The Dean of Law was requested to

investigate the matter. The Government changed and the Dean of Law belonging to legal cell of the national party had lots of other assignments and he had to travel outside Chandigarh a lot, in connection with court cases (in which he had appeared as Counsel). Then he said that he would not be able to devote time. Then another Committee was formed and an emeritus Professor of Law was entrusted this job and they started investigating the matter. After one year, he said that he would not be able to do it. Then the job was given to a third Committee. That Committee comprised retired Judge of the Punjab and Haryana High Court Justice B.B. Parsoon, Ambassador I.S. Chadha, who was a member of the earlier Committee also, Professor D.V.S. Jain and Shri V.K. Sibal. That Committee has given this report which is before the members. This report has various dimensions. One is relating to paper leakage *per se*. The second matter is in its entirety that certain recommendations are also expected. It has three dimensions. As far as paper leakage is concerned, who has leaked, it could not be established and the thing which report is very concerned that the processes are not in place, foolproof processes which are well advertised are not available. There are no guidelines as to how the paper is to be sealed and how a record is to be kept and such other things. There is no examinations manual for such things like the Accounts Manual for keeping accounts and auditing of financial transactions. Only some instructions are there. They carry out so many entrance examinations and of those entrance examinations he did not know whether such a paper leakage has been there in the history of Panjab University, leakage of such a kind. He had also asked Professor A.K. Bhandari.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that once, a paper was published in the newspaper. It is a serious thing. In the late 1990s when Dr. Sodhi Ram was the Controller of Examinations, the question paper was published in the newspapers. It is which that he knows and there might be other cases also which might not have come to light. Strict measures are needed to be taken. It brings bad name to the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was just giving the little background and not saying that it is not a serious issue and not stating that the action is not to be taken. This report has various dimensions and one of the dimensions is who leaked it and whether the procedures are not in place. Why the Committee has recorded that the procedures are not in place? It is noted that the procedures in the form of a manual are not there those things which are related to the entrance examination. When they send a question paper to be set up that procedure is not in place. When this kind of a process is assigned to a faculty member, it is left to him/her and he/she is not being given any instructions because such instructions are not in place. A follow-up action is required in the form of a paper setting manual and that manual has to be framed. Then the report says that they have not been able to find out because they could not get the information or some people have said contradictory things. The Committee thought that they were not empowered to verify such things which he could not say that they were not empowered but the Committee may have had something in mind like the lie detector test or any other technology. They have made the recommendation that the matter should be further investigated. Whether they should empower to make a further enquiry by anybody and it is a question for all of them. Things related to a certain examiner that he/she came under pressure the people are asking him about the model question

paper. Even if the examiner was subjected to pressure, he/she is not supposed to do such things. The Committee has made certain things which are not the cause of the leakage of the paper. In spite of all these things the conduct of the people could not be known. The central thing is that the leakage was made, but who leaked it, that could not be established. How to proceed with it, that is one question before all of them. The second question is whether the manual should be prepared and that should be well known. So, this is what it is. In this background, the report is before all of them. The report, of course, has to be sent to the Senate eventually and members have to ask the question about the report. As and when the report goes to the Senate and the Senate could ask those questions. The Syndicate members could also question. This is the background in which the matter is before the members.

Professor Shelley Walia said that as Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa had said that the leakage could take place any time and it is not reported. It is just a projection and one could never say whether it is at the paper setter's level or the clerical level. It is very difficult to say.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired as to how many persons are involved in the system starting from paper setting to the conduct of examination.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everything is written in the report. If they want more time to read it, they could do so.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there should be some strict guidelines. They could give the total responsibility to a single officer. There should be at least 12 papers and any paper out of those could be got printed.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the suggestion is good, the idea being that the question paper be not got set by a single person and they could have a question bank.

The Vice-Chancellor said that online examination is one of the answers. It is a national level examination and how to overcome the leakage, then they would have to adopt the technology and the technology meant that everybody is not examined at the same time and everybody gets a different set. One could have the choice of taking the examination as is the case with the GMAT examination, the time slot is booked and one has to reach at the fixed time and take the examination and the score is also known immediately. But that is for the future to adopt that technology and they could not take such a decision right now. They could just recommend that the technology should be adopted and slowly the University should move on to technology based question bank and make sure that the question bank is not a limited one that the question bank is leaked. The question bank has to be dynamically updated and not a fixed question bank. There is an algorithm as there are some difficult questions and some easy questions. If one question is easy then the second is supposed to be a different way. There is a classification. There are algorithms of which he is not aware and the questions have to be programmed. It is not an easy task but there are agencies in the world which are doing it and there are Indian people who are doing like the CAT examination.

Professor Shelley Walia said that before they adopt the technology, assuming that if the Coordinator of an Examination approaches a person, he sets the question paper on the computer and sends a hard copy by putting it in the envelope, which is the practice all over the world and did not use the lac, put the signature and then affix the tape on it. First of all, he would like to ask the question was he the only one to set the paper. Probably, there might be another one. There are two people who are asked to set the question paper. The system in the University is that two people are asked to set a question paper in a department. Out of that, the Controller of Examinations or the Coordinator opens both the question papers in front of the Dean of University Instruction and then one is taken up to which one does not come to know whether the paper set by him/her is printed or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that prima facie it is not opened. The Coordinator says that the question paper is sealed. The way the paper has been sealed is wrong. When the Committee took out the sealed question paper and matched with the key which was already available in the market, the key matched. And the paper which was not used, one page of that paper did match with the leaked paper.

Professor Shelley Walia enquired whether the persons who were to conduct the examination did not check the seal before processing the paper and if the seal was tampered with then it is at the paper setter's level.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what should they do for the future and some manual has to be prepared or the technology has to be used. First of all, they have to prepare the manual and then have to plan for introduction of technology.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired what is that technology?

The Vice-Chancellor said that an examination centre is created where 500 students could take the examination simultaneously. The duration of the examination is 1-1½ hours and in a day in 4 batches, 2000 students take the examination. It is an online examination and the candidate could see his/her score immediately after the examination and when all the candidates had taken the examination, the whole result is declared.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have to see the cost of it as in CAT examination, about Rs.3000/- is taken from the candidates.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would have to pay for the technology. The point is that right now, whether they order a new enquiry and this is a question that all of them are facing and if a new enquiry is ordered, who should do that enquiry. If they did not want to take a decision today and wanted to take a decision next time, they could consult among themselves.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the suggestions of the Committee are good.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to take a decision on whether they order new enquiry or not.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that there is no need of a new enquiry.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if there is a consensus, that is okay with him. He was giving both the option to the members. He accepted the consensus that if they did not want a new enquiry.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the Controller of Examinations should be involved in preparing the examination manual.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that most of the things have improved after that and if something new is required that could be done.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that there is procedural lapse at every step of the enquiry as the enquiry is not complete and the persons involved did not appear before the Committee. It is necessary that they need to strengthen their system. Panjab University is a prestigious University. The letter which they had written to the Coordinator was not even marked as confidential as they could see the letter in which the Vice-Chancellor had appointed Professor Vijay Nagpal as the Coordinator for the law entrance examination. They should write confidential on the things which are confidential in nature. There should be a proper stock register with the Dean of University Instruction. They should follow the sealing procedure and that should be strictly adhered to.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the only solution is the question bank. Why only one person sets 5 subjective questions. These needed to be set by different persons and out of those one question from each set could be picked up.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that on the Board of Studies for undergraduate and postgraduate classes, the same persons are being repeated to frame the question paper and examiners. There is a need of diversity in it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the leakage of the paper was first reported by Dr. Ajay Ranga.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there are guidelines of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India that if any person has unearthed a fraud, he/she should be protected. Nobody should be allowed to point a finger at that person.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that the remarks in the report against Dr. Ajay Ranga needed to be expunged.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not expunge the remarks and nobody has the authority to expunge it. If the members did not want to accept the report and whatever the members were saying that would become part of the proceedings.

Principal B.C. Josan said that they could reject the report.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that the suggestions given by the Committee could be accepted.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired whether is it true that Dr. Ajay Ranga accepted the duty for examination while knowing that his brother was appearing in the entrance test.

The Vice-Chancellor said that does it encourage in any way the leakage of the paper. Why he has chosen to put something in the report and Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he has nothing to do with it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to know the enquiry report of which Committee is here as earlier also there were two Committees and report of the first enquiry is not attached with the report.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the statements are recorded and no report is given by the earlier Committees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the examination was conducted in 2014 they were getting the report in 2016 and that of the third Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what the first Committee did was whether the paper was leaked or not and took a decision that the examination would be conducted again. The first Committee did not have any sitting.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to whether any expenditure was done on the conduct of the enquiry and how much payment was made.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would find it out.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he did not know what for the Enquiry Committee was constituted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is written in the report on page 2 that the mandate of the Committee is to enquire into the leakage of the paper in its entirety and to make suitable recommendations so that such a lapse did not occur in any of the competitive entrance examination and to include effective deterrence to be put in place as the existing mechanism is not found adequate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is the mandate of the Committee. He did not know wherefrom the mandate has been changed from appointing the first Committee and in the transition period the mandate has been changed. The mandate of the first Committee was to fix the responsibility for the leakage. Shri Satya Pal Jain resigned from the Committee, then Professor Veer Singh resigned and the mandate is totally changed. The first Committee which met only to see whether the leakage was there or not and gave the finding that the paper might have been leaked and so the Committee recommended that the paper be re-conducted and thereafter another Committee was constituted to fix the responsibility for the leakage of the paper. The Chairman of the first Committee was Shri Satya Pal Jain, when he quit, he was replaced by Professor Veer Singh who also quit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Veer Singh quit later.

Continuing Shri Ashok Goyal said that the same Committee is going on with the same mandate. But with the change in Chairmanship, the mandate is changed, he did not know from where it has been changed. But now the mandate has been changed, he did not know has he (Enquiry Officer) spared anyone in this report as he has not spared Shri Satya Pal Jain, Professor Veer Singh, Dr. Parmod Kumar, Dr. Ajay Ranga, Professor V.K. Nagpal, Professor Nishtha Jaswal, Dr. Anupama Goel, the Controller of Examinations, has not spared any of the staff member who were involved in conducting this exam by saying that all were non-cooperative and all were interested in not telling that they did not know anything.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not that all were non-cooperative.

Continuing Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could see the finding of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the report is by 3 members of the Senate and let they take it to the Senate and they could request the members and let those members answer.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why the members should answer. The Enquiry Officer was supposed to answer. The members had submitted the report and were not answerable to them. They are discussing. He did not want to put the question to the Vice-Chancellor also but at the same time whatever has appeared in the paper, they have to evaluate on its merits to ensure whether such a report could be accepted or as the Vice-Chancellor has already said that the report is before the members and it is for them to accept or reject.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the prerogative is with the members whether to accept or reject the report.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was not understandable why two Chairmen of the Committee had resigned. What did it mean? Secondly, it was not understandable under which provision of Panjab University the Committee conducted the enquiry because unless and until that provision is quoted only then he would come to know under which provision it has come to the Syndicate. Unless and until he did not know under which provision it has come to the Syndicate, he would not be able to tell what course of further action is to be taken. If they send it to the Senate and the Senate would say why it has come to the Senate. The issue was something and started from where and where it was taken. It is more than two years and today the situation is that even today they did not know how the paper was leaked. The Committee had not been able to pinpoint as to who has leaked the paper except saying that some persons did not appear before the Committee and did not give the statements. Even if, they accept the report and whosoever's name has been mentioned in the report, they have to ask for explanation. As he had earlier said that if any such thing is done without investigation, it is neither a departmental enquiry nor a judicial enquiry. Nothing, but he is very hesitating in sharing that Judge while dealing with the cases should have kept this thing in mind that in this Enquiry Committee, he is not the Judge of the court as the statements have been given. He (Enquiry Officer, a Judge) should have the confidence in himself that this is what he has stated. Even after signing, anybody could deny and say that it has

been got done forcefully. If it is for the Syndicate and Senate to think, then what mind the Enquiry Officer had applied in it and he has spared none and has questioned the credibility of Dr. Ajay Ranga. They were saying that the reply could be sought. He (Enquiry Officer) has questioned the credibility of the question paper setter. He could not find anything such as was reported in the newspapers and did not whether it is the report or not. In the newspaper it was written that the findings of the Committee are that Professor Nishtha Jaswal was very arrogant. If such kind of remarks, unsubstantiated remarks by the Judge himself have been given in the report, could he question the authority of anybody by saying that he has filed unsubstantiated allegations. He (the Judge) is saying anything about everyone whatever he wanted just because he happens to be a retired Judge and all others are not having any integrity of their own.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the report is not on behalf of any individual. The report is on behalf of the University Committee. 3 members of the Committee are sitting Senate members and the report has been signed by all of them. Let the Syndicate forward the report to the Senate, where the Senate members can answer.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when he said that whosoever conducted the enquiry and the Vice-Chancellor is saying that the Enquiry Officer is not answerable and yes it is also right that the Enquiry Officer has not to give any answer and they were not to conduct an enquiry about the conduct of the Enquiry Officer.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that either the report could be accepted or rejected.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the recommendation regarding the procedures is right.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that those recommendations could be made with the help of the Controller of Examinations.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he had already said that the report is not conclusive and doubting the integrity of Dr. Ajay Ranga. But it is his gut feeling that if some relative is appearing, one should not perform the examination duty.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in the confidential statement on page 11, it is written that the Committee was surprised to learn that Dr. Ajay Ranga was on duty in the examination hall. He quoted from the 'examination hall' part of the report, "on the day of test as an Observer even though he knew, as admitted by him in his testimony that his brother was appearing in the examination. In the Committees' view this constitutes a serious lapse on the part of Dr. Ajay Ranga who should have recused himself from the duty". Now, there was an allegation which was made against him that he did something wrong. But he is making a very serious statement, this statement written by this Committee is misleading and a wrong information, because they could see page 2 of his statement which is attached with this letter. He has specifically mentioned to them where he was on duty and where his brother was appearing. He was on duty as Observer in University Institute of Legal Studies and his brother was appearing in the paper in Arts Block 3, then where was the clash of interest, what was lapse on his part. Secondly, specifically about this rule, they should see Rule 8 Chapter 30 of Panjab University Calendar

Volume-III. It is specifically mentioned that who could be an invigilator. He did not do anything wrong. He did not violate any rule and this statement of this lapse on his part written by the Committee, they misled the statement, the reason being, examination hall, they did not clear which examination hall. The Committee was silent and misleading the authority in this case. Why they did not mention here that Dr. Ajay Ranga was on duty in UILS and his brother was appearing in Arts Block No.3. It is a misleading statement and allegations against him made by the Committee members. They could see as to who was the Chairman of the Committee, a retired Judge of the High Court and one of the senior member of the Advocate of Punjab and Haryana High Court and other members big dignitaries. They did not consider his statement. The second allegation which was levelled against him (p.70), the Committee said specifically that Professor Vijay Nagpal mentioned that he had been approached by Dr. Ajay Ranga on evening before the examination to get some help. This was denied by Dr. Ajay Ranga. Then in this case also, one of them is not telling the truth. Dr. Ajay Ranga acceptance of examination duty, knowing that his brother was appearing in examination, casts doubt on his credibility. In this case, again he is saying, this is a very careless, negligent and biased statement made by the Committee without verifying the facts and without looking into the rules of Panjab University. Rule 8 of Chapter 30 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-III titled Conduct of Examination where a special note has been mentioned in this case that the following person shall not be eligible for appointment on the supervisory staff (a) disqualified person or a superannuated person or a person whose near relative, and this near relative has been specifically clarified in the Calendar: the wife or husband or son or daughter is appearing in the examination, that person will be ineligible; (b) the persons who have written or published any help book or guide or cheap notes, he will be ineligible; (c) persons who are related in any way to the candidate appearing at the Centre. He was not at that Centre. He disclosed this in his statement and the same statement has been signed by Justice B.B. Parsoo. How the Committee has negligently mentioned and passed this kind of derogatory remarks against him. They have raised this question on his credibility. Why this issue was not verified by them? He had specifically mentioned in his statement (page 3), where the Committee asked him when your (Dr. Ajay Ranga's) real brother was appearing in the said examination, did not you feel to request for not being put on duty in the said examination, your being a case of conflict of interest. He had answered to it that since my (Dr. Ajay Ranga) brother was appearing in the examination in Arts Block No.3, there was no conflict of interest. Secondly, Observer has nothing to do with the setting of question paper. To his knowledge, in the Panjab University Calendar, there is no such bar for performing duties and the same question was clarified by the then Registrar and Dean of University Instruction Professor A.K. Bhandari. Even after this statement, this legal statement, they did not care about it and made a derogatory and defamatory statement against him and under which rule. The Committee has made very unclear statements. They have said who can be the prospective leaker of the paper. They have made that the person who was in possession of all three papers, he can be the sole person, who can leak the paper. It is written in the conclusive statement at page 50. The Committee said either that only someone who had access to all 3 sets was solely responsible for leak. Then after that this time there was a leak in which one or more of the paper setters were also simultaneously involved. They themselves are making contradictory statements in two lines consecutively. Thirdly,

they are mentioning here that Professor Vijay Nagpal was in possession of all the 3 papers and many others. Then after they, as the Vice-Chancellor had mentioned in his statement, have concluded in a very vague word that this statement was given by this person and so on and any of them is telling lie. Who is telling a lie, the Committee is not able to decide. But in all the questions Professor Vijay Nagpal versus X, Y, Z and so and so, in all the cases only the credibility and the statement of Professor Vijay Nagpal and somebody else has been put under the doubt. In the concluding statement, again they are saying that the written statement given by Professor Vijay Nagpal is not sustainable that does not seem to be true. This report, to his knowledge, is biased. This report is negligent report and they have acted very negligently and his humble request to the House is that there is a maxim in law ignorance of the facts is excusable but ignorance of law is not excusable. On the basis of this report, a report was published in the newspaper which had defamed his credibility, reputation and image in the society. His request to the House is that a strong action be taken against this kind of negligent report. In his view, the Committee has acted negligently, with biased intention which is proven by a recorded statement in the report which he has given in the contradictory statement for acting negligently act of this Committee. He felt that the Committee should have acted with little maturity and logical and impartial transparency while making derogatory statement against any person, especially against him, without verifying the facts and the rules on the points of dispute. They have made many derogatory statements. They have put his credibility in doubt. He was the first person, the Controller of Examination is sitting here, to inform. The Finance and Development Officer was also present at that time when he received the report. He got the reward of this that there was a pressure making tactics against him so that he could keep silent. When he informed this, there was no talk on this matter for about a week. When the students raised this issue, the media persons came to him asked that since he had raised the issue what action he would take to which he had repeatedly said, they could see the news reports, that there should be a CBI enquiry. Then he was targeted by one political party of the students to defame him that his brother was appearing in the same examination hall and a written statement was also given by them. Why this was not considered by the Enquiry Committee to verify the matter. He was repeatedly pressurized to keep silent and not to raise the issue. But he took a stand and had fought with them and the reward of that this Committee has given to him due to derogatory and negligent conduct by giving a statement in the newspaper that Dr. Ajay Ranga was involved in the paper leakage and his brother was also there. Why the Committee did not enquire into it? What is the need of such people if they wanted to spoil the make credibility, dignity and image of someone? How carefully the Committee has worked, they could see on page 20, the last page where the 4 honourable Committee members had put their signatures, there it is written Dr. Ajay Ranga, Department of Laws. The Committee did not know in which department he is teaching and what he is doing and what kind of negligent report the Committee has submitted. The Committee did not know the fact where he is working. What kind of enquiry they must have made in the matter? His question in this case is that if Professor Vijay Nagpal had said that he (Dr. Ajay Ranga) had gone to him for helping his brother, it is written in the statement that this incident was of 8.7.2014 and the examination was conducted on 9.7.2014. Professor Vijay Nagpal disclosed this statement after two years on 22.7.2015. Why it was a concealment of facts whereas this issue was

very hyped in the media and in the University administration. It was a burning issue. His statement was repeatedly appearing in the newspaper as also the statement of the Vice-Chancellor and also of other persons including the Registrar and the Dean of University Instruction. Why Professor Vijay Nagpal did not disclose this to the University authorities on the same day and why after one year. Why it was not given on the day of the examination? Why it was not given on the day when the information about the paper leakage was given to the Controller of Examinations. Why all these were not brought to their notice.

The meeting was adjourned for lunch.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they were discussing the enquiry report. Dr. Ajay Ranga was saying something before the meeting was adjourned for lunch. The issues that have come in the enquiry report, one is on which the members opined that there is no need to of having any further enquiry. The second was the procedure and the third is other things which are contained in the report and it was regarding that one of the things that Dr. Ajay Ranga was speaking.

Continuing, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that this report be rejected in toto with remarks that responsibility at the cost of the University finance was given to these people and to his knowledge, they (Committee members) have acted negligently, carelessly and biased which is at least not expected of any person who is holding such a senior position and this report be rejected.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Dr. Ajay Ranga) has a prerogative whatever he wanted to say.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that he agreed with Dr. Ajay Ranga that this report could not be accepted.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said he is of the viewpoint that he wanted to further add on two points. One is relating to management of finances and the second on conduct of examinations. The Items 3 and 3-A came up for discussion and it falls within the subject of finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no connection between Item 3, 3-A and this item. Whatever they say just as the report is subject to scrutiny, whatever they say is also subject to scrutiny as the same is recorded, uploaded and a public document.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that his concern is that strongest measures be taken for the future. He endorsed the viewpoint of Dr. Ajay Ranga on the enquiry report. There must be strongest measures in place to handle such a failure in future.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as Dr. Ajay Ranga has said that the report be out-rihtly rejected. If the report is outrightly rejected, they were rejecting all of the section 3 and 4, they were rejecting all the conclusions of section 3, recommendations and the concluding remarks. It is not a question of page 11. If Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa is endorsing Dr. Ajay Ranga that this report should be outrightly rejected, it would not be correct.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if there are certain lacunae in the system and if they want to take corrective measures then they need to think differently and then act accordingly. His viewpoint on this is that for this purpose only one post, one important person should be held accountable for the whole affairs of conducting the examination. For example, the Controller of Examinations, 100% it could be his responsibility.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Controller of Examinations is not abdicating the responsibility in any way. This is not for the first time in the history of Panjab University that the law entrance examination was conducted. So many entrance examinations are conducted on behalf of the University and in this particular case, there is a leakage and via the leakage, certain weaknesses stand brought out, which are listed, that how the paper is to be sealed, etc., and one could come out and discuss and there is a need to have an examination manual on the lines of Accounts Manual so that it is not left for the word of mouth from one to the other. There are Law Professors only who have been conducting this examination and it is not that somebody else had been conducting this examination. They must have appointed someone as the paper setter for the first time, but he is sure, that it is a long career and the senior people must have been acting as paper setters so many times.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there are certain procedures. The procedures needed to be consolidated under the office of one person. They should give this entire responsibility to a person and must have faith in his office and the post that he could conduct the whole affairs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that on behalf of the University, one of the senior most Professors of Law, who is currently Chairperson of the Department of Laws, was given the responsibility of getting an examination conducted and he did not need to be told anything about how to go about doing his job. He started his job and appointed 3 competent people to set the paper as per the set procedure every year and it is not that he has not got 3 papers set but has got 2 or 4 papers set and one of those papers is picked up. In the picking procedure apparently some default action is needed. Certain discrepancies might be there. There are these things. The recommendation is that like the Accounts Manual, there should be a procedure so that it might not happen that the numbers written on the paper are not written by a single person, and the seal has to be put in a set procedure so that it might not be known as to who has set a given paper. Whatever Professor Nagpal followed, it is not that he devised something new. Though it is not written down but whatever he did it is a matter of custom.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if the trend is wrong, then they have to change it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the report has suggested certain changes. When they say that they reject the report outrightly, they cannot reject the report outrightly. An inquiry was asked for, and in his wisdom, he took the help of some people. If the Dean of Faculty of Law could not do it, then he assigned this job to a senior Professor who had been the Vice-Chancellor of National Law University, and if after having 10 sittings he (former Vice-Chancellor, NLU) could not complete the task and submitted the report, he (Vice-Chancellor) took

the help of persons like Ambassador I.S. Chadha, who had been participating in the (ten) meetings. He could provide to the members all the papers that Professor Veer Singh had after having done 10 sittings. The report was not submitted, the members could judge for themselves on the basis of whatever papers have been given (by Professor Veer Singh). There is no issue. He would get the papers (of Veer Singh Committee) photocopied and provide to the members. The members could have a reassessment of this Committee on the basis of whatever material is available. Then, there are made certain recommendations. While making recommendations, certain observations are made and one could have reservations about those observations. Even without observations the central part of the thing would not change. Whatever inputs they got, they could not come to a conclusion. The second part is the recommendations, how to improve the things. Those recommendations are there as to what should be put in place. Like Accounts Manual, an examination manual should be there. There are different examinations in the University. There are routine examinations in Honours Schools where a teacher himself does all these things. Then there are examinations where the papers for BA, MA, Ph.D. and other entrance examinations are set and there are different guidelines for different examinations. The University being as old and diverse needed to have a manual so that they did not get into such a sorry state of affairs as whatever happened and whatever this Enquiry Committee says. There are problems and it is an embarrassment that they have to face. There are certain things for which they need to have a technology to minimize these things. They have to discuss but all those things would take time. When they say that the report be rejected outrightly, they could do it but why, the basis should be stated. If they did not want to state the basis, that is fine with him. Whatever action he took, the Syndicate members did not ask him to do the same. He did it in his own wisdom. Whatever report he got, he was sharing the same with the members and it is his duty. If the members wanted more time and wanted to go through whatever he could not provide, he would provide and the members could choose to defer the matter to the subsequent meeting. At this stage, if they wanted to take an interim decision, the matter was before them, they could do so.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor has rightly said that whatever decision is to be taken that should have reasoning so that they are able to explain. He did not want to discuss any further on merits. The mandate of the Committee was, in fact, they have gone beyond that, to enquire into the leakage of the question paper of law entrance 2014 in its entirety and to make suitable recommendations that such a lapse does not recur in the competitive examinations of the University and the recommendations would include effective deterrence to be put in place if the existing mechanism is found inadequate. Even after finding out where they have gone wrong instead of passing undesirable remarks against individuals, the Committee should have given the recommendations to be followed for future and those recommendations are only on page 17, section 4 which says for preparation of examination manual. Next selection of personnel, it is very easy to say all these things. They could see the recommendation that a great care should be taken in the selection of personnel charged with the responsibility of undertaking various tasks connected with the conduct of examination at different stages including Coordinators, paper setters and the officials concerned in the office of Controller of Examinations and Dean of University Instruction. This should include checking the background of their

antecedents as to their reliability for maintaining confidentially as if for attending to other academic works or administrative works of the University, this is not required. They have to believe that everybody here is working honestly without any vested interest and indirectly it amounts to commenting that all the people connected with the conduct of examinations, specially those who have been mentioned in the end on page 6, probably their antecedents are doubtful. If they say that this should also be accepted, they were accepting indirectly that in case of teachers are teaching in various departments, they are not bothered about their antecedents and they are bothered about only the paper setters, coordinators and the Controller of Examinations. Writing this recommendation only on one page, after giving the recommendation, they (Committee members) are giving concluding remarks and in concluding remarks the Committee wishes to place on record its serious concern at the tendency it has noticed on the part of those charged with the responsibility of ensuring the conduct of examination. This was evident from the repeated remark that this is a procedure which is always followed implying that there was no need to change anything. There seems to be general reluctance not to investigate such incidents with any degree of seriousness as well as to take remedial measures to prevent their recurrence. This Committee which has been assigned the task of investigating in its entirety and to give recommendations in giving the finding that in this University nobody is interested in conducting any kind of investigation, they were reluctant. Such contradictory statements have come in. So this concluding remark could also not be accepted. It is, therefore, imperative that whatever incidence of wrong doing in the University to disrepute comes to notice, they are investigating with seriousness they deserve and those found guilty should be given exemplary punishment. Obvious, when it is established that some person has committed serious offence, he/she has to be punished in terms of service conditions or the law of the land. This para is followed by the next para which is connected with the earlier para which says the Committee accordingly recommends, as if the list has been given of 6 people, that in the light of the deficiencies it has noticed in the conduct of the under mentioned individuals with regard to their respective roles to which attention has been drawn in this report, appropriate remedial action be considered by the competent authority to remove the relevant deficiencies and the Committee has mentioned 6 names. He did not need to explain it further. He would simply say that the recommendations that the Committee has made vide para 1, i.e., for preparation of examination manual 4.1, 4.2., 4.4 and 4.5 could be accepted and another Committee of experts who are expert in conducting the examinations be constituted to put some more conditions because they have only to ensure that such things did not recur. Instead of recording that the report be rejected in its entirety, it should be recorded that keeping in mind the mandate of the Committee, it is resolved that the recommendations which the Committee has made regarding avoidance of recurrence of such things, the para which says about doubting the integrity should be removed and for other things he understood that the 4-member Committee which had been constituted to give suggestions for improving and strengthening the examination system, they have got better experts who could contribute and for that they could take the services if they feel that there are some inadequacies in the system, it is only to follow the already laid down procedure very carefully. They could take the help, as they had been taking earlier also, of Controller of Examinations of other Universities. He thought that it would suffice. With due apology and due respect to the

members of the Committee, they appreciate that they have done good work, he just wanted to know, at least for his own consumption, that he be provided the cost of conducting this probe.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Finance and Development Officer to provide the expenditure incurred on the payment of TA/DA, honorarium, etc. to this Committee.

Professor Anil Monga said that he thought that recommendation with regard to appointment of Coordinator needed to be reconsidered. They need to appoint a Coordinator. This happened here and it may happen anywhere. They need to have a Coordinator because in some courses, there are interdisciplinary things involved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that may be the Committee has given this recommendation not exactly knowing that it is not possible for the Controller of Examinations to get all the papers set, that is why the Coordinators are appointed at different levels. As such, appointment of Coordinator is must.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if more than one department is involved, the provision for the same has been provided in the Calendar.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the recommendations of the Committee are well received which should be looked into by another Committee while making more suggestions. So, they did not think to take it to the Senate for information.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay. The relevant recommendations relating to the mandate of the Committee have been accepted by the Syndicate and would be worked upon by the University by having another Sub-Committee to make a detailed proposal and to make modifications if required in the recommendations of the Committee. The report would not be forwarded to the Senate for consideration.

RESOLVED: That, the following recommendations of the Committee as per the mandate given to it, be approved:

- (1) preparation of an examination manual;
- (2) selection of personnel for conduct of examination; and
- (3) appointment of Coordinator/s for examination/paper setters.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Committee be constituted to look into the above stated and related issues.

**Letter received from
Chancellor's Office**

5. Considered the letter received from Chancellor's office pursuant to Senate proceeding dated 05.12.2015 (Para XXXVIII). Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The above item was placed before the Senate in its meeting dated 27.03.2016 (Para XXXIV) (I-4) and it was resolved that the item be treated as withdrawn as it is yet to be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item is that a letter came from the Chancellor's office. There is a communication which was sent by the Chairman, PUCASH to the Chancellor's office and the Chancellor's office want that it should go to the Senate. But everything that goes to the Senate has to be routed through the Syndicate. It is in this spirit that the matter is before the members. If the members wish to discuss, they could discuss it or the matter could be sent directly to the Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was discussed in the Syndicate and in the December meeting of Senate that the policy against sexual harassment has to be modified and after that a Committee was formed. The Committee having the Registrar, Chairperson, PUCASH and he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) as members was chaired by the Dean of University Instruction where the policy was formulated. Once that policy was formulated, it was again informed to PUCASH. The issue was that what PUCASH over there were trying to say that since the policy was not proper, so unless and until a proper policy is framed, matter cannot be taken up. Thereafter, revised policy was written and adopted by Syndicate and the Senate. But even after that the matter pertaining to the Vice-Chancellor was not taken up by PUCASH on the plea that if they investigate that and as per the policy which has been adopted by this very Syndicate and Senate, the report of that has to go to the Senate and then, of course, what was being said was that the matter could not be sent to the Senate in case of the Vice-Chancellor because the matter has to go to the employer and the employer in case of the Vice-Chancellor is not the Senate. As per the Act, the report has to go to the employer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the University, the Chairman of the Senate is the Chancellor and Chancellor is the appointing authority. So the thing is that to whom the report would go. This is the matter which needs a decision. According to the Chancellor's office, everything has to go to the Senate. So recently there is a communication that the Chairperson, PUCASH has sent a report of PUCASH directly to the Chancellor and the Chancellor has sent that communication for consideration back to the Senate and those papers were made available to the Senate meeting of 24th July 2016. Senate did not reach up to that item on July 24, 2016, it could consider only item No.1 on that day. The letter from the Chancellor's office says that in view of the above, the Governing Bodies of Panjab University are requested to kindly act accordingly for taking required action in this regard. This appears on page 8 and it was issued with the approval of the Secretary to the Hon'ble Chancellor, etc.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there was lot of discussion and his viewpoint was that if a Committee formed by the Syndicate and the Senate is not agreeing to whatever has been approved by the Syndicate and Senate, he could not be a part of that Committee because he was a member of the Committee and also a member in the Syndicate/Senate. Then if the Committee makes their own Rules and Regulations, his resignation be accepted from that Committee. He would submit the resignation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, Item No. 5 is under consideration.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that something is said at one place and the other thing at the other place and nothing is accepted. Even what the Syndicate and Senate says, that is not accepted. The policy has been made by them on their own.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) was mixing up the two things. Right now, they were considering Item No.5.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the letter of 20th January 2015 was written by the Chancellor to do something.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this letter was placed before the Senate and the Senate said that first the matter should go to the Syndicate and it has come to the Syndicate. Now what the Syndicate could do in this matter. After that time has passed and the incidents have happened. The Chairperson, PUCASH has sent a communication directly to the Chancellor and the Chancellor sent the same back asking to place before the Senate. Without doing anything, the matter has progressed with whatever report of the PUCASH has been sent to the Chancellor, the Chairperson, PUCASH has set a procedure in place and sent the report directly to the Chancellor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, that procedure is right because being the Chairman of the Senate, if it could be sent directly there is nothing wrong in that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let them send it directly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that regarding the letter of 20th January 2015, he would just like to remind that it is not the Senate which resolved that it should be considered, that it is not the case. But the case is that this letter was placed before the Syndicate for information only and he wanted to point out some glaring omissions in this letter to which the Vice-Chancellor ruled that this item was not brought to the Syndicate for consideration so no discussion is allowed and if they wanted to discuss this letter, this could be again brought to the Syndicate for consideration. To his belief, instead of the item being brought to the next Syndicate for consideration, it was, as it is, taken to the Senate for information under the bonafide belief that all the items under information which were taken to the Syndicate are to be taken to the Senate. So, there in the Senate, he had pointed out that may be by mistake, this item has been included. There was no discussion, there was no mandate of the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that because the item was placed before the Senate and it was resolved that the item be treated as withdrawn as it is yet to be placed before the Syndicate. So, it is now placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the meantime, some developments have taken place. This relates to the meeting of January 2016 when this letter was placed before the Syndicate. It was never brought for consideration as was discussed in the Senate till date meaning thereby almost 6 months. In the meantime, it was taken to the Senate. Why it was not brought to the Syndicate in the months of April or May and they have had so many meetings. Anyway that had not been the intention of anybody to delay and it was by overlook. It is admitted that some decision was taken in the Senate of

December 2015, whatever decision was taken, he did not know, under whose instructions and under which mandate, the decision of the Senate was sent to Legal Retainers for legal opinion. The Senate has taken some decision that this be sent to the Chancellor and from the letter it looks as if the decision was sent to the Legal Retainer for getting it legally examined. He is not sure whether it is correct or not but from the letter it seems and no legal opinion has been annexed with the item. Who are those people who have given the legal opinion, he is not asking for that now. It should have been given as to from whom they asked for the legal opinion and what was their legal opinion, who gave the mandate that this decision of the Senate be sent for legal opinion and under which mandate they sent the decision of the Senate for legal opinion and whether that communication was sent for consideration of the Chancellor as was resolved by the Senate or it was sent for the consideration of the Secretary to the Chancellor. This letter has been issued by the office of the Chancellor with the approval of the Secretary to the Hon'ble Chancellor. Secretary to Hon'ble Chancellor cannot enter into the shoes of the Chancellor and without pointing out anything against any individual, a letter is coming from the constitutional authority who happens to be the Chairman of the Upper House of Parliament, i.e., Rajya Sabha. He is really sorry for who has drafted this letter. Perhaps Dr. Ajay Ranga and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa belonging to the Law would appreciate that the Chancellor's office is writing that 'thereafter the Sexual Harassment Act, the term employer is defined in Article 2 (g). If they did not have the basic knowledge of knowing that in any Act, there is no Article, it is section. They have used Article everywhere. The letter which should have been written with the approval of the Hon'ble Chancellor is written to the University with the approval of the Secretary to the Chancellor. He thought that somewhere or the other, they as the University have also failed to handle the issue the way it should have been and it has not been properly handled by the office of the Chancellor also. He did not know whether it is in the knowledge of the Chancellor or not. Now his contention is strengthened, the letter which the Vice-Chancellor is referring now which has come from the Chancellor's office, they could clearly find the difference where it is clearly mentioned that 'this issues with the approval of the Hon'ble Chancellor' which has been received by the Vice-Chancellor and this letter is approval of the Secretary to the Chancellor. Now they could know the difference had it been written that this is issued with the approval of the Chancellor. These were the two things which he wanted to discuss. In his opinion, let them take those legal opinion which have been sent and let them see under what instructions, the decision of the Senate was put to legal examination and then take a decision whether the Senate is the employer or the Chancellor is the employer or the opinion of the office of the Chancellor is binding or the provisions of the Act or the decisions of the Senate are binding because it is a ticklish matter. Another thing he wanted to have the information also about it. The University is getting very bad name which they have discussed earlier also. Instead of trying to resolve the issue, they by acting in such way, they have been trying to complicate the matter. The letter which the Vice-Chancellor was referring has come only qua particular complaint sent by the complainant. So both those things if discussed with all the papers which are in the file, that should be clinching and they could reach at a decision which could be brought to the next meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all those things could be combined so that the matter is resolved.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred. Letter received from the Chancellor's office which was placed in the Senate meeting dated 24th July be also clubbed with the above item and be brought together again in next Syndicate meeting.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 16.05.2016 regarding to frame guidelines for the Chair Professorships

6. Considered the minutes dated 16.05.2016 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in pursuance of the decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 27.02.2016 (Para 11) (**Appendix-VIII**) to frame guidelines for the Chair Professorships to be given to the existing Professors/Re-employed Professors.

NOTE: The Syndicate at its meeting dated 20.09.2015 (Para 25) (**Appendix-VIII**) considered and approved the recommendations of the Committee dated 25.08.2015 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss the modalities/means to fill various Chairs and Chair Professorships in the University.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he would like to draw the attention to the fact that as he takes it the semantics of the checks have connotation of eminence, excellence in academics, international importance and national importance. He understood the benevolence of the University in trying to offer 19 Chairs to senior people in the Departments but he did not really agree with this kind of demarcation that 6 Chairs are very important and 19 are unimportant Chairs where they have Chairs like Sarojini Naidu Chair. He is looking forward to the time when the University has lot of money and then could they think of inviting people to these Chairs also. One is the Chairs for senior people from the Department where they could have a person from outside or would be stuck only with the seniority. He did not agree with this kind of demarcation and the seniority principle which could be the only practice anywhere in the University that because of the seniority they dole out Chairs. The Committee which was formed by the Vice-Chancellor had little inadequacy in its final conclusion is that suppose they are going to give a Chair to a person, where does the tenure begin, does the tenure begin while the person is in service as they are talking about the senior most before the age of 60 years. Whether the tenure would begin for the re-employed persons also?

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are having the re-employment scheme because the Centre is not agreed to enhance the age up to 65 years. They have given the re-employment for 5 years which is kind of a contractual appointment with a one day break. It is in that spirit that it is done. In that spirit, when it comes to giving the Chair Professorship nomenclature, it would be given even to the re-employed Professors and this is the recommendation of the Committee.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it meant that the re-employed teachers beyond 60 years would also get it. He had a hypothetical case that there is a Professor who is 4 months senior to another. But the person who is at number 2 is actually older by 4 months, it meant that the second person would never get the Chair Professorship and he/she might be better also. They are talking in terms of merit for Chairs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the CAS is also the same thing. The people of outstanding merit were appointed as Professor. So, all Professors are outstanding.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it is a generalization and there is no period. There are Professors who remain senior for 10 years and they might carry on for 10 years and what about the one who is retiring 4 months late. This nomenclature would be a mockery of the Chairs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now these Chairs are dead in a sense that if we remove all these Chairs then they would be simple Professors in that given department. There is a Professorship in Music which is called K.L. Sehgal Chair Professor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the period should be mentioned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now there is no recommendation about this. The Syndicate could take a decision that it could be given to a given individual on seniority basis for a period of 3 years. It is the decision to be taken by the Governing body.

Professor Shelley Walia said that they should not declare it as there is another item where they are offering honorary Professorships.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Syndicate has already adopted. They are not taking a new decision. They could offer the honorarium only if the financial situation permits.

Professor Shelley Walia said that they are having honorary Professorships and on the other side there are Chairs where they have money for which he would propose that they invite Mr. Girish Karnad or some other eminent person which meant that he is not actually ignoring merit at all. Let them not make a mockery of the Chair that it be given to all and that also for period ranging 9-10 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Professor Shelley Walia) had a point but the Committee have recommended this.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the recommendations of the Committee are right but for the tenure, they should not act abruptly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the tenure could be fixed for 3 years or 5 years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that 3 years tenure would be right.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the tenure in IIT Kanpur is 5 years.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he had also talked in the meeting of the Syndicate held on 27th February 2016. In principle, he is not against these Chairs. They are passing through very difficult times with lot of financial problems. Secondly, the problems would also arise on the tenure. As they are having Chairs in the name of eminent persons, how would they scrutinize and analyze the work done by the

Chair Professors. He feared that these Chairs would become only a financial burden. He wanted to know as to how much work had been done in the existing Chairs. He requested that this information be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting. The work done in these Chairs needed to be assessed as to whether these Chairs for which cause these had been established are actually contributing or not. His concern is only symbolic in nature. His humble submission is that in the next meeting of the Syndicate, they should assess the already existing Chairs. There is a Bhai Vir Singh Chair.

The Vice-Chancellor said that how they could assess. Whatever the Committee has given, is a valid recommendation. Professor Shelley Walia has raised a point that if somebody becomes a Professor at the age of 50, he/she blocks the chances of the others. Right now those persons who had been selected with the nomenclature like Shaheed Bhagat Singh Chair Professor or some other Chair, they are as such as long as they remain. Right now, they are not assigning this tag to anybody. In view of the valid suggestion, the Syndicate could put a rider to it that the tenure could be either 3 years or 5 years.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that a rider has to be put as so much benefits have been given to the Professors.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that during the last 20-25 years, a lot of work had been done in the Chair in Punjabi. They have to see whether some work actually has been done or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would request that on the completion of the term, Professor would be required to prepare a consolidated report during the tenure of his Chairship or an academic output so it could be on University records. IIT Kanpur is having such kinds of Chairs for senior persons like Professors for a period of 5 years and 3 years for Assistant Professors and the money is also given in the form of additional salary and that money comes from the corpus created by alumni of IIT Kanpur. They ask the alumni if an alumnus wanted to have a tag of his name and ask for a specified money and the tag of that alumnus is put on an Assistant Professor. This is how the money is being raised and there are competent Professors and an extra amount of Rs.15,000/- p.m. is given to them. This sets a competition at every level. The University could also raise the resources if any alumnus wanted to give the money at least for a minimum period of 5 years and they could put a tag to it.

Professor Shelley Walia enquired as to whether it is given on the basis of seniority.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is given on the basis of the performance.

Professor Shelley Walia said that this is what he also wanted and they should look to the other Universities which are doing like this.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that as the teachers take so much time in submitting the academic active reports, similar could be the situation in the case of these Chairs. He requested that in the next meeting of the Syndicate, the contributions made in the existing Chairs should be provided.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they approve it, he would get it endorsed from the Senate before the current tenure of the Senate ends. If the members wanted, they could do it in the next meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a Committee could be formed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a Committee should be formed. There are two different things. One is that the Committee has divided the Chairs in two parts – the traditional Chairs and the other positions of Professors in the Departments but their nomenclature is changed. If some Professor is to be appointed, he/she could be appointed only up to the age of 60 years and could not appoint somebody beyond the age of 60 years. If somebody is appointed with a tag, he/she could be appointed only up to the age of 60 years and the provision is that if he/she is holding the tag before attaining the age of 60 years, he/she could be allowed to be continued as re-employed Professor with the same tag. It meant that a person who has been appointed as such with tag even after re-employment with one day break would continue to have the tag till the age of 65 years. As per the opinion of the Committee, the teacher already holding the title of Chair Professor in a department will hold the title till the period of his re-employment i.e. up to the age of 65 years. If somebody is appointed at the age of 57/58 years, and the tenure is 3 years, then the question is not of 3 years or till the re-employment period up to the age of 65 years. The moment they say 3 years or till the age of 65 years, that meant that they were contemplating the idea of appointing a re-employed Professor also at the age of 62 years by giving the tag which he/she did not have earlier. That probably is not the intention of the Committee. The intention of the Committee is that whosoever has got the tag should be allowed to continue up to the age of 65 years. Now there is a consensus that they have to fix a duration as in the case of Chairs falling under category-2(Sr. No.1-8), it is clearly mentioned that they would occupy the Chair for short duration which could be 6 months or 1 year. But they are thinking for fixing the tenure for 3 years. A Committee could be constituted in this Syndicate keeping this thing in mind so that they are clear what they intend to do. Whether they wanted to appoint somebody beyond the age of 60 years also?

Professor Anil Monga said that there seems to be problem under category-1 (Sr. No. 1 to 19). But there is no problem under category-2 (Sr. No. 1-8). He suggested that the recommendations of the Committee regarding the facilities to be provided to the eminent persons to be invited for heading the prestigious Chairs could be approved as Shri Gulzar Singh has to come to the University on 24th August 2016.

Most of the members said that these recommendations be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these recommendations be approved and for the first part of the recommendations of the Committee, a Sub-Committee be constituted.

Shri Ashok Goyal proposed that this Committee be constituted under the Chairmanship of Professor Shelley Walia.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, the Committee be constituted under the Chairmanship of Professor Shelley Walia including Professor Anil Monga, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra as members.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired whether they invite defence personnel for Maharaja Ranjit Singh Chair.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are lucky that Lt. Gen. K.J. Singh has agreed to accept this assignment since he has been appointed as Chairman of the Armed Forces Tribunal at Chandigarh. Lt. Gen. K.J. Singh has formed a Gyan Chakra forum where he (Vice-Chancellor) had a chance to go and was amazed to see the galaxy of knowledgeable persons there. Professor R.P. Bambah had no person in mind while conceptualizing the concept and he could not think that the concept would be realized in such a short period. There are so many thinking Generals and Air Marshals in India. Chandigarh is a place where so many such retired persons are living who could come and share their experiences.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that about 6 months ago, he had also said about the setting of a Sports Chair.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal S.S. Sangha and other members to provide the names of persons who could be appointed on the Balbir Singh Chair. One of such names could be Shri Abhinav Bindra as they are having good shooting range.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the Chairs are Professorships.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that to honour someone for highest achievement is one thing and sharing the experiences is other thing.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal S.S. Sangha and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua to provide some such names which could be got approved from the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the following Committee be constituted to examine the recommendation of the Committee dated 16.05.2016 (Chairs in Cagtegrory-1) and make recommendation/s:

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------|------------|
| 1. | Professor Shelley Walia | (Chairman) |
| 2. | Professor Anil Monga | |
| 3. | Professor Navdeep Goyal | |
| 4. | Professor Keshav Malhotra | |
| 5. | D.R. (Estt.) | (Convener) |

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the recommendation of the Committee dated 16.05.2016 (Chairs in Category-2), as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Confirmation of certain faculty members

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

(i) University Institute of Legal Studies

Sr No	Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Rattan Singh	Professor	06.12.1967	07.05.2015	23.04.2016
2.	Dr. (Ms.) Rajinder Kaur	Professor	30.08.1976	24.04.2015	24.04.2016

In order of merit**(ii) P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana**

Sr. No.	Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Harmeet Singh Sandhu	Professor	06.04.1970	07.05.2015	07.05.2016

(iii) University Institute of Engineering & Technology

Sr. No.	Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. (Mrs.) Nishima	Assistant Professor	01.08.1980	12.03.2015	12.03.2016

NOTE: 1. Confirmation of all the above will be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No. 17501 of 2011.

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

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

(i) University Institute of Legal Studies

Sr No	Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Rattan Singh	Professor	06.12.1967	07.05.2015	23.04.2016
2.	Dr. (Ms.) Rajinder Kaur	Professor	30.08.1976	24.04.2015	24.04.2016

In order of merit**(ii) P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana**

Sr. No.	Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Harmeet Singh Sandhu	Professor	06.04.1970	07.05.2015	07.05.2016

(iii) University Institute of Engineering & Technology

Sr. No.	Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. (Mrs.) Nishima	Assistant Professor	01.08.1980	12.03.2015	12.03.2016

NOTE: Confirmation of all the above will be subject to the final outcome/ decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No. 17501 of 2011.

At this stage, Item 36 on the agenda be taken up for consideration.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 15.07.2016 regarding offer of Maharaja Ranjit Singh Chair Professorship to Lt. Gen. K.J. Singh (Retd.)

36. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 15.07.2016 (**Appendix-X**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that Lt. Gen. K.J. Singh, PVSM, AVSM, General Officer Commanding in Chief Western Command, Chandimandir, be offered Maharaja Ranjit Singh Chair Professorship at the Department of Defence & National Security Studies initially for a period of one year and he be offered the honorarium, equivalent to that of a Visiting Professor appointed in the University from within the country.

- NOTE:**
1. Bio-Data of Lt. Gen. K.J. Singh, PVSM, AVSM, General Officer Commanding in Chief Western Command, Chandimandir enclosed (**Appendix-X**).
 2. Lt. Gen. K.J. Singh is due to superannuate on 31.07.2016. He could be available to accept the offer from 01.08.2016.

After detailed discussion, it was unanimously –

RESOLVED: That Lt. Gen. K.J. Singh, PVSM, AVSM, General Officer Commanding in Chief Western Command, Chandimandir, be offered Maharaja Ranjit Singh Chair Professorship at the Department of Defence & National Security Studies initially for a period of three years and he be given an honorarium of Rs.5,000/- per visit/lecture subject to a maximum of Rs.40,000/- p.m. or whichever amount is payable to a Visiting Professor from within a country.

Recommendations of Leave Cases Committee dated 25.05.2016

8. Considered minutes of the Leave Cases Committee dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-XI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18) has resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to appoint a Committee to look into the leave cases of members of the teaching staff before, these were put up to him for consideration.

Initiating the discussion, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there are two cases and one of them is the case of Dr. Gaurav Verma, Assistant Professor, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology. In fact, the case of Dr. Gaurav Verma was decided in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 27th February 2016, but it has not been processed and has again be placed before the Syndicate. When it was pointed out that now he is being granted Study leave with pay, Dr. Ranga said that the Syndicate in its February 2016 meeting itself has decided that to grant him study leave with pay. When enquired, he said that the decision has not been implemented.

The Vice Chancellor said that since the people go on such prestigious projects/fellowships, salary is to be paid to him/her.

Continuing, Dr. Ajay Ranga pointed out that earlier, he (Dr. Gaurav Verma) was not to be paid salary, but after the decision of the Syndicate dated 27th February, 2016, he was to be paid salary because it was decided specifically in his case, and it would be implemented in all such cases. It was decided at that time that they would go and enjoy the scholarship with salary. He reiterated that his case was decided, but till date it has not been processed, and has again be placed before the Syndicate.

Continuing further, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there is a case of Dr. Ramesh Kataria, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, who flight is on 8th August 2016. He, therefore, requested that this paragraph should be got prepared, approved and released at the earliest.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the leave cases Committee dated 25.05.2016, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 27.04.2016 regarding leaves

9. Considered if the recommendations of the Committee dated 27.04.2016 (**Appendix-XII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the following kind of leaves shall be admissible to an employee during the period of one year before his/her retirement, be approved:-

1. Leave preparatory to retirement, in one go, and not in piece-meal (the person will not re-join in between, except the last working day of active service). In case, during that leave period annual increment falls, the increment will be given from the due date, irrespective of the fact that he/she is on leave preparatory to retirement;
2. Leave on medical grounds;

In exceptional circumstances, for reasons to be recorded, leave of the kind due can be allowed with the approval by the authority before proceeding on leave. In no case, post-facto approval of leave would be granted.

RESOLVED: That the following recommendations of the Committee dated 27.04.2016, be approved:

1. Leave preparatory to retirement, in one go, and not in piece-meal (the person will not re-join in between, except the last working day of active service). In case, during

that leave period annual increment falls, the increment will be given from the due date, irrespective of the fact that he/she is on leave preparatory to retirement;

2. Leave on medical grounds;
3. In exceptional circumstances, for reasons to be recorded, leave of the kind due can be allowed with the approval by the authority before proceeding on leave. In no case, post-facto approval of leave would be granted.

10. Item 10 has been taken to ratification.

Issue regarding scrapping of entrance test for M.Ed. admissions in the next session

11. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 08.04.2016 (**Appendix-XIII**) constituted by the Vice Chancellor to discuss the issue of scrapping of entrance test for M.Ed. admissions in the next session in order to facilitate filling of seats in the Colleges and University Departments:

Initiating discussion, Principal S.S. Sangha stated that though the decision of the Committee was very good, a communication gap is there. The meeting of the Committee was held on 8th April 2016, and the Vice Chancellor referred the recommendation/s to the Committee to the Syndicate for consideration on 19th May 2016. In the last week of June 2016, an advertisement of the University appeared in the press that 30th June in the last date, but no communication was made to the affiliated Colleges in this regard. When he enquired from the Deputy Registrar (Colleges), he (DR) told him that they could not do anything until the Syndicate takes any decision in this regard. On the other hand, the University made the admission on 15th July 2016. The old Colleges kept afraid that since the University has not allowed this and did not make admission, but the new Colleges gave the admission notices. Hence, there is a confusion in the Colleges that until the letter is received from Deputy Registrar (Colleges), they could not make admissions. He suggested that, in future, the items relating to admissions should be got approved from the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate.

Shri Raghubir Dyal enquired as to why they are putting on hold the admissions to M.Ed. course. Secondly, the Committee has not mentioned where the seats are vacant, in the University Teaching Departments or in the affiliated Colleges. He apprehended that it might result into dummy admissions at the level of the Colleges, and it must be looked into.

Principal S.S. Sangha stated that this year, admissions to M.Ed. are not there because there was no admission to B.Ed. during the previous session and it was declared a zero session. So far as dummy admission is concerned, certain Colleges might indulge into it. Hence, they must take some action on that also, and if need be, a Committee could be constituted for the purpose. He added that an admission was made through the Entrance Test during the last year in one of the Colleges (College in Raikot) and even in the renowned Colleges in Chandigarh, only 50% admissions were made. When the Inspection Committee went to Raikot College, they showed admission against 50% of the seats, whereas in none of the College in Punjab 50% admissions were made. 50% admissions were not made even at the Campus, Dev Samaj College and Government College also. Hence,

there are certain Colleges, where non-attendance is a serious issue and it is aggravating slowly and steadily.

The Vice Chancellor requested Principal S.S. Sangha to give this in writing, so that the matter could be looked into.

Continuing, Principal S.S. Sangha said that, earlier, only couple of students with non-attendance were used to be admitted, but now the situation is that the students do not hesitate asking the College authorities, where non-attendance seat/s are available. This ultimately affects the admission of good/reputed Colleges, because students prefer to get degrees by studying at home. Therefore, it is a serious issue. He suggested that if someone is caught indulging in this practice and his/her admission is cancelled, only then this practice could be discontinued.

The Vice Chancellor said that he should tell him the names of the Colleges, so that some strategy could be evolved.

Continuing further, Principal S.S. Sangha said that for admission to B.Ed. course, which is going on at the moment, the students, who have done B.A./B.Sc./B.Com. and B.Tech., have been made eligible. Now, couple of cases are where there the students have appeared in the Entrance Test, and they have done B.A.LL.B. and M.A. (English). Although they are eligible, the word 'LL.B.' does not exist. If they make "graduation in any stream", there would be no problem.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Dean, College Development Council (Dr. Parvinder Singh) to take necessary action in this regard.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that the test should not be abolished, but if need be, the minimum percentage of marks should be reduced. Secondly, he needs an advice of the House relating to another issue, which is connected to this. There are several postgraduate courses in the Colleges, admissions to which are made on the basis of OCET. Citing an example, he said that a College situated in far flung area, is attached to OCET, but it has not eligible OCET candidates. How could they fill up their vacant seats? Do such Colleges admit candidates with less merit or admit even unqualified candidates or the seats remained vacant?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that such Colleges should take permission from the University.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the clear-cut process of the same should be told to them. He urged that this issue should be settled today.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that it has been happening during the last so many years that the seats remained vacant in the Colleges situated in the rural areas. When the requests come from the Principals of the Colleges, they (University) allow them to fill up the vacant seats even without OCET. The candidates who appeared in the OCET are preferred and thereafter admissions are made without OCET.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Colleges should make the requests so that it could be seen that firstly those candidates should be admitted who at least have appeared in the OCET, so that it is ensured that all the candidates who have appeared in the OCET get admission.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu apprehended that the College might not throw away the OCET candidates and admit other candidates.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that, that is why, he is saying that the candidate must have at least appeared in the OCET, and if one is unable to qualify, then what would be criteria for admission – whether the marks of graduation would be taken into consideration or something else. Meaning thereby, there should be some sort of merit.

Principal B.C. Josan said that they are finding ways and means for increasing the revenue of the University. One of the ways is that they should allow additional seats both in the courses being offered in the University as well as in the affiliated Colleges except B.Com. With this, they would be able to generate some additional revenue for the University. It is absolutely necessary because the last date for admission with late fee with the permission of the Vice Chancellor is approaching fast. He added that with an additional seat, the College is supposed to earn a minimum of Rs.5,000/-.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that additional seats are required for the survival of the Colleges. The other way is that they should enhance the strength of unit from 30 to 40 and so on.

Shri Raghbir Dyal remarked that they could not do injustice to the students in this way because they are separate rules for number of seats and making admissions against them.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are several Colleges offering to same course/s, and if a candidate is not able to get admission in one College, he/she would get the same in another College.

Principal B.C. Josan suggested that the Colleges which have requested should be given the additional seats.

The Vice Chancellor said that if there are two Colleges offering the same course and one of them has filled up all the seats and the other has still vacant seats, and if the former is given additional seats, how the later would fill up its vacant seats.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they could not give additional seats to the Colleges forcibly. The Colleges would be able to fill up their seats in accordance with their reputation. As such, they could not ask the candidates to take admission in any particular College. In fact, the candidates could take admission in the Colleges of their choice. Therefore, if a College has a good reputation, is able to fill up all the seats, and is demanding certain more seats, it should be given the additional seats.

The Vice Chancellor said that suppose there are two Colleges affiliated to Panjab University offering M.Sc. (Mathematics) and one of the Colleges has been able to fill up all the 30 seats and the other is able to fill up only 20 seats. If the seats of former College are

enhanced from 30 to 40, how the later College would be able to fill up its 10 vacant seats?

Principal B.C. Josan said that there is no College in Chandigarh which has vacant seats.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that although they discuss in almost every meeting that in order to generate additional revenue, they should enhance the number of seats, when the Colleges are demanding additional seats, the same are not being given to them.

Shri Raghbir Dyal proposed that where the strength of students in a unit is 30-40, 10% additional seats should be given, and where the strength of students in a unit is more than 40, 5 seats should be given, but the courses where there is more than one unit, maximum 10 additional seats should be given. And no additional fee should be charged for the purpose. Whatever fee is applicable, i.e., late fee either with late fee with the permission of the Principal or Vice Chancellor only be charged.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not grant additional seats because it would lead to unnecessary defamation.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there is lot of allegation from people from outstation that the persons sitting in Chandigarh are always advantageous and the persons who are sitting members of the Syndicate and Senate are more advantageous. People seek additional seats on the plea that tomorrow is the last date. He would like to ask them if they decided to grant additional seats today, how would people of Abohar know about it?

Principal B.C. Josan said that the information about this would reach everywhere within few minutes.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the information about the grant of additional seats would reach only those places where they are interested. So it should always be a level playing field for all the players. If at all such a decision is to be taken, it should be taken keeping in view every request on merit. Instead they have now started to give additional seats to all the Colleges. At one point of time, they had granted additional seats to all the Colleges, as they are contemplating today, certain Colleges said that they have not been able to fill up the sanctioned seats, still the University has granted them additional seats. Next year, they became wiser and decided that additional seats should be given only to those Colleges, which make request. They know that whosoever request for additional seats, what is their purpose, and would it serve the purpose. He (Principal Josan) has rightly asked as to which is the College in Chandigarh where the seat(s) is/are vacant. So they could say that if there is any request from the Colleges in Chandigarh for grant of additional seats, they would have no problem in allowing the same. Similarly, if any request is received from the College situated in rural areas or border areas or far flung areas, there would also not be any problem. Or from a College of a city where all the seats are filled in and all are demanding additional seats, only to ensure that one or two Colleges are not able to fill up even the sanctioned seats, whereas the other Colleges fill up even the additional seats. So far as the last date for admission is concerned, he would like to tell them that in every College, provisional admissions against the additional seats, which are being sought, have

already been made. There is second category of Colleges, where the list of students has been prepared, but the admissions have not been made as the people are assuring them that the additional seats are coming. Therefore, it is taken for granted that the additional seats would definitely come. He only wants to say that even if the additional seats are to be granted, it should look that they have taken the decision on merit keeping in view all the Colleges as one category and additional seats be given only to those who apply.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) should be instructed to seek applications from the Colleges, which wishes to seek additional seats.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that he would like to tell that usually 5-10 Colleges apply for additional seats, but they grant additional seats, several Colleges submit applications for the purpose. Therefore, either they should give time to the Colleges to submit their applications within next 4-5 days.

The Vice Chancellor instructed the Dean, College Development Council to seek requests from the Colleges within a stipulated date, which wishes to have additional seats.

It was pointed out that when the Vice Chancellor was chairing the meeting of the Committee appointed to frame Academic Calendar, it was pointed out by certain Principals that the additional seats are granted at a very last stage, and at that time the Vice Chancellor had told them that the requests from the Colleges come at a very late stage. Secondly, even if the strength of a unit for M.Sc. Chemistry is 40 students, but the inspection Committee while recommending affiliation to another College recommends that the number of seats for the Course should be 25. They face such problems. They would prepare a summary keeping in view all these factors.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that it is not a prerogative of any inspection Committee to recommend less number of seats, especially when the number of seats in a unit is fixed. When they impose the conditions of appointment of requisite number of teachers, payment of salaries as per the UGC norms, etc., Committee has no power to reduce the number of seats. The Committee could only recommend that affiliation should be granted or affiliation should not be granted.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he would like to augment Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu. The decision of the Syndicate is that the strength of unit in courses, where there are practical, is 40 and the courses where there are no practical, is 60. If any Committee is recommending less number of seats, it is being done wrongly. Since he has been a part of the inspection Committee during the last few months, he has seen the attitude of the Professors of the University from the reports submitted by them. According to him, there is great need for scrutiny. He is astonished to see that they do such types of inspections. They are also a part of this system. They have done a lot of work under the leadership of Shri Ashok Goyal, but the way the reports are coming from the Inspection Committees is very astonishing.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that anyhow, they have to take corrective measures.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that when the strength of unit has been fixed in the courses like B.Sc., B.Com., M.Sc., M.A., etc., the strength of unit for B.A. should also be fixed. He suggested that this should be again looked into, and if need be, a Committee should be constituted for the purpose.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that these problems are being experienced because they have not conducted the periodical inspections.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu suggested that the applications for additional seats should be sought from the Colleges up to 5th August and thereafter, the additional seats should be sanctioned and the admission of the candidates against these seats be made within a couple of days by depositing a late fee with the permission of the Vice Chancellor of Rs.2,040/- or whichever is applicable.

The Vice Chancellor said that as suggested by Shri Raghbir Dyal 10% additional seats be sanctioned, and the upper limit for one unit is 5 seats and the upper limit for two or more units is 10 seats.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the blanket decision that whosoever would apply be given the additional seats, is not right. Just now, they have discussed that they have seen all the Inspection Committee reports, and there are several Colleges, which are not ready to follow the directives of the University. Why they are giving additional seats to such Colleges? The additional seats should only be given to those Colleges, which follow the directives/guidelines/instructions of the University, and not that whosoever applies, should be granted the additional seats. The Committee which has been constituted to examine the reports of the Inspection Committees, should be requested to consider the issue of grant of additional seats and only those Colleges should be granted additional seats the reports of which are satisfactory, i.e., fulfil the conditions, infrastructure and requisite faculty is there.

Principal B.C. Josan said that earlier, M.B.E. course was being offered and the nomenclature of the said course has been changed to M.Com. (Business Administration). This course is being offered at 2-3 Colleges in Chandigarh and one in Ludhiana. Since the requisite candidates have not been able to qualify the Entrance Test for admission to this course, the condition of OCET for admission to said course should also be exempted.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Shri Raghbir Dyal also suggested that the requests of the Colleges for grant of additional seats should be referred to the Committee constituted by the Syndicate, which is looking into the affiliation cases.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that to certain Colleges they are not giving the course as they did not fulfil the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee, but at the same time, they are giving the additional seats to those very Colleges. Secondly, they have also to go as per the history of introducing the Entrance Test. Entrance Test was not introduced to screen out the students equal to the number of seats available in the University and the Colleges. Entrance Test was introduced to find out those who are capable to pursue the course. Slowly and steadily it came that though seats are 100, the applicants

are 70, but for the Entrance Test is there, as if the Entrance Test was introduced to make admission on merit. It seems to be right that if the unit contains of 40 seats, the Committee cannot reduce the same to 25 seats. But if the College is saying that it has only 25 desks, how the Committee could recommend 40 seats. When the Inspection Committee sees the classroom, and the classroom could accommodate only 25 students, how could the Inspection Committee give a unit of 40 students? However, he agrees in principle that it is not necessary to give less seats than a unit, and instead they should either one unit or two units. If the College did not have infrastructure for the unit of 40 students, no unit should be given. It was done to ensure that they were supposed to see the infrastructure, but the Committee, which goes, in its own wisdom feels that 40 seats could not be granted to them, but only 25 could be given. There is a College where it is written that affiliation is granted for half a unit and they have not mentioned the seats. When from here the decision went that they have been given five seats per unit, whether that half unit is to be treated as one unit or half unit. A letter goes from here that since they had only half unit, their seats were supposed to be 2.5, and they could have admitted maximum three students. They argued that since the University has sanctioned maximum 10 seats and 5 seats per unit, they consider it second unit though comprising lesser number of seats. Thereafter, it was enquired as to who has sanctioned half unit though it was approved by the University. Professor Keshav Malhotra is right that they should evolve a system so that nobody is able to have the leverage to manipulate. The Professors of the University or for that matter, even the Inspection Committee are not at fault because they feel that they should justify each and everything. However, in the justification, they themselves are caught. So far as inviting of applications for addition seats is concerned, practically it does not look nice that the University is seeking from the Colleges whether they require more seats. According to him, officially they should not seek applications from the Colleges whether they need additional seats or not. Principal Josan has said that the information about the grant of additional seats would reach everywhere by the evening. They should take a decision that applications for grant of additional seats if received latest by such and such date, would be entertained by the Committee into whether those Colleges are following the directives/guidelines/ instructions of the University. The Colleges, which follow the directives/guidelines/instructions of the University, should be granted the additional seats.

This was agreed to.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that he does not think that there are more than 2-3 Colleges out of 192 affiliated Colleges, which have been granted less number of seats than a unit. It was, in fact, the duty of the Inspection Committee to verify the infrastructure and if the College had the same, the unit should have been given; otherwise, refused. According to him, College says that it should be given 25 seats instead of full unit of 40 seats, and if says, it was their duty to refuse the affiliation for the said course.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that nowhere he has said that the College says that it should be given 20 seats or 25 seats instead of a full unit. He has said that when the Inspection Committee saw the infrastructure, it was told to the College that only 20/25 seats could be recommended. The Vice Chancellor had expressed his concern the way things were handled in the University. It is the mandate of the

UGC and the NAAC also that they have to take care of teacher/students ratio. What is happening in the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University, he (Principal S.S. Sangha) was talking about non-attending students also, there are number of Colleges, which are giving even advertisements that the admission as well as degree is also granted. There are Colleges having only 10 classrooms and only 8 teachers, but having strength of 5000 students. Every College is under the impression that there is no unit for B.A. and it is unlimited. There is only one teacher, but the students are 380 or more. Even if they take the option, there would be 380 students in the subject of English, whereas the teacher is only one. In which hall or auditorium the students are being taught. Or whether they have made six sections of 380 students, and if yes, whether there are six teachers. That is not being seen by them. He is only saying that the fault lies with them and they should expedite, though they have asked the Dean, College Development Council earlier also, that the periodical inspections should be carried out at the earliest as that would serve the purpose. However, they should not expect that all these things would be done overnight. In fact, these would take sometime. He thinks that they should work in that direction so that no misuse is being done by any of the Colleges, especially keeping in view the NAAC accreditation of the University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is 342 fixed seats for B.A. in the Department of Evening Studies. Similarly, there should also be fixed seats in the affiliated Colleges for B.A. course.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the Colleges also there are fixed seats for B.A.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that for B.A. also there is a unit of 80 seats.

The Vice Chancellor said that the problem is that most of the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University are located 100 kilometers or more away. As such, there could not be any physical check from the University office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they ask any teacher of a College as to what the strength of his/her College, he would say that their strength is 122, whereas as per the University record their strength is 322. Hence, the Colleges do not even tell the true strength to their own teachers, because 200 students are non-attending and only 122 students attend the classes, but the return of 322 students is sent to the University. So much so the fees of 200 students are not on the record of the College.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they have resolved that no application for grant of additional seats would be entertained after 5th August.

The Vice Chancellor said that August 5, 2016 is the last date.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that since they are left with very little time, if they quietly allowed additional seats, as said by Shri Ashok Goyal the seats in small Colleges would fall vacant because their students would go to big Colleges. Therefore, the Dean, College Development Council should be authorized to grant additional seats, but after examining each and everything.

It was said that *pro forma* would be sent to the Colleges to intimate as to how many seats are there and how many of them have been filled in.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said they were talking about those Colleges, which have been denied the next unit.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Dean, College Development Council would make a summary and it would be put along with the agenda papers of next Syndicate meeting.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the recommendations of the Committee dated 8.4.2016, as per **Appendix**, be approved; and
- (2) the affiliated Colleges be allowed to make admissions to postgraduate courses, admission to which is based on OCET, without OCET, but they have to ensure that first the admission is given to the candidates, who had at least appeared in the OCET; and thereafter, on merit.

Issue regarding the promotion of the Faculty Members

12. Considered the recommendations of the Screening Committee dated 20.05.2016 (**Appendix-XIV**) (constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to screen the applications of the teachers promoted from 24.07.2013 onwards till the date of capping on API score for promotion, pursuant to Letter No. F.11-1/2009 (PS) dated 06.04.2016 (**Appendix-XIV**) received from the Under Secretary, University Grants Commission, New Delhi) that the following Faculty members be promoted as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty members/ Department/Institute/Centre	Date of Promotion
I. Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2)		
1.	Dr. Prabhdeep Brar UIFT	22.12.2013
2.	Ms. Kumari Monika P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre Hoshiarpur	03.09.2013
3.	Dr. Prashant Kumar Gautam UIHTM	13.10.2013
4.	Dr. Vishal Sharma Forensic Science & Criminology	07.12.2013
5.	Ms. Charu UIET (ECE)	07.10.2013
6.	Ms. Nidhi UIET (ECE)	17.10.2013
7.	Mr. Amandeep Singh Wadhwa UIET (Mech. Engg.)	04.09.2013
8.	Dr. Prashant Jindal UIET (Mech. Engg.)	22.09.2013
9.	Dr. (Ms.) Aman Kaura P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre Hoshiarpur (Chemistry)	07.10.2013
10.	Ms. Suman P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre Hoshiarpur (Chemistry)	07.01.2014

11.	Dr. Bimal Rai Department of Physics	07.06.2014
12.	Ms. Anju Berwal UILS (Law)	18.08.2013
13.	Dr. Karan Jawanda UILS	01.08.2013
14.	Ms. Sarpreet Kaur UIET (EEE)	07.10.2013
15.	Ms. Preetika Sharma UIET (EEE)	06.10.2013
16.	Shri Neeraj Sharma UIET (ECE)	06.10.2013
17.	Shri Jaswinder Singh Mehta UIET (Mechanical Engg.)	04.09.2013
18.	Ms. Preeti Gupta UIET (ECE)	06.10.2013
II. Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3)		
19.	Dr. (Mrs.) Ashish Virk P.U.R.C. Ludhiana	01.07.2014
20.	Dr. Shruti Bedi UILS	05.10.2013
21.	Dr. Aman Amrit Cheema nee Ranu P.U.R.C. Ludhiana	26.07.2013
22.	Dr. Manju Gera USOL	07.09.2014
23.	Dr. Monica Bedi UBS	01.07.2014
24.	Dr. Rani Mehta Department of Sociology	26.08.2013
25.	Dr. Ram Mehar USOL	14.10.2014
26.	Dr. Jasmeet Gulati UILS	12.07.2014
27.	Dr. (Mrs.) Jyoti Rattan Department of Laws	01.07.2014
28.	Dr. Vipin Bhatnagar Department of Physics	24.08.2013
29.	Dr. Ashok Kumar Department of Physics	24.08.2013
30.	Dr. (Mrs.) Sunita Srivastawa Department of Physics	24.08.2013
31.	Dr. Supreet Kaur USOL	07.09.2014
32.	Dr. Ganga Ram Chaudhary Department of Chemistry	05.02.2014
33.	Dr. Nishi Sharma UIAMS	28.08.2013
34.	Dr. Kalpana Dahiya UIET (Mathematics)	03.02.2014
35.	Dr. Navneet Agnihotri Department of Biochemistry	27.08.2013
36.	Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi University Institute of Applied Management Sciences	08.04.2014

III. Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4)		
37.	Dr. Gulshan Kumar UILS	01.01.2014
38.	Dr. Vandana Arora Department of Laws	22.12.2013
39.	Dr. Sarabjit Kaur UILS	07.08.2013
IV. Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5)		
40.	Dr. (Mrs.) Gunmala Suri UBS	18.12.2013
41.	Dr. Neeraj Sharma Department of Evening Studies- MDRC	31.10.2013
42.	Dr. Jasminder Singh Dhillon PURC, Sri Muktsar Sahib	31.07.2013
43.	Dr. Archana R. Singh School of Communication Studies	12.01.2014
44.	Dr. Indu Chhabra Department of Computer Science and Applications	27.03.2014
45.	Dr. Surya Kant Tripathi Department of Physics	24.12.2013
46.	Dr. Ravinder Kaur Department of Geography	08.01.2014
47.	Dr. (Ms) Suman Makkar nee Suman Bala Vohra Department of Evening Studies-MDRC (Economics)	30.04.2014
48.	Dr. Harsh Gandhar USOL (Economics)	15.04.2014
49.	Dr. Geeta Mangla Bansal USOL (Commerce)	06.05.2014

- NOTE:**
1. Pursuant to the letter of the Under Secretary dated 06.04.2016, a committee was constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to screen the application of the teachers promoted from 24.07.2013 onwards till the dated capping on API score for promotion under CAS. The Committee in its meeting dated 20.05.2016 screened 55 cases in total out of which 49 cases have been cleared by the Committee. The cases of remaining 6 faculty members will be reviewed later on.
 2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).
 3. Since, the meeting of the Board of Finance is to be held after 31.07.2016, the matter is not placed before BOF. However, after the Syndicate decision it will be got noted by the BOF.

RESOLVED: That, it be recommended to the Senate that, as recommended by the Screening Committee dated 20.05.2016, the following Faculty members, be promoted as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty members/ Department/Institute/Centre	Date of Promotion
I. Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2)		
1.	Dr. Prabhdeep Brar UIFT	22.12.2013
2.	Ms. Kumari Monika P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre Hoshiarpur	03.09.2013
3.	Dr. Prashant Kumar Gautam UIHTM	13.10.2013
4.	Dr. Vishal Sharma Forensic Science & Criminology	07.12.2013
5.	Ms. Charu UIET (ECE)	07.10.2013
6.	Ms. Nidhi UIET (ECE)	17.10.2013
7.	Mr. Amandeep Singh Wadhwa UIET (Mech. Engg.)	04.09.2013
8.	Dr. Prashant Jindal UIET (Mech. Engg.)	22.09.2013
9.	Dr. (Ms.) Aman Kaura P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre Hoshiarpur (Chemistry)	07.10.2013
10.	Ms. Suman P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre Hoshiarpur (Chemistry)	07.01.2014
11.	Dr. Bimal Rai Department of Physics	07.06.2014
12.	Ms. Anju Berwal UILS (Law)	18.08.2013
13.	Dr. Karan Jawanda UILS	01.08.2013
14.	Ms. Sarpreet Kaur UIET (EEE)	07.10.2013
15.	Ms. Preetika Sharma UIET (EEE)	06.10.2013
16.	Shri Neeraj Sharma UIET (ECE)	06.10.2013
17.	Shri Jaswinder Singh Mehta UIET (Mechanical Engg.)	04.09.2013
18.	Ms. Preeti Gupta UIET (ECE)	06.10.2013
II. Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3)		
19.	Dr. (Mrs.) Ashish Virk P.U.R.C. Ludhiana	01.07.2014
20.	Dr. Shruti Bedi UILS	05.10.2013
21.	Dr. Aman Amrit Cheema nee Ranu P.U.R.C. Ludhiana	26.07.2013
22.	Dr. Manju Gera USOL	07.09.2014

23.	Dr. Monica Bedi UBS	01.07.2014
24.	Dr. Rani Mehta Department of Sociology	26.08.2013
25.	Dr. Ram Mehar USOL	14.10.2014
26.	Dr. Jasmeet Gulati UILS	12.07.2014
27.	Dr. (Mrs.) Jyoti Rattan Department of Laws	01.07.2014
28.	Dr. Vipin Bhatnagar Department of Physics	24.08.2013
29.	Dr. Ashok Kumar Department of Physics	24.08.2013
30.	Dr. (Mrs.) Sunita Srivastawa Department of Physics	24.08.2013
31.	Dr. Supreet Kaur USOL	07.09.2014
32.	Dr. Ganga Ram Chaudhary Department of Chemistry	05.02.2014
33.	Dr. Nishi Sharma UIAMS	28.08.2013
34.	Dr. Kalpana Dahiya UIET (Mathematics)	03.02.2014
35.	Dr. Navneet Agnihotri Department of Biochemistry	27.08.2013
36.	Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi UIAMS	08.04.2014
III. Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4)		
37.	Dr. Gulshan Kumar UILS	01.01.2014
38.	Dr. Vandana Arora Department of Laws	22.12.2013
39.	Dr. Sarabjit Kaur UILS	07.08.2013
IV. Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5)		
40.	Dr. (Mrs.) Gunmala Suri UBS	18.12.2013
41.	Dr. Neeraj Sharma Department of Evening Studies- MDRC	31.10.2013
42.	Dr. Jasminder Singh Dhillon PURC, Sri Muktsar Sahib	31.07.2013
43.	Dr. Archana R. Singh School of Communication Studies	12.01.2014
44.	Dr. Indu Chhabra Department of Computer Science and Applications	27.03.2014
45.	Dr. Surya Kant Tripathi Department of Physics	24.12.2013
46.	Dr. Ravinder Kaur Department of Geography	08.01.2014
47.	Dr. (Ms) Suman Makkar nee Suman Bala Vohra	30.04.2014

	Department of Evening Studies-MDRC (Economics)	
48.	Dr. Harsh Gandhar USOL (Economics)	15.04.2014
49.	Dr. Geeta Mangla Bansal USOL (Commerce)	06.05.2014

Issue regarding conversion of Extra Ordinary Leave availed by Dr. Kapil Kumar Sharma, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics

13. Considered the recommendation of the Committee dated 18.05.2016 (**Appendix-XV**) that the Extra Ordinary Leave without pay already availed by Dr. Kapil Kumar Sharma, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, w.e.f. 14.11.2005 to 22.12.2006, be treated/converted, as under:

1. Extra Ordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 14.11.2005 to 29.01.2006, as per Regulation 11 (G), pages 139-140, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.
2. Study leave without pay w.e.f. 30.01.2006 to 22.12.2006, subject to submission of progress reports, as per Regulation 11 (I)(i) and (xv) at pages 140-143, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee dated 18.05.2016 to treat/convert extra Ordinary Leave without pay already availed by Dr. Kapil Kumar Sharma, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, w.e.f. 14.11.2005 to 22.12.2006, be approved, as under:

1. Extra Ordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 14.11.2005 to 29.01.2006, as per Regulation 11 (G), pages 139-140, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.
2. Study leave without pay w.e.f. 30.01.2006 to 22.12.2006, subject to submission of progress reports, as per Regulation 11 (I)(i) and (xv) at pages 140-143, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

Issue regarding afresh reappointment of Dr. Neha Singla

14. Considered if, Dr. Neha Singla, be re-appointed afresh as Assistant Professor in the Department of Biophysics, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date she starts work for next academic session 2016-17 commencing from 07.07.2016 against the vacant post, 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.

NOTE: The term of appointment of Dr. Neha Singla was extended by the Vice-Chancellor up to 30.06.2016, which was noted by the Syndicate its meeting dated 01/15/28/29.05.2016 vide Para 118 (I-xxi) (**Appendix-XVI**).

RESOLVED: That Dr. Neha Singla, be re-appointed afresh as Assistant Professor in the Department of Biophysics, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date she starts work for next academic session 2016-17 commencing from 07.07.2016 against the vacant

post, 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.

Deferred Item

15. Considered the following recommendations dated 20.06.2016 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the issue of converting the Director's positions into equivalent Professor's positions in different departments, be approved, as there is no need of Director's position in the budget document of Panjab University, in view of introduction of Rotation Policy in all the Centres and Departments/Institutes at Panjab University Campus.

1. The Director/Principals' position, wherever it exists in the departments within P.U. Campus, be converted into Professors' positions.
2. The positions of Director-Professor/Principal-cum-Professor in the following Institutes (P.U. Campus), be converted into positions of Professor:
 - (i) University Institute of Educational Technology.
 - (ii) University Institute of Hotel & Tourism Management.
 - (iii) University Institute of Applied Management Sciences.
 - (iv) Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences.
3. The position of Director-Professor in Educational Multimedia Research Centre (P.U. Campus) be converted into the position of Associate Professor, as the Centre has already positions of two Professors and two Assistant Professors and there is no post of Associate Professor.
4. Respective Departments/Centres/Institutes will recommend the specialization(s) to be assigned to such posts of Professors from time to time.

NOTE: The necessary changes be incorporated in the draft budget documents of the Panjab University and be presented to the BOF and Governing Bodies of Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have introduced the rotation policy. Somewhere in the budget document, there is a mention of Director's position(s) and that these positions should be converted into the Professor's position.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired as to why it is being done so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the positions of the Directors are not being filled up and the positions of the Directors have become redundant. Therefore, these are being converted into that of Professor.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when these positions were created, there must have been a thought or a mandate behind the position of Director by the regulatory bodies.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when the Institutes were started in the University, someone had to be appointed as head of these institutions. Now, they have put a process that all organs of the University have to be treated in the same way. However, there are some conditions imposed by the regulatory bodies, as in the case of UILS, only a Professor could be the Director, in Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences (Dental College) only a Professor with 5 years standing could be the Director. But the heads of departments are being appointed for 3 years. After a lot of deliberation, they could appoint the heads of departments. The Director, UILS; Director, UIAMS and Principal, Dental College were appointed as heads of departments and their terms started in December 2014. All these people were appointed afresh for a period of 3 years. But in the budget document, the position is mentioned as Director, but there is no position of Director and that has to be converted into the position of Professor and a teacher could be appointed on that position. Either the post has to be advertised or completely abolished. So they have two options – either completely stop the position or the position should be only that of a Professor, instead of Director-Professor or Principal-Professor. So this is the suggestion, and nothing more than that.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there must have been some guidelines at the time of establishment of the institutes, like, University Institute of Educational Technology, Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management, Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Dental College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now that policy is over and this all is reset and they are not going to appoint anybody as head of UILS by advertising the post of Director but appoint only the Professors as heads.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there different guidelines of different regulatory bodies like Bar Council, Dental Council, etc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the guidelines of the DCI are that the Principal of a Dental College should be a Professor with 5 years standing.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired whether there is any post of Director as per the AICTE guidelines applicable in the case of UIAMS.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the position of Director is there but there is no tenure fixed for any specific period and the qualifications of a Director have also been specified.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the guidelines of those bodies should have been annexed with the item which were followed at the time of establishment of these institutes. There must have been

guidelines that the senior most could have been appointed as the Chairperson/Head of the Department otherwise there would not have been a need to create the post of Director.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want to go into that history which is over at the moment.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the supporting documents should have been given relating to the guidelines.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all this has been done in the tenure of this Senate only.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that is there any policy of the regulatory bodies and if the inspection is done by those bodies and a rider is put to create the position, then what would they do.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no such situation.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that when they had appointed the Director, Culture in the University, he had pointed out that scale of Director is not even that of an Assistant Professor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not an issue related with Director Culture.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that there two important points – one is about the Panjab University campus and the other is about 4 new institutes. In the Regional Centre at Muktsar, there is a post of Director-Professor. Why the same has not been included in it as they have not filled up that post for long. The senior most person Professor Dhingra worked there for a tenure of 3 years and the next senior most Professor was shifted at Kauni because there was a requirement of Professor there. Why those posts have not been included in it and why it is only for the campus? The posts at Rural Centre, Kauni and Regional Centre, Muktsar are of Director-Professor which have not been filled up. If those posts are of Director, then the rule of Professor to be appointed as head for tenure of 3 years is not applicable. But they are treating as Professor as the tenure of 3 years is being given.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this matter is not there. They would look into that. The Director at Hoshiarpur has been appointed under very special circumstances and that is pre-2014. Since no person was available for Hoshiarpur, they had to appoint a special Committee. At the moment, there is no issue of that. By that time, the present Director superannuated there would be enough number of Professors in that Centre and till then he could continue.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested that a Committee could be formed and the Centre at Muktsar be also taken into consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee had made the recommendations in a casual manner as there is no supportive document that the four posts which they have recommended to be converted into that of Professor that there is no need of mentioning the nomenclature of Director in the budget document. How could one know that these 4 posts are mentioned in the budget document as Director? To his knowledge there is no budgeted post of Director, UIAMS. If they have to pass the things like this, at least, he would not

become a party to such a decision. There is no post of Director in the UIAMS and they were converting that post also and the Committee has also not bothered to see the documents.

It was clarified that these are budgeted posts and as per budget document, these posts were in the name of respective departments except UIAMS. But in UIAMS, Director was appointed and the nomenclature of the Director was there in the other documents. It is to clarify that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no post of Director in the budget document. It was headed by Professor and it was at the time when Honorary Director was appointed at the beginning of the Institute and Professor A.K. Saihpal was appointed as Director and thereafter, it was said that the senior most person could be the Director. But there is no budgeted post. Then coming to the year 2014 when it was decided, if they could recall or check the records also that as far as possible keeping in view the regulations of the apex bodies like DCI, AICTE, etc., nobody bothered to check it up from the apex bodies in which the Syndicate and Senate decision was that first it should be checked before introducing the scheme. NO letter has ever gone to BCI, DCI, AICTE and the policy was introduced. The Vice-Chancellor has said that the DCI condition is that a Professor with 5 years standing would be the Principal. This is not the case. The DCI says where the Principal is appointed, there is no need of having Professor of the speciality of which the Principal is. So, the appointment has to be made primarily of the Principal and then they have been exempted to appoint the Professor in that specialty and not that they appoint a Professor and start saying that the senior most Professor would be the Principal, that is not the case. Probably, the rotation policy was introduced in 2014 itself. Nobody brought it to the notice of the Syndicate and the Senate that in this session the University had to face the same situation of which they were afraid of the DCI putting the objection and ultimately from the Government of India and it was highlighted in the newspapers that they faced disaffiliation as far as MDS course is concerned only because of the fact that they did not have the Principal. The University filed a writ petition in the High Court and had to go into LPA and were given the relief of admitting the students in MDS just only one day after the order was passed by the High Court and they could admit only 7 students. He would have to evaluate it that how much money they have lost in one year and how much money it would become if they multiply it by 3 because the students are admitted for 3 years. He simply wanted to say that before taking such decisions, as he had said in the year 2014 also, that the budget document should be annexed with such a proposal and also the regulations of the respective apex bodies unless and until the Vice-Chancellor or the University finds in emergent situation that if this issue is not clinched, they might face the situation. He did not think that there is not any such emergency and they would have to face the same thing.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would not happen as most of the inspections for the MDS have already been done. All the deficiencies have been resolved with the DCI.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that is why he is saying that there is no urgency now and they should bring both the documents – the budget and the regulations of the apex bodies so that they did not face any embarrassing situation as they had to face earlier.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there would be no such embarrassing situation and he has no hesitation and the item could be deferred and both the documents could be provided.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that were they sure that these are the only 4 positions with nomenclature of Director existing in the University which are mentioned in the budget, that has also not been verified and if there is any other position of Director, why they have not included that. There must be some valid reasons and the verification should also be attached so that they could take a conscious decision.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested that the position of Kauni and Muktsar be also included in it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as far his knowledge, there is no budgeted post of Director at Regional Centre, Ludhiana and they all are under the impression that the position of Director is also to be advertised and it was discussed also and the Vice-Chancellor was saying in 2014 that they would get some good Director. Then he checked and found that there is no position of Director at Ludhiana, as is the case of UIAMS. He thought that once they had advertised the post of Director at Ludhiana and he is sure that the draft was prepared for the advertisement. Let them identify the positions of the Director or the Coordinator or the Principal and see how many of them could be converted to that of Professor's position to be included in the budget document.

RESOLVED: That, keeping in view the discussion, the consideration of the item be deferred and the item be again placed before the Syndicate along with the relevant guidelines of the apex regulatory bodies and the budget documents.

Proposal for increase in honorarium of Visiting Professors from inside the country as well as abroad and appointment of Dr. Gurinder Pal Singh as Visiting Professor in the Department of Physics

16. Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 27.06.2016 (**Appendix-XVII**) (to evaluate the proposal for increase in honorarium of Visiting Professors from inside the country as well as abroad) and 11.5.2016 (**Appendix-XVII**) (to appoint Dr. Gurinder Pal Singh, Senior Scientist at USA at Department of Physics, P.U.), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, on the request (**Appendix-XVII**) of Professor Devinder Mehta, Chairperson, Department of Physics, that.

- (i) Dr. Gurinder Pal Singh, Senior Scientist at USA be appointed as Honorary Professor in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (ii) the limit of honorarium payable to a person appointed as Visiting Professor from outside the country be increased to Rs.80,000/-. Also the same for the superannuated persons appointed as Visiting Professor from within country be increased to Rs.60,000/- per month excluding other superannuation benefits

- NOTE:**
1. Bio-Data of Dr. Gurinder Pal Singh is enclosed (**Appendix-XVII**).
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2011(Para 38) (**Appendix-XVII**) has approved the recommendation of

the Committee dated 10.12.2010 with regard to work out the modalities of Visiting Professors and their likely role in the University.

3. Since the meeting of BOF is to be held after 31.7.2016, the matter is not placed before the BOF. However, after the decision of the Syndicate it will be got noted by the Board of Finance.

Professor Shelley Walia said that why should there be discrimination between the visiting Professor coming from abroad and that within the country because both of them are going to reside in the campus.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what he gathered from the documents is that the honorarium was fixed many years ago and it should be enhanced. The point is that they were not paying any fare to the persons coming from abroad. In some way, it is just like subsidization. If somebody stays here for 3-4 months, that fare could be adjusted through this honorarium.

Professor Shelley Walia enquired as to what is the tenure of this position.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the tenure could not be more than 3 years.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if a person gets the tenure of 3 years and an honorarium of Rs.80,000/- the difference of honorarium payable to a person from abroad and to that within the country would be very much.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to whether the expenditure done on the honorarium would be received from the Ministry of Human Resource Development or it would be met from the University funds.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not know. These decisions have been taken by the Syndicate and the University is having the notion of Visiting Professors and the expenditure on the honorarium could probably go to the salary budget.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it has to go to the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now it is that from whatever budget head it is being paid, it would be paid from that budget head. It is not known whether the Ministry of Human Resource Development would allow the increase or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when an item has to be placed before the Board of Finance, then why the same is being presented to the Syndicate. It is very embarrassing that if something is done by the Syndicate and the same is negated by the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that academic decision is involved in this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the financial decision is also involved. Therefore, it should have been routed through the Board of Finance as the increase in the honorarium is in the domain of the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine. They could just take a call that if it is approved by the Board of Finance, it be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first it should be placed before the Board of Finance and then it be placed before the Syndicate in the next meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could grant the approval for the appointment of Visiting Professor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the approval for the appointment could be granted and not for increase in honorarium.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Gurinder Pal Singh is an eminent scientist and has developed the technology of the slider which moves on the disk.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired about the honorarium being increased to Rs.80,000/- for a person from outside the country and Rs.60,000/- for a person from within the country. If someone is not a superannuated person and is an eminent scientist, had never been a Professor and had never served, is of the age of 55 years, did not get salary from anywhere, is that person not included in it. So, it should be looked into.

The Vice-Chancellor said, 'okay'. He said that it is case by case. They have to make a case and ensure that the person would provide research value to the University which they could not provide on their own. This man had visited the Panjab University many times. Only when this person has made a validation, then the Department of Physics took an initiative that he should be appointed as a Visiting Professor. There is an academic recognition that they were according him in this way. If somebody is coming and staying in the Guest House, either they could provide free facilities or give the notional money. The Department of Physics pointed out that they have a provision and he could be appointed.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) as per recommendation of the Committee dated 11.05.2016, Dr. Gurinder Pal Singh, Senior Scientist in USA be appointed as Visiting Professor in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh; and
- (ii) the matter regarding enhancement in honorarium for Visiting Professors from outside the country and from within the country be referred to the Board of Finance.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 20.5.2016 for implementation of roster for non-teaching posts

17. Considered the following recommendations (1 & 2) of the Committee dated 20.05.2016 (**Appendix-XVIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review & give recommendations for implementation of roster for Non-Teaching posts in the Panjab University.

- (i) that it be got clarified from the Syndicate whether the roster for non-teaching be prepared as per the Punjab Government Reservation Policy or as per the Central Government Reservation Policy as they have done in the case of teaching faculty; and
- (ii) if it is decided to follow the Reservation Policy of Punjab Government, then they have to prepare the roster according to total reservation of 25% as there are no Scheduled Tribes in the State of Punjab

NOTE: The Committee has also recommended that the Establishment Branch may provide information as to how many sanctioned posts (category and cadre wise alphabetically) are there and also as to how many of them are vacant and how many filled, including how many candidates belonging to reserved categories have been selected through open selection against the above said posts.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Vice-Chancellor had constituted a Committee for implementation of roster for non-teaching posts. Since the rules of Punjab Government are followed for the non-teaching posts in the University, the question arose as to whether the roster should be as per the Central Government or Punjab Government reservation policy. In the policy of the Punjab Government, reservation is there for SC and not for ST and the percentage of reservation is 25%. In the Central Government, the reservation is 22% (15% for SC and 7.5% for ST). This is the question as to which roster is to be implemented. It is just for that clarification that the matter has come to the Syndicate as till date there is no roster.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the service conditions of Punjab Government are applicable and reservation policy of Chandigarh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that service conditions are different from reservation policy.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the reservation is not covered under service conditions.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it is so as the service conditions start from the stage of appointment.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the service conditions are not specifically mentioned whether one is from SC or ST or general category. He said that the service conditions come into force only after somebody has been appointed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a lot of pressure from the Commission.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Court case is not yet decided whether the University is centrally funded or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Court case has nothing to do with this. They should not talk in such a way otherwise unnecessarily the Syndicate would get into the issue that the matter came up to the Syndicate but it did not take a call.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice-Chancellor as to what to do.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever reservation policy is followed by U.T. Administration, they could also adopt the same as they used to get the money through U.T. Administration from the Government.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it would be better if they implement the policy of Central Government as it would cover both the SC and ST.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they did not have ST.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Panjab University has its employees in Punjab also as they are having the Regional Centres and they have the Constituted Colleges also. If they adopt the Central Government policy, there would be problems. If they adopt the U.T. policy, then there would also be problems. How the employees are to be treated could they have a separate cadre.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the U.T. Administration mostly follows the Punjab Government.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the U.T. Administration also follows the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a point that they are having the presence in Punjab in the form of Regional Centres. If they have to adopt the policy, that could be of Punjab Government.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they adopt the policy of Punjab Government, then they would have to put in the Calendar also wherein it is mentioned that the Colleges falling in Punjab would follow the reservation policy of Punjab. The Colleges falling in U.T. would follow the policy of U.T. and the campus of the University would follow the policy of Central Government. There are 3 different reservation policies – for the University, for the Colleges of Punjab and for the Colleges of Chandigarh. He did not know how much pressure is there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that during a visit to Delhi, it was articulated that Panjab University has a national character. They have 3 sub classifications even for their general existence.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in today's situation, it would be better if they implement the reservation policy of Central Government. But in that they have to take into consideration the stay which is operative as far as the appointment of ST in the University is concerned, they would be left with only 15% reservation for SC as per the Central Government policy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could do at least the minimum reservation of 15%.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that even after the stay by the Court, the appointments under ST category had been made subject to the outcome of the court case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that no such appointment had been made. In fact, subject to the outcome of the court case was mentioned only in the case of those appointments which had already been made.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could implement at least 15%.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it could be done as per Central Government policy.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that they could adopt the Central Government policy of reservation, i.e., 15% for SC and 7.5% for ST and in the case of ST, they could wait for the decision of the Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could adopt the reservation policy of Central Government of 15% for SC. The reservation of 7.5% for ST would be subject to the outcome of the decision of the High Court. He further said that if they see the policy of the Central Government, ST would not be covered under this policy in Chandigarh because STs are covered only in those areas to which they belong. Even in Himachal Pradesh, in some areas there is no reservation for STs and most of the STs are getting reservation in admission in Panjab University.

RESOLVED: That roster for non-teaching positions be prepared as per the Central Government Reservation Policy fixing 15% reservation for the SCs.

**Appointment of Technical
Advisors in the P.U.
Construction/Architect
Office**

18. Considered if, the following who have been retired as Senior Officers, be appointed as Technical Advisors in the P.U. Construction/Architect Office on the suitable fixed honorarium, initially for one year from the date they assume their duty:

1. Mr. Yogesh Gupta (Civil)
2. Er. Ajit Singh Gulati (Electrical)
3. Ms. Sumit Kaur (Architect)

NOTE: 1. At present the following persons are working as Technical Advisors:

- (i) Er. V.K. Bhardwaj (Civil), Chief Engineer in Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh at consolidated pay of Rs.15000/- p.m. His last term of appointment was extended for one year w.e.f. 22.02.2015.
- (ii) Er. Param Hans Singh (Electrical), Engineer-in-Chief, Punjab State Electricity Board at honorarium of

Rs.15000/- p.m. His term of appointment is till further order.

(iii) Shri P.R. Luthra (Architect), Chief Architect, Punjab at honorarium of Rs.10000/- p.m. His term of appointment is till further order.

2. An office note containing the history in this regard is enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**).
3. Bio-Data of all the three recommended Engineers are enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that presently they are having 3 Technical Advisors who are advising in the matters related with the architecture and construction and are to be replaced with the new ones.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to from where they got the three names of these persons.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Ms. Sumit Kaur has recently retired as Architect from U.T. Chandigarh.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that let they be transparent and it should be kept pending for some time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Ms. Sumit Kaur had helped a lot in getting the land for the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they appoint a person from the U.T. Administration that could be very helpful.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired whether any advertisement was given for these appointments.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had come to know about these persons while having talks with various people.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had no reservation.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said Ms. Sumit Kaur had not helped the U.T. Administration much.

The Vice-Chancellor said that she had helped a lot in getting the land for the University in preference to the other institutions. He said that they keep it pending and the members could study the details and he has given the background. He did not want the difference of opinion and wanted complete unanimity in this matter.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that if some of the members could suggest the names of suitable persons and they could authorize the Vice-Chancellor to take a decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to give the answer to the society also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let they not stretch it and get into this argument. He is not in any hurry. He has given the background from where he came to know about these persons. Ms. Sumit Kaur is a retired Chief Architect and he had a good experience with her. Er. Ajit Singh Gulati (Electrical) is a retired Engineer-in-Chief from Punjab. If those people agree to work on such a small honorarium, it would be a good thing for the University. If they have got better people, they could consider it and solicit a copy of the bio-data from them.

Dr. Ajay Ranga enquired whether these persons have agreed to come.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he got these names from someone and had a talk and it is hoped that these persons would not decline the offer. He said that would they come back to this item again.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could authorize the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Vice-Chancellor is satisfied, then there is no problem. He wanted to bring to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor some very serious facts. The Vice-Chancellor should at least have an interaction with these people and assess their abilities. He cited the example of DMC Ludhiana where earlier the UGC scales were not being paid to the doctors but were being paid a fixed salary. But the doctors worked because they were allowed the private practice. One of the doctors was a member of the Senate and when the issue was raised, the UGC scales were given to the doctors of DMC Ludhiana. He is saying this from that angle that keeping that thing in mind, the Vice-Chancellor should have interaction and assess these people.

The Vice-Chancellor said that okay, he would have the interaction with these persons.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Issue regarding seniority of Store-keepers vis-à-vis newly appointed Clerks

19. Considered the proposed amendments, and

RESOLVED: That, it be recommended to the Senate, that the following amendments, be incorporated, in the earlier Senate decision dated 29.09.2013 (Para-LX (8)(iii)):

Decision of the Senate dated 29.09.2013 (Para-LX (8)(iii))	Amendment as proposed by the Committee dated 27.02.2016
(i) They will continue to perform the duty as Store-Keepers.	(i) No Change
(ii) They will not claim for seniority from back dates.	(ii) No Change
(iii) They will be given seniority in the Clerical cadre after the last confirmed Clerk.	(iii) They will be given seniority in the clerical cadre after the Last appointed Clerk.

(iv) Their inter-se-seniority will remain the same as Store-Keepers.	(iv) No Change
(v) They will be given pay-scale & all other benefits as are applicable to Clerks from the date on which their cadre is merged.	(v) No Change
(vi) The implementation of merger into Clerical cadre will be effective w.e.f the date of decision of BOF.	(vi) No Change

Issue regarding providing of facility of dongle

20. Considered the modification in the decision of the Syndicate dated 15.04.2013/25.04.2013 (Para 11) (**Appendix-XX**) by making addition that the facility of dongles for internet, be allowed to the officials/officers authorized by the Vice-Chancellor.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 15.04.2013/25.04.2013 (Para 11) has approved a policy regarding residential landline/internet telephone facility of ISD and internet connection at residential landline telephone to designated officers.
 2. The office orders No. 3/2/VC/ds dated 01.02.2016 issued by the Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor vide which Shri Rohit Ahuja, Senior Assistant and Shri Hari Om Khurana, Stenographer deputed in the office of Vice-Chancellor were provide dongles for internet facilities enclosed (**Appendix-XX**).
 3. The audit has observed that rules/instructions may be provided under which Vice-Chancellor has been authorized to sanction dongles to such officials as a special case. In order to make the payment in time, the bills were got admitted provisionally.
 4. The Vice-Chancellor has observed that these are newer technologies; their usage facilitates the work of the Office of the Vice-Chancellor.
 5. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XX**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the services of these persons are required at odd hours and they have to use internet at their homes for performing the job/s assigned to them, it was thought to provide them the dongles.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That, in addition to the designated officials/officers who have been provided the facility of telephone/internet/ISD at residence vide Syndicate decision dated 15.04.2013/25.04.2013, the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to allow the facility of dongle/s to the officers/officials for using the internet, as and when required, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Endowment for institution of “Mata Gujri” Gold Medal

21. Considered if, an endowment of Rs.1,04,752/- made by Dr. Lakhbir Paul Saini, 7612, Tea Berry Way, Sacramento, CA 95828 (USA)/ # 380, Sector-38, Chandigarh, in the memory of his beloved mother, Late Smt. Parkash Kunj, accepted and the office be allowed to invest the said amount in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh and the interest so accrued be credited annually in the SET A/c No. 10444978140 and be utilized as under:

- (i) An endowment will be named as Late Mother Parkash Kunj-“Mata Gujri” Gold Medal.
- (ii) The Gold Medal should be awarded to the student securing highest marks in M.Sc. (Bio-Physics) and pursuing Ph.D. in the Bio-Physics in this institution every year during the Panjab University Convocation.

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

After some discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That an endowment of Rs.1,04,752/- made by Dr. Lakhbir Paul Saini, 7612, Tea Berry Way, Sacramento, CA 95828 (USA)/ # 380, Sector-38, Chandigarh, be accepted for institution of Mata Gujri Gold Medal in memory of his mother late Smt. Parkash Kunj and the office be allowed to invest the said amount in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh and the interest so accrued be credited annually in the SET A/c No. 10444978140 and be utilized as under:

- (i) the endowment will be named as Mata Gujri Gold Medal in memory of late Smt. Parkash Kunj; and
- (ii) the Gold Medal should be awarded to the student securing highest marks in M.Sc. (Bio-Physics) and pursuing Ph.D. in the Bio-Physics in this institution every year during the Panjab University Convocation.

Endowment for institution of “Dashmesh Pita” Gold Medal

22. Considered if, an endowment of Rs.1,05,036/- made by Dr. Lakhbir Paul Saini, 7612, Tea Berry Way, Sacramento, CA 95828 (USA)/# 380, Sector-38, Chandigarh, in the memory of his Late Grandfather Sardar Sher Singh Satauria, be accepted and the office be allowed to invest the said amount in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh and the interest so accrued be credited annually in the SET A/c No. 10444978140 and be utilized as under:

- (i) An endowment will be named as ‘Late Grandfather Sardar Sher Singh Satauria-“Dashmesh Pita” Gold Medal’.

- (ii) The Gold Medal should be awarded to the student securing highest marks in M.Sc. (Medical Physics) and pursuing Ph.D. in the Medical Physics/Genetics Studies in this institution every year during the Panjab University Convocation.

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

After some discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That an endowment of Rs.1,05,036/- made by Dr. Lakhbir Paul Saini, 7612, Tea Berry Way, Sacramento, CA 95828 (USA) / # 380, Sector-38, Chandigarh be accepted for institution of Dashmesh Pita Gold Medal in memory of his grandfather late Sardar Sher Singh Satauria and the office be allowed to invest the said amount in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh and the interest so accrued be credited annually in the SET A/c No. 10444978140 and be utilized as under:

- (i) the endowment will be named as Dashmesh Pita Gold Medal in memory of late Sardar Sher Singh Satauria; and
- (ii) the Gold Medal should be awarded to the student securing highest marks in M.Sc. (Medical Physics) and pursuing Ph.D. in the Medical Physics/Genetics Studies in this institution every year during the Panjab University Convocation.

Endowment for institution of “Dashmesh Pita” Gold Medal’

23. Considered an endowment of Rs.4,00,000/- made by Dr. L.N. Gupta, # 220, Sector-7, Panchkula-134109 (Haryana) (Ex-Professor & Chairman, Department of Geology, P.U., Chandigarh) for institution of an Endowment named as “Professor L.N. Gupta Merit Scholarship”. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XXIII**) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That an endowment of Rs.4,00,000/- made by Dr. L.N. Gupta, # 220, Sector-7, Panchkula-134109 (Haryana) (Ex-Professor & Chairman, Department of Geology, P.U., Chandigarh) be accepted for institution of an Endowment named as “Professor L.N. Gupta Merit Scholarship”. The Investment of Rs.4,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year and the interest so accrued there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 10444978140 to facilitate to utilize the funds in the department of Geology/C.A.S. in Geology, P.U., to a student of M.Sc. (Hons. School) class with the following terms and conditions:

- (a) The amount of merit Scholarship should be Rs.1000/- p.m. i.e. 10 months w.e.f. July to April.
- (b) The scholarship will be awarded to one student of M.Sc. (H.S.) 1st year (Geology) every year on the basis of B.Sc.(H.S.) Geology result on the recommendation of the Chairman and continue the scholarship to the same student of M.Sc. (H.S.) Geology 2nd year if he or she would be topper in the M.Sc. (H.S.) Geology 1st year. Otherwise,

the scholarship would be awarded to the next deserving candidate on the recommendation of Academic and Administrative Committee of the department.

- (c) A student who is awarded the scholarship should not be getting any financial grant from any other source.

**Recommendations of
the committee dated
30.3.2016**

24. Considered the following recommendations (Sr. No. 1 & 2) of the Committee dated 30.03.2016 (**Appendix-XXIV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the Human Resource available in the Director Public Relations Office and access their qualifications and experience recommend, in relation to their workload and expectation from their office, that:

1. The post of 'Senior Assistant' in the Public Relation Department be converted into 'Assistant Public Relation Officer' (APRO) as both the posts are carrying the same pay-scale i.e. Rs.10300-34800+GP of Rs.4400 (initial pay of Rs.17420/-).
2. After conversion, the post of APRO be filled in with the same qualifications as prescribed by the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a post of Senior Assistant in the office of Director, Public Relations and this nomenclature has to be changed to that of Assistant Public Relation Officer (APRO).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Senior Assistant and Assistant Public Relation Officer are two different things. He enquired if any Senior Assistant is to be posted there and would like to be called as Assistant Public Relation Officer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the post of Assistant Public Relation Officer is a new post.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the post of Senior Assistant is to be converted into that of Assistant Public Relation Officer and to be filled up on the same qualifications as prescribed by the Punjab Govt.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then it should have been written that a new position of APRO be created in the office of the Director, Public Relations and in lieu of that the DPR is ready to surrender the post of Senior Assistant. Let they take a decision to convert the position of Senior Assistant into that of Assistant Public Relations Officer as there would be no financial liability and the post would be filled up as per the qualifications prescribed by the Punjab Govt.

RESOLVED: That the post of 'Senior Assistant' in the Public Relation Department be converted into 'Assistant Public Relation Officer' (APRO) as both the posts are carrying the same pay-scale i.e. Rs.10300-34800+GP of Rs.4400 (initial pay of Rs.17420/-) and after conversion, the post of APRO be filled in with the same qualifications as prescribed by the Punjab Government.

Leave Case of Shri Manish Sabharwal, Senior Assistant, Establishment Branch

25. Considered if, Shri Manish Sabharwal, Senior Assistant, Establishment Branch be treated absent from duty w.e.f. 21.11.2015 to 06.01.2016, as he could not resume his duty after the expiry of Extra Ordinary Leave without pay granted to him w.e.f. 18.02.2015 to 20.11.2015. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXV**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:** 1. As per Regulation 12.2 (c) at page 127 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, an employee can avail Extra Ordinary Leave up to five years. Accordingly, Shri Manish Sabharwal has availed five year extra ordinary leave as under:

Extra Ordinary Leave Without Pay
19.01.2010 to 31.08.2010 = 225 days
01.12.2010 to 31.05.2011 = 182 days
01.06.2011 to 15.07.2011 = 45 days
16.07.2011 to 31.03.2012 = 260 days
01.04.2012 to 31.07.2012 = 122 days
01.08.2012 to 31.07.2013 = 365 days
01.08.2013 to 22.09.2013 = 53 days
04.02.2014 to 09.10.2014 = 248 days
10.10.2014 to 27.11.2014 = 49 days
18.02.2015 to 20.11.2015 = 276 days
Total = 1825 days

2. Shri Manish Sabharwal was allowed to resume his duty w.e.f. 07.01.2016 vide order dated 27.01.2016 (**Appendix-XXV**). Whereas EOL granted to him to visit Australia to see his family had been expired on 20.11.2015.
3. The Resident Audit Officer on 25.02.2016 had made the following observation:

“There are no rules/regulation for treating overstayed of leave absent beyond the permissible limit of leave as has been got approved from the Vice-Chancellor in this case. As the official has joined the service after overstayed of leave, the ECR be got ticked from audit from the date of joining subject to deciding the period of overstayed of leave from 21.11.2015 to 06.01.2016 by the Syndicate and Senate as there is no provision regarding this in the leave regulation”.

4. Regulation 13 at page 128 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, reproduced below:

“13. Any case not coming within the purview of the Regulation and/or Rules approved by the Syndicate, for

Non-Teaching employees, may be decided in such manner as the Senate in the case of employees of Class A and the Syndicate in the case of employees of Class B and C may deem fit”.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is to overcome the objection raised by the Resident Audit Officer (RAO).

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to whether the leave for the period 18.02.2015 to 20.11.2015 was sanctioned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a case of overstay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Shri Manish Sabharwal has availed five year extra ordinary leave during the period from 19.01.2010 to 20.11.2015. He would like to draw the attention to what is happening in the University. A person proceeds on leave and does not return.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person could not join due to reasons beyond his control and now he has already joined the duty.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then it is a very serious case.

Professor Shelley Walia said that in the Army, that person could have been thrown out.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that not only in the Army, but that person would have been thrown out in any service except Panjab University. He would like to point out as to what is happening that a person gets the leave sanctioned for some specified period, e.g, 15 days or one month and goes abroad. They have got the PR status there and are also working there. It is very well within the knowledge of the University that such persons have got the PR status. It had come in the newspapers last year where it was found that thousands of the Government employees are permanent residents of Canada, Australia. At the same time, they were working in the Punjab Government. They come to India for a month, work here and get the salary and meet their family members. As a result, the Punjab Government has asked each and every employee to submit a copy of their passport and passed the orders to do away with the services of such personnel. But what is happening in Panjab University is that all such people have got their PR status in Canada and Australia, get the leave sanctioned from here and after going there ask for extension. Even the first extension has not been sanctioned, again another request for extension is sent. Instead of treating them on unauthorized absence, the employee makes a telephone call and the final notice is issued to join within 30 days otherwise action will be initiated. A week before the expiry of this notice, that person comes and join the duty. But the personnel here say how they could allow such a person to join and that person says that he was asked to do so. Presuming that now they could do nothing, if the final notice had been given that if the employee did not join before such and such date, the post would be declared vacant or any other action would be taken, that did not mean that after allowing the employee to join, they could not take the action because the charge of unauthorized absence still remains against the employee. If such a person has become habitual of being absent from duty without getting the leave sanctioned, then

they have to proceed against such an employee under serious misconduct. The post had to be vacated and it should be got vacated because they could not become a tool for somebody to attain the PR status at the cost of Panjab University. Now they are saying for the extraordinary leave, that meant that all the unauthorized absence be condoned and be authorized, could they do it?

It was informed that that it cannot be and should not be done but it has been done earlier. That is why it has been sent for approval

Shri Ashok Goyal said that all the leave would become part of the charges to be levelled against that employee that he remained absent during such and such period and as a special case they had been doing it. But now it has been observed that he is habitual and why disciplinary action should not be taken against him. Instead of condoning the extraordinary leave because of the unauthorized absence, he should be proceeded with disciplinary action against him as per service rules. He gave another suggestion that how do they afford that the employee remain absent for such long period. There should be a system that anybody who has absented himself beyond 7 days or 15 days, a notice be sent, again another notice be sent and then a notice be given in the newspaper and the whole process should be completed within a maximum period of 3 months and it is all prescribed in the service rules also.

It was informed that in fact it had been done in such a case but the person immediately joined. The persons get immediate communication. An order was issued to insert an advertisement in the newspaper, the next day a phone comes from the person that he wants to join.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there have been instances where action has been taken.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that all such similar cases should be taken up.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there is a similar case in the Centre for Women Studies. The Peon posted there does not come on duty and the department is suffering as the replacement is not given from the administrative block. That person has some other problem and the letters have been issued to that person. The Registrar had formed a Committee for this case and the Committee has made the recommendation for taking appropriate action, it should be got expedited.

RESOLVED: That Shri Manish Sabharwal, Senior Assistant, Establishment Branch be treated absent from duty w.e.f. 21.11.2015 to 06.01.2016, as he did not resume his duty after the expiry of Extra Ordinary Leave without pay granted to him w.e.f. 18.02.2015 to 20.11.2015, for which disciplinary proceedings be initiated against him as per service and conduct rules.

**Recommendation of
the Committee dated
12.5.2016**

26. Considered the recommendation of the Committee dated 12.5.2016 discharging the functions of Board of Studies in M.Sc. Environment Science, that the nomenclature of the Board of Studies in Environment Science & Solid Waste Management be changed to that of Board of Studies in Environment Science.

NOTE: The Dean, Faculty of Science has approved the said recommendations on behalf of the Faculty of Science as per authorization given by the Faculty vide Para 13 dated 28.3.2016

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is a basic issue and the Government is working on solid waste management.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now there is a Board of Studies in Environment Studies & Solid Waste Management. Since there is no course on solid waste management, the Committee has recommended that it be known as Board of Studies in Environment Studies. There is so much emphasis on the solid waste.

Professor Shelley Walia said that they could not have environment science without solid waste management.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that, in fact, it is correlated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a University in England which wants to come and collaborate with Panjab University and work for solid waste management.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that his proposal is that the nomenclature of the M.Sc. in Environment Science be changed to M.Sc. in Environment Science and Solid Waste Management.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it should be left as it is.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could leave it as it is.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the matter be referred back to the Dean for seeking the clarifications.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item be not rejected and referred to the Dean to provide the justification.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should also be conveyed that the Syndicate wanted that there should be no change in it.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred back to the Dean, Faculty of Science to reconsider and provide the justification for recommending the change of nomenclature.

Condonation of Delay for submission of Ph.D thesis by Ms. Kamaldeep Kaur

27. Considered if, delay of 9 years 3 months and 19 days for submission of Ph.D. thesis of Ms. Kamaldeep Kaur, Research scholar (enrolled on 16.04.2002) in the Faculty of Languages, Department of English & Cultural Studies, be condoned, beyond the 6 years as strongly recommended by her supervisor Dr. Shelley Walia, Professor and Fellow, Department of English & Cultural Studies, P.U. vide letter dated 17.05.2016 (**Appendix-XXVI**):

- NOTE:** 1 Ms. Kamaldeep Kaur, Research Scholar, Department of English & Cultural Studies was enrolled for Ph.D. on 16.04.2002 in the Faculty of Languages. She was granted 1st extension for one year up to 15.04.2006 and second extension up to 15.04.2008. She requested for grant of permission for continuation of Ph.D. programme vide application dated 30.03.2015 (**Appendix-XXVI**) duly recommended by her supervisor. She has also given July 2017 as the specific date for submission of thesis and has also submitted the progress report (**Appendix-XXVI**).
2. The Joint Research Board in its meeting held on 04.01.2016 (Item 26) (**Appendix-XXVI**) has resolved that the candidate and her Supervisor be requested to give more justification and reasons as to why the submission of Ph.D. thesis has been delayed to such an extent.
3. The extract from the clause 17 of Revised Ph.D. Guidelines, duly approved by the Syndicate/Senate is reproduced below:

“The maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis be fixed as eight years from the date of registration, i.e. normal period: three years, extension period: three years (with usual fee prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time) and condonation period two years, after which Registration and Approval of Candidacy shall be treated as automatically cancelled. **However, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond eight years may be considered by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reasons to be recorded**”.

RESOLVED: That the delay of 9 years, 3 months and 19 days in the submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Kamaldeep Kaur, Research scholar (enrolled on 16.04.2002) in the Faculty of Languages, Department of English & Cultural Studies, be condoned.

NOTE: The candidate has intimated that she would submit her Ph.D. thesis up to July, 2017.

Request of Ms. Mukesh Lata, Research Scholar, School of Punjabi Studies for change of supervisor

28. Considered, request dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-XXVII**) of Ms. Mukesh Lata, Research Scholar, School of Punjabi Studies, duly recommended by Chairperson, School of Punjabi Studies, to change her present Supervisor/s and allow her to engage the following as new Supervisor/s to complete her Ph.D. and be also allowed to submit the thesis by condoning the delay beyond 3.8.2008:

1. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Govind National College, Narangwal.
2. Dr. Harpal Singh Bhatti, A.S. College, Khanna.

NOTE: 1. The following observations/ suggestion of Dean of University Instruction was approved by the Vice-Chancellor (**Appendix-XXVII**):

“this is a very old and sad case of disagreement between a student and teacher. Since the supervisors has retained and has apparently moved away, as a very special case, the student may be allowed to change the supervisor and work with new supervisor for some time on the same problem and submit the thesis, by condoning delay, by the Syndicate.

2. Accordingly, Ms. Mukesh Lata was advised to suggest two names of supervisors through Chairperson vide letter dated 19.05.2016 (**Appendix-XXVII**).
3. Ms. Mukesh Lata was enrolled for Ph.D. in the faculty of languages on 04.08.2003. She was granted first extension for one year i.e. up to 03.08.2007 after normal period of 3 years. She was further granted second extension up to 03.08.2008. She was pursuing her research work under the supervision of Dr. Joginder Singh Nehru, School of Punjabi Studies.
4. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXVII**).

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he wanted to bring to their knowledge that he was member of both the Committees which were constituted to consider this case. Though he has no objection in permitting the candidate to get her Supervisor changed, in future, there would be problem when many such candidates would request for change of their supervisors on one pretext or the other. In fact, the Committee had asked the candidate to give her thesis to Professor Akshaya Kumar, who was President, PUTA, at that time also, who would in turn get the same checked from her Supervisor, but she did not do that saying to the Dean of University Instruction, that if he would be her Supervisor, she would not do Ph.D. It should be

ensured that the Supervisor should not be of the choice of the candidate concerned. Now, the candidate had got her Ph.D. thesis bound mentioning the name of the changed supervisor. How the candidate could submit the thesis without the knowledge of the supervisor? The Committee had repeatedly requested the candidate and also convinced the supervisor but the candidate said that she would not do the Ph.D. under the supervision of the present supervisor. Now the supervisor had retired and the candidate wanted to submit the same earlier thesis which is about 8 years old.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that let they forget whatever has happened. In future, it should be made mandatory that the candidate should submit the soft copy through e-mail along with the hard copy of the thesis. In this way, everything would be on record as an evidence of the work done by the candidates as there have been complaints from the students that they had worked so hard and the teacher had got published their work. The e-mail should be sent to the Dean of University Instruction and other concerned persons. In this way, there would be no chances of copying. With the advances in technology, they could reduce the problems. If a student wanted to submit the thesis on which she was working since 2005, they should allow, as their role is to impart education to the students and not to take away anything from them. Everyone knows as to what was the situation of the Department of Punjabi from the year 2005 to 2013-14. If the teachers of the Department were themselves indulging in politics, agreement/disagreement, they should not be blame the students.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he wanted to help the student, as he had been a part and parcel of both the Committees in this case. The then Chairperson and the next Chairperson and he had requested the candidate but she refused and even went to the extent of saying that she would tear the thesis but would not do the Ph.D. under that supervisor. The thesis which was not approved by guide, how the candidate could submit the same after getting it signed from anyone else. In this way, they would have to face such problems in future also. It should be got checked. If the candidate was submitting an old thesis, he did not agree with it as it is a wrong practice. Even the names of the new two supervisors are involved in politics that if they sign the thesis, it could be submitted. He suggested that a 3-member Committee could be formed to check all these things.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that it is for the supervisor to see the quality as the same would be known at the time of the viva.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if the students had the liberty to select the supervisor, it is the role of the supervisor that 75% of the work is done by the candidate under the direction and supervision of the supervisor. If there is no guidance, how a student could work.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that why the supervisor was not changed about 5 years ago. It was because the student did not have any problem.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they see the title of the thesis, there is no change in the title.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that a supervisor takes so much pain in getting the work done from the student, makes the corrections, does the proof reading and ask the student to incorporate the suggestions. The student gets fed up and says that he/she did not want to work under his/her supervision and would say that he/she would like to work under the supervision of a supervisor who easily signs the thesis. Even the degrees are done through correspondence where the supervisor signs the thesis and the students take it. A supervisor has taken pains to get the title approved from the Board of Control, Board of Studies, Research Board and got the synopsis prepared. When the stage of submission of thesis comes, the student wanted to get another supervisor. There could be the other meaning of it also that the student did not want to work under a supervisor who wanted the student to really work hard.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he felt that the supervisor of the thesis does not need to be changed. But if they appoint a supervisor now and as he/she has to give a certificate that he/she has read the thesis, it is an original work, would there be a supervisor who could give such an undertaking.

The Vice-Chancellor said that lot of time has passed and Professor A.K. Bhandari has rightly conclude that this is a very old and sad case of disagreement between a student and a teacher. Since the supervisor has retired and has apparently moved away, as a special case, the student may be allowed to change the supervisor and work with a new supervisor for some time on the same problem and submit the thesis. The Dean of University Instruction had studied the case and taken a call and they should respect the opinion. After all Dean of University Instruction is an academic head. Otherwise it would send a wrong signal.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the student should not be penalized.

Some of the members said that this should be allowed.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he is not against helping the students.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever has happened has not left them with any other alternative except to ask the candidate to submit the thesis.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that whenever a student submits the thesis, chapterisation or the thesis in full or whatever research the student had done during the course of research, he/she should e-mail it to the Director, Research, Dean of University Instruction and the supervisor as it would bring in transparency.

RESOLVED: That request of Ms. Mukesh Lata, Research Scholar, School of Punjabi Studies, dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-XXVII**), duly recommended by Chairperson, School of Punjabi Studies, to change her present Supervisor/s and allow her to engage the following as new Supervisor/s to complete her Ph.D. be

acceded to and she be allowed to submit the thesis by condoning the delay beyond 3.8.2008:

1. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Govind National College, Narangwal.
2. Dr. Harpal Singh Bhatti, A.S. College, Khanna.

Issue regarding grant of temporary extension of affiliation to Sri Guru Gobind Singh College of Education, Beghpur Kamlooh (Mukerian)

29. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted, to Sri Guru Gobind Singh College of Education, Beghpur Kamlooh (Mukerian), District Hoshiarpur, for B.Ed. Course (1st and 2nd year) 4 Units i.e. 200 seats for each year, for the session 2016-17. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: Inspection report dated 28.03.2016 enclosed.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the Committee had imposed a condition for fulfillment of 15 Lecturers. The advertisement for these posts has been given and the College has sought the selection panel from the University on 18.4.2016. It should be got verified whether the College had appointed some Lecturers or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be looked into by the Dean College Development Council.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the matter did not come up before a Committee already constituted for this purpose.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to why this was not placed before the Committee.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he along with another member had visited the College, but till date no teacher has been appointed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the earlier constituted Committee should look into the matter.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 28/29.05.2016 (Para 56).

Issue regarding grant of temporary extension of affiliation to Bhag Singh Khalsa College for Women, Kala Tibba, Abohar

30. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation be granted to Bhag Singh Khalsa College for Women, Kala Tibba, Abohar for (i) B.Com. I, II & III (one unit), (ii) B.Sc. I, II & III (Non-medical), (iii) M.A. II (Sociology), (iv) B.Lib & Inf. Science Course for the session 2016-17, subject to fulfillment of the conditions as listed in the Inspection Report (if any), as well as with the condition that College will observe/follow the other Instructions/Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Government/UGC. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. The report of Inspection Committee dated 29.02.2016 enclosed.

2. The Principal was requested to comply with deficiencies vide letter dated 9.3.2016 copy enclosed, but the compliance was awaited.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he had no objection but he wanted to bring it to their notice that the course of B.Lib. has been granted to the College. Earlier, a Committee was formed that the course of medium should be English. In the meeting of the Committee, Chairpersons from other Universities also came and there was unanimity that English as the only medium of instruction could not be implemented in the Colleges. He pointed out that on page 279, the condition of purchasing books worth Rs.1 lac has been imposed. This condition has been imposed because some teachers did not want that the College should run this course. The Committee and the Dean College Development Council should keep these things in mind. When a Committee visits the College one of the members recommends for the course while the other Committee does not recommend the course. He requested that it should be got checked.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that for B.Com the books required to be purchased is Rs.3,000/-, for B.Sc. it Rs.5,000/-, for M.A. (Sociology) it is Rs.10,000/- and for B.Lib. it is Rs.1 lac.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 28/29.05.2016 (Para 56).

Issue regarding grant of temporary extension of affiliation to Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector 26, Chandigarh

31. Considered if temporary extension of affiliation be granted to Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector-26, Chandigarh for (i) M.Sc. (Microbial Biotechnology) I & II-40 seats each class & (ii) M.Sc. (Biotechnology)-I & II-40 seats each class for the session 2015-16. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The recommendation and deficiencies of the Inspection Committee dated 6.04.2015 were conveyed to the College on 26.4.2015 vide No.Misc./A-5/3967 dated 26.5.2015.
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 20.04.2015 constitutes a committee, to look into the temporary extension of affiliation of the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University for the session 2015-16. The Committee authorized the Chairperson of the Committee to constitute 2-members Committee/s, amongst the members of the Affiliation Committee, to visit/surprise visit/re-visit to verify the compliance by Colleges opened in the session 2015-16 and other Colleges, which have not sent the compliance report, for verifying the fulfillment of the various conditions stipulated by the inspection teams in their inspection reports and any persistence with the shortcomings thereof on report of

the re-visit teams, shall be dealt with as per P.U. rules/regulations.

Accordingly, a 2-members Committee comprising of Dr. I.S. Sandhu, Associate Professor/Fellow P.U. and Dr. S.K. Arora, Principal, DAV College, Abohar/Fellow, P.U. visited Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector-26, Chandigarh, on 23.04.2016 and submitted its report on 30.05.2016 wherein it has been mentioned that:

1. Previous Inspection report of the Committee was submitted/ reported i.e. %age of deficiency in terms of staff: NIL.
2. Sufficient Infrastructure was found available in the College for class rooms, Laboratories & equipments.

RESOLVED: That temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector-26, Chandigarh, for (i) M.Sc. (Microbial Biotechnology) I & II -40 seats each class; and (ii) M.Sc. (Biotechnology)-I & II - 40 seats each class for the session 2015-16. .

Request of Principal, R.S.D. College, Ferozpur City, for panel for selection of Assistant Professors and the case of Ms. Sonia

32. Considered request dated 18.04.2016 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) of Principal, R.S.D. College, Ferozpur City, with regard to provide a panel for making selection of Assistant Professor in Physics & Commerce and to consider the case of Ms. Sonia for appointment as Assistant Professor in Commerce pursuant to recommendation of the Committee dated 24.09.2015 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) on contract basis for three years on consolidated pay of Rs. 21600/- p.m., under grant-in-aid-scheme of Punjab Government. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXVIII**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The D.R. Colleges vide letter dated 11.04.2016 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) had informed the Principal, RSD College, Ferozpur City, that the Vice-Chancellor had allowed Ms. Sonia to join at RSD College as Assistant Professor in Commerce on contract basis for initial period of three years on consolidated pay of 21600/- under grant-in-aid-scheme of Punjab Government.
 2. The Vice-Chancellor vide order dated 11.04.2016 has observed that the Principal makes a representation and the matter will be put to the Syndicate.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the College is harassing the candidate.

It was informed that the candidate Ms. Sonia was recommended by the Selection Committee. The advertisement had been issued thrice, first in the year 2013 and the management said that none found suitable. Again for the second time the advertisement was issued in 2014 and third time on 24.09.2015 and in response to this the selection was made which was recommended by the nominee of the Vice-Chancellor and others also. The management is not considering her. After that a letter was written to R.S.D. College, Ferozepur to give her appointment but the College has not given the appointment. That is why the matter has come to the Syndicate. He had talked with the Principal in the morning but Ms. Sonia had not been allowed to join till now.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that no panel should be given to the College. He would like to tell that how the management of the College is inhuman. He did not know the candidate as she has never been a student of Panjab University but a student of Punjabi University. The chart of API score is missing. If they see the API score, the candidate has so many books to her credit and having the highest API score. The only reason for not giving the appointment is that she is a handicapped candidate. The candidate is having first division. At the time of interview, the DPI nominee, DPI expert and he himself found everything right but the management person was very rude. They all have signed the minutes of the Selection Committee. As is being said that he talked to Sh. Prabhjeet Singh, he talked with him to know if the DPI nominee, DPI expert and he, as the nominee of the Vice-Chancellor, had recommended the appointment, whether it could be done. He did not know the candidate.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that since all the members of the Selection Committee had signed the minutes, then what is the problem in the appointment?

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that he had gone in one of the Selection Committees and found that the selected candidate was asked by the management to join and resign the next day.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is just like a punishment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would have to take a call because if a representative had been sent by the University to do some work, the University has to stand by that decision.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired as to what is the rule if there is a fractured decision in the selection.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the Chancellor's nominee is sitting with him and speaks against him, how he could bring that appointment to the Syndicate. Let they take the example of the University. They have a nominee of the Chancellor in the Selection Committee and pay lot of reverence to the Chancellor. Then there are subject experts which he is picking up from the list given by the departments. Once in a while, if he has to change the expert, he has to change only with a person of very high stature than those in the list. If the nominee of the Chancellor and the subject expert give the same opinion, then whatever be his opinion that has no relevance. He could not bring such a decision to the Syndicate for approval.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said what could be the decision where there is a conflict.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the Chancellor nominee says that a particular person be taken and he says no to that candidate, then whose decision would be final. The matter has been brought to him and that is why he has brought this matter to them. If the matter comes to him as an individual but in this case the individual is replaced by this Syndicate body.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that the candidate should have been allowed to join.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the DPI nominee and the Vice-Chancellor nominee say something, it is not that the management could do anything. The management could not ask again for a panel on it. Either the management would have to surrender the post or the candidate would be allowed to join actually. If the management did not allow the candidate to join, then they would have to defend the University.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that what is the role of the management?

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the money has to come from the Government, it being an aided post, then the role of the management is nothing. The management is serving on behalf of the society and if they could not do it then should not take the grant. The University should take a strict call on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a very serious case and not a routine one. As Professor Navdeep Goyal had pointed out that even if this girl is allowed to join as the Vice-Chancellor has already passed the orders.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the management could harass the candidate to no end.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the management could harass the candidate, he thought that the duty to perform their job is with the University. That is why he is saying that it is a very serious case. He did not know why such people get encouraged. Four months earlier, he had raised an issue in the Syndicate and the Vice-Chancellor was surprised to note that there is a girl who is Lecturer of Physical Education who still remains DPE in spite of the fact that everything is clear. At that time the Vice-Chancellor had said that a letter should be issued to the College to explain and he is sure that no letter has been issued. They could see that if some decision is taken in the Syndicate and the same is not implemented, what they could expect from other people. They have got the courage to put allegations against the Vice-Chancellor nominee and Vice-Chancellor nominee is explaining that the only drawback in the candidate recommended for selection is that she is handicapped. Instead of realizing that, even after Vice-Chancellor looking into the file has passed the orders on 11th April, the management has the courage to represent on 18.4.2016 and has requested for panel as the Vice-Chancellor had refused for giving the panel. The management is to be compelled to issue the appointment letter to the candidate and this is also to be ensured that the candidate is not put to any kind of harassment. He did not say

that the management has lost their right to act as management. But if at all, the management intends to take any action against her after she joins, the management could not do it without the prior approval of the University. Then the University should enquire into it. As Professor Navdeep Goyal has pointed out that some selection has been made and the management asks the candidate to join and resign.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could call up the Principal, the President of the Management Committee and the candidate and convey the anguish and the anger of the Syndicate. As earlier, they had taken action against a College and the College had mended its ways. Till the matter is resolved, no panel is to be given to the College.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested that the case of the Physical Education teacher which he had pointed out should also be taken up.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the DPI office has to check the eligibility whether a candidate is eligible or not and the selection is to be made by the Vice-Chancellor nominee-cum-subject expert, and the subject expert appointed by the DPI and only those could know which of the candidate is suitable. If the candidate is eligible, the College has to allow the candidate to join. If they think that the management did not want the candidate to join, or did not obey the orders of the University or the selection made by the experts, it being an affiliated College why should they provide the second panel. They could also bring this to the notice of the DPI.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is already taken care of.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that as Shri Ashok Goyal has said and the Vice-Chancellor has also shown the apprehension that the management would harass the candidate. Just to protect her from harassment, he favored the procedure which has been proposed by Shri Ashok Goyal. If the College has to take any action against the appointment, then they have to take prior permission from the University otherwise no action be taken by the College on their own.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the way the discussion has taken place, the College could not go against the candidate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the candidate could get the relief from the court but it is very difficult to fight the cases.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would tell the management that if the matter goes to the court, the University would defend the candidate.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that another condition should be imposed that before the confirmation of the candidate if any issue comes up, prior approval of the Dean College Development Council should be taken.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Registrar to take up the matter with the College.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that as Shri Ashok Goyal has talked about Ms. Neeraj who was the DPE, it should be got checked whether he has got the letter of Assistant Professor, whether the pay has been

fixed or the management is verbally saying all these things. Whatever he has come to know in this case is that the management has verbally said that she has been made Assistant Professor and her vote has been prepared and approved. It should be got checked whether any written orders have been issued or not and what is the position of her salary.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that two months ago he had raised a point and wanted to bring to the notice of the Dean College Development Council that the candidates should be provided the approval letters. Whether they have adopted it or not?

It was informed that it has been adopted.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the status of the College as to what they have done should be placed in the next meeting of the Syndicate so that if the College did not mend its ways, the Syndicate should take cognizance of that.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that whenever there is an issue related with the Colleges, they could not address the issues as promptly as required which perhaps might be due to heavy workload due to which the issues are increasing. The decision in the case of Ms. Neeraj was taken in the month of March and it is 5 months since then. They had also formed a Committee on the issue of PF but no communication of the same has been given and the teachers keep giving representations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at that time a decision was taken, immediately a Committee should be formed. He had come to know that the formation of the Committee had not been initiated.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that whenever decision in a particular case is taken, prompt action should be taken on that decision.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) request dated 18.04.2016 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) of Principal, R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City, for providing a panel for making selection of Assistant Professor in Physics & Commerce be not acceded to; and
- (2) so far as the appointment of Ms. Sonia as Assistant Professor in Commerce is concerned, both the President of the Management Committee and the Principal of the College be directed to meet the University authorities so that the matter is resolved and the candidate is issued the appointment letter.

Deferred Item

33. Considered recommendations of the Committee dated 05.07.2016 with regard to revision of fee structure, that:

1. the revised tuition fee as per, be approved for the session 2017-18.
2. freeship up to 10% of the total seats in all courses be given to the meritorious students belonging to the economically weaker section.

NOTE: The detailed modalities to implement the provision of freeship shall be worked out once the revised fee structure is approved by the competent bodies.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred.

Recommendations of the Regulation Committee dated 19.05.2016

34. Considered minutes of the Regulations Committee dated 19.05.2016 (**Appendix-XXIX**) with regard to the proposal of the FDO to ensuring the representative of both MHRD and UGC be made as ex-officio member of Senate/Syndicate/Board of Finance etc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the grants to the University are released by the UGC, so it is a proposal for the representatives on these bodies.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it is a proposal given by the Finance and Development Officer. It might not be that it might affect the University when the representative of the Government of India would be on these bodies.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Ministry of Human Resource Development has given a directive to the UGC to send its representative.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would be beneficial in the form of a commitment.

Professor Anil Monga said that it is okay for the Board of Finance and Senate but not for the Syndicate as they have autonomy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that if the DPIs of U.T. Chandigarh and Punjab are the ex-officio members and the autonomy is not affected then how it could be affected with those representatives. Let it be and nobody might come as those representatives would have to spend a lot of time to understand how it is difficult to take the decisions about the University. The Vice Chancellor added that Dr. Tripathi came to attend the meeting of the Board of Finance of an institution, where he is also a member but Dr. Tripathi did not stay for the whole duration of the meeting.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the DPIs do not come to attend the meetings, they turn in only when they have their own specific issues.

The Vice-Chancellor said that with those representatives, the pressure on the University would decrease as otherwise the Government thinks that the University is doing whatever it wanted. With this, the Government could not say that they would not grant the sanction. The members could read the letter written by the UGC to the Ministry of Human Resource Development that there is no representative of the Government in the University. Even in the Central Universities also, there is no representation of the Government. They could have the representatives so that the Central Government would have no excuse that the Government did not know anything what the University is doing. He suggested that the representatives should be included as the amendment in the Regulations.

Professor Anil Monga said that for the Board of Finance and Senate it does not seem any issue but for the Syndicate somewhere it seems that there is some uncomfortableness.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in any case the representative of the UGC would come to the Board of Finance. The Government might not approve these Regulations but the pressure would be over from the University that the University is not interested in having the representatives.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there could be some difficulty. They could have the nominee of the MHRD/UGC in the Board of Finance as they are already having the nominee of the Ministry of Education. Perhaps application of mind has not been done properly. As is the practice, the Regulations are approved by the Syndicate and afterwards the same are referred to the Regulations Committee. But in this case, a proposal is submitted by the Finance and Development Officer, at once the meeting of the Regulations Committee is held and the recommendations are placed before the Syndicate. He understood the spirit that let they throw the ball in the court of the Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Government is saying so.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that purpose could be solved only by way of having the Government's nominee on the Board of Finance because where he is not to become a member of the Board of Finance by name or by position and the Government could send anyone to attend the meetings as is being done by the U.T. Chandigarh and the Punjab Government. But if they say that they (representative of the Central Government) would become members of the Senate or Syndicate, they are to be made by designation. Then they could not say that the nominee could be sent. Only the designated person could come. But in the proposal the representative is mentioned. To start with, let they change the Regulations because for making them member of the Syndicate and Senate, amendment in the Act is required. Let they limit themselves only to the Regulations that the nominee of the UGC is already there and the nominee of the MHRD would come in the meeting of the Board of Finance and if they get good experience, then they could think in terms of amending the Act also. He suggested that the representative could be invited only for the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the representative of both MHRD and UGC be invited to Board of Finance and the rest of the matter be deferred.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 19.05.2016 (**Appendix-XXIX**) to ensure the representative of both MHRD and UGC as ex-officio member of Board of Finance only be approved and the matter of ex-officio member for Syndicate/Senate be deferred.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 16.6.2016 regarding two special increments to Mr. Subhash Chander, Senior Technician G-II, Department of Physics

35. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 16.06.2016 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that two special increments, be granted to Mr. Subhash Chander, Senior Technician G-II, Department of Physics, for recognition of his outstanding performance to his work.

NOTE: An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the item be referred to the Board of Finance.

Item 36 on the agenda has been taken up for consideration after Item 7.

Request/demand of the students of B.E. M.B.A – Five Year Integrated course for creation of exit policy

37. Considered the request/demand of the students of B.E. M.B.A – Five Year Integrated course being run in the University at the campus, to create an Exit Policy Option for the students after successful completion of their four year Bachelors' degree in this course and the degree should be awarded to the students, needs to be a Bachelors' degree for those who want to opt out of the course, pursuant to orders of the Hon'ble High Court for the State of Punjab and Haryana, dated 11.7.2016 passed in CWP No. 23212 of 2015 filed by Mr. Harsh Yadav and Others.

- NOTE:**
1. The decisions of the Syndicate/Senate with regard to exit policy are available with the petition.
 2. A copy of the written statement dated 22.3.2016 filed by the University in the said petition is enclosed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this exit option is something that they have considered many times and last time they had resolved that the exit is not to be allowed. Whatever they had allowed, that was one time exception. Then somebody had gone to the Court and the Court has directed the matter to be considered by the Syndicate. They could reiterate the earlier decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when it was done that the exit is not allowed, there was a very serious debate as to which degree would be issued to the students because the student had not studied the complete B.E. course because it is an integrated course spread over a period of 5 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that only those students could quit the course who had completed all the courses of the 4-year course. But if they have not offered these courses of 5½ years duration up to 4 years, the student could not complete the course. One student could

say that he/she would complete all the courses within the next 6 months and instead of 5½ years, he/she be allowed the exit option after 4½ years or somebody who intends to quitting up after 4 years, after attending extra classes, somehow manages to complete the course.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that how the teaching could be completed. Similarly, there could be a demand from the students of B.Com. LL.B. that they also be given the exit option after 3 years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology, they had given the exit option and at that time a condition was imposed that the students did not study some of the papers of B.E. but had studied the papers of B.E. M.B.A., before the exit option, the students had to complete those papers. The present petition is on the basis that the students had already been given the option. Now it is being said that it is the same University and the courses are also the same and since the exit option was allowed in University Institute of Engineering & Technology, the same option be given in the University Institute of Chemical Engineering also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Court has not directed the Syndicate to reconsider but the Court simply asked the University counsel to seek instructions from the University whether it is possible to put up before the Syndicate afresh. The instructions were issued on 21.7.2016 that they were putting up the matter. Since they had already taken a decision, the counsel should have brought it to the notice of the Court that the earlier exit option was one time measure and there some condition and all the cases were cleared. So these students are not equated with that case. If they accept it, they would not be able to stop this practice. Anyway, now nothing could be done. He thought that they must reiterate the earlier decision. If there is no academically comprise, then there is no problem. Professor S.K. Sharma talked about these integrated courses that a new thing is happening that the students are asking for the degree of B.E. after 4 years. There is a difference that a student who got admission in B.E. was much higher in merit and those who got admission in the integrated course were lower in the merit. After 4 years, those students would get the same degree. A student who was at No.7 in the merit and the other one who was at No.700, both would get the same degree. How is it justified?

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired whether this was the trend or reverse of it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the merit got diluted. The students who were higher in the merit and did not want to go in this integrated course they waited for another year and those in the lower merit, by paying extra fee, got admission in integrated course.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they reiterate the earlier decision.

RESOLVED: That, the earlier decision of the Syndicate with regard to exit policy, be reiterated.

**Admission of Foreign/
National/PIO/NRI seats
under DASA in UG course
for the session 2016-17**

38. Considered if, the following Fee Structure and eligibility criteria prescribed by Direct Admissions of Students Abroad DASA - A Scheme of Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India for admission of Foreign/National/PIO/NRI seats under DASA 2016-17 in UG course for the session 2016-17 in UIET and Dr. SSBUI CET, P.U:

- (i) Tuition fee of \$ 4000 for Foreign National for 1st and every subsequent semesters;
- (ii) Nationals of SAARC Countries are eligible for 50% Tuition fee waiver and will have to pay \$ 2000 towards 1st and every subsequent semesters; and
- (iii) For children of Indian Workers in Gulf Countries, the fee is at par with Resident Citizens. The fee of USD 700 has been charged towards Tuition Fee by DASA for one semester and will be adjusted in the first installment as applicable to resident students of UIET and Dr. SSB UI CET.

In addition to the above Tuition Fee, Other charges will be applicable as per the fee structure approved by the Panjab University.

- NOTE:**
1. A copy of admission Brochure containing admission guidelines, Fee structure etc. enclosed (**Appendix-XXX**).
 2. Two students one in UIET and one in Dr. SSBUI CET have got admission under NRI category.
 3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXX**).

RESOLVED: That the following Fee Structure and eligibility criteria prescribed by Direct Admissions of Students Abroad DASA - A Scheme of Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India for admission of Foreign/National/PIO/NRI seats under DASA 2016-17 in UG course for the session 2016-17 in UIET and Dr. SSBUI CET, P.U, be approved: Tuition fee of \$ 4000 for Foreign National for 1st and every subsequent semesters;

- (i) Nationals of SAARC Countries are eligible for 50% Tuition fee waiver and will have to pay \$ 2000 towards 1st and every subsequent semesters; and
- (ii) For children of Indian Workers in Gulf Countries, the fee is at par with Resident Citizens. The fee of USD 700 has been charged towards Tuition Fee by DASA for one semester and will be adjusted in the first installment as applicable to resident students of UIET and Dr. SSB UI CET.

In addition to the above Tuition Fee, Other charges will be applicable as per the fee structure approved by the Panjab University.

Additional sum of 39. Rs.9,88,682/- donated by Bhavender Pal Sharma

Considered if:

- (i) an additional sum of Rs. 9,88,682/- (Rs. Nine Lacs eighty eight thousand six hundred eighty two only) donated by Dr. Bhavender Pal Sharma, USA, on behalf of Class 1969 batch for the award of four Scholarships @ Rs.500/-p.m. each for 10 months to the students of Department of Chemical Engineering & Technology P.U., be allowed to invest in the shape of TDR @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year in the State Bank of India, P.U., Chandigarh and the interest so accrued be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust (SET) fund Account No. 10444978140, to enable to disburse the payment of scholarship well in time.
- (ii) Proposed amendments in the terms and conditions (1 and 2) already approved by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 17.08.2014 (Para 29) (**Appendix-XXXI**), be made as requested by the donor following addition, be made as clause (v) in para C of the Regulation 14.4 appearing at page 129 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, in respect of temporary/daily-wage/Contractual employees of P.U. subscriber towards provident fund:

Existing Terms and Conditions	Proposed Terms and Conditions
1. The scholarship be known as "Class of 1969 Alumni Scholarship".	1. Three scholarships be known as "Class of 1969 Alumni Scholarship" and three be known as "Amrit Kaur Scholarship".
2. Four scholarships be paid one each for under-graduate classes of 1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd and 4 th year of University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology (UICET), on merit-cum-means basis @ Rs.1500/- p.m. each for 10 months.	2. Total six scholarships be paid two of each of the 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th year Chemical Engineering to undergraduate students (including those with the combined MBA program) on merit-cum-means basis @ Rs.2000/-p.m. each for 10 months.
3. The applicant must have cleared all of his/her immediate past semesters Examinations with at least 60 % marks. There should be no backlog from the immediate past semesters. The student's family income should be no more than Rs.3 Lakhs per year.	No Change
4. The student should be willing to perform at least 10 hours of Volunteer work of his/her choice. A few examples are as follows but the student is free to perform any positive service to society: a. Volunteer work at the UICET library.	No Change

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Volunteer tutoring of Klin worker's children near the University. c. Volunteer work at the University Library. d. Volunteer work for activities such as a community clean up or off campus. e. Volunteer work at the Sector 25 Government School. f. Tutoring of one or more children from very poor families such as the unorganized sector. g. Any service to help the poor of the society. 	
<p>5. The student has to complete the volunteer work by February 28. A one page summary of the volunteer work needs to be e-mailed to Indian Schools Alumni & Friends, USA (INSAF) at sharma7336@gmail.com with a copy to the UICET Chairperson at DCET@PU.ac.in by March 10 of every year.</p>	No Change
<p>6. Upon timely submission of the volunteer work summary, the scholarship recipient will be awarded the Class of 1969 Alumni Scholarship Certificate by March 31.</p>	No Change
<p>7. The recipient of this scholarship will be free to accept to any other scholarships.</p>	No Change
<p>8. Professor S.K. Sharma is nominated to be a representative on the scholarship administration committee.</p>	No Change
<p>9. The scholarships will be awarded on the recommendations of a committee to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.</p>	No Change

Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXXI**) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) an additional sum of Rs.9,88,682/- (Rupees Nine Lacs eighty eight thousand six hundred eighty two only) donated by Dr. Bhavender Pal Sharma, USA, on behalf of Class 1969 batch for the award of four Scholarships @ Rs.500/- p.m. each for 10 months to the students of Department of Chemical Engineering & Technology P.U., be allowed to be invested in the shape of TDR @ maximum prevailing rate

of interest for one year in the State Bank of India, P.U., Chandigarh and the interest so accrued be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust (SET) Fund Account No. 10444978140, to enable to disburse the payment of scholarship well in time.

- (ii) as requested by the donor, the proposed amendments in the terms and conditions (1 and 2) already approved by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 17.08.2014 (Para 29) (**Appendix-XXXI**), be made:

Existing Terms and Conditions	Proposed Terms and Conditions
<p>1. The scholarship be known as “Class of 1969 Alumni Scholarship”.</p> <p>2. Four scholarships be paid one each for under-graduate classes of 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th year of University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology (UICET), on merit-cum-means basis @ Rs.1500/- p.m. each for 10 months.</p> <p>3. The applicant must have cleared all of his/her immediate past semesters Examinations with at least 60 % marks. There should be no backlog from the immediate past semesters. The student’s family income should be no more than Rs.3 Lakhs per year.</p> <p>4. The student should be willing to perform at least 10 hours of Volunteer work of his/her choice. A few examples are as follows but the student is free to perform any positive service to society:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Volunteer work at the UICET library. b. Volunteer tutoring of Klin worker’s children near the University. c. Volunteer work at the University Library. d. Volunteer work for activities such as a community clean up or off campus. e. Volunteer work at the Sector 25 Government School. f. Tutoring of one or more children from very poor families such as the unorganized sector. 	<p>1. Three scholarships be known as “Class of 1969 Alumni Scholarship” and three be known as “Amrit Kaur Scholarship”.</p> <p>2. Total six scholarships be paid two of each of the 2nd , 3rd , 4th year Chemical Engineering to undergraduate students (including those with the combined MBA program) on merit-cum-means basis @ Rs.2000/-p.m. each for 10 months.</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>No Change</p>

g. Any service to help the poor of the society.	
5. The student has to complete the volunteer work by February 28. A one page summary of the volunteer work needs to be e-mailed to Indian Schools Alumni & Friends, USA (INSAF) at sharma7336@gmail.com with a copy to the UICET Chairperson at DCET@PU.ac.in by March 10 of every year.	No Change
6. Upon timely submission of the volunteer work summary, the scholarship recipient will be awarded the Class of 1969 Alumni Scholarship Certificate by March 31.	No Change
7. The recipient of this scholarship will be free to accept to any other scholarships.	No Change
8. Professor S.K. Sharma is nominated to be a representative on the scholarship administration committee.	No Change
9. The scholarships will be awarded on the recommendations of a committee to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.	No Change

Condonation of Delay for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Shilpi Salwan Department of Economics

40. Considered if, delay of 4 years, 06 months and 7 days as on 29.06.2016 beyond six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Shilpi Salwan, research scholar, enrolled on 23.12.2005 in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Economics be condoned w.e.f. 23.12.2011 and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision, as she could not submit her Ph.D. thesis due to the following reasons:

- (i) She was working in the Economics Research and Policy Division of the Confederation of Indian Industry (Northern Region), Chandigarh for the period June 2011-October 2013. As the job required organizing economic event and frequent travelling to NCR region, it was difficult to work on her thesis along with the hectic travelling schedules.
- (ii) She was then teaching at Post Graduate Government College, Chandigarh from July 2014-March 2015 and July 2015-March 2016. She was also teaching in Chandigarh College of Engineering & Technology, Sector 26, Chandigarh from July-December 2015

NOTE: 1. The extract from the clause 17 of Revised Ph.D. Guidelines, duly approved by the Syndicate/ Senate reproduced below:

“The maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis be

fixed as eight years from the date of registration, i.e. normal period: three years, extension period: three years (with usual fee prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time) and condonation period two years, after which Registration and Approval of Candidacy shall be treated as automatically cancelled. **However, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond eight years may be considered by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reasons to be recorded.** The relevant regulations be amended accordingly”

2. Request dated 15.06.2016 of Ms. Shilpi Salwan enclosed **(Appendix-XXXII)**.
3. Ms. Shilpi Salwan was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Arts on 23.12.2005. She was granted two year extension up to 21.12.2010.
4. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXXII)**.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that, earlier, they had referred such cases to a Committee, and it should also be referred to the same Committee. Such 1-2 cases appear in every Syndicate meeting. In the case under consideration, the delay is more than four and half years.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are about 12 Syndicate meeting in a year, and they produced more than 300 Ph.Ds. So if 6-7 such cases came in a year, it is not that large a number. They should consider these case by case and take decision on merit.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That delay of 4 years, 06 months and 7 days (as on 29.06.2016) beyond six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), in submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Shilpi Salwan, Research Scholar, enrolled on 23.12.2005 in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Economics, be condoned w.e.f. 23.12.2011 and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision.

Reappointment of Demonstrators on purely temporary basis at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital

41. Considered if, the following three Demonstrators working on purely temporary basis (whose present term of appointment was for academic session 2015-16 and expired on 30.06.2016), at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, be re-appointed further for three months w.e.f. 02.07.2016, after one day break on 01.07.2016 or till regular selection is made, whichever is earlier, at the minimum of the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances, on the existing terms and conditions. The person possessing Medical/Dental qualifications i.e. M.B.B.S./B.D.S. are also entitled for Non-Practicing Allowance (NPA) @ 25% of the basic-pay, subject to the condition that the basic pay +NPA shall not exceed Rs.85000/- p.m. in the terms of Senate decision dated 29.9.2013 (Para LX) (Item No. 20(III)):

1. Dr. Harkirat Sethi
Department of Pharmacology
2. Dr. Anupam Vijayvergia
Department of Physiology
3. Dr. Ravi Kant Sharma
Department of Biochemistry

NOTE: An office note enclosed
(Appendix-XXXIII).

Initiating discussion, Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that these are Demonstrators posts and have been kept in the non-teaching category even though they are doing teaching at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital. Secondly, they have been appointed there for the last about 8 years and since then they were being granted extension for one year at a stretch. Thirdly, the University had given an affidavit to the Dental Council of India (DCI) that every year they are being given extension for one year. But from this year, they have been given extension for only three months.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that the extension was recommended for a year, but here a note has been given that they be granted only three months' extension. What is the need of granting them three months extension, especially when they themselves had given an affidavit to the DCI that they are being given extension of one year. He pleaded that they should be granted extension for one year and secondly, their status – whether they are teaching or non-teaching, should be verified. He suggested that one year's extension is required to be given.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that although they might be performing the job of teaching, according to him, the Demonstrators are not considered in the teaching side.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Demonstrators do both teaching and clinical jobs.

Professor Emanuel Nahar pointed out that the note from Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital had also come for extension in the services of these persons for the academic session, i.e., from 02.07.2016 to 30.06.2017.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay Fine", they would be granted extension of one year.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they have put in service of about 8 years and they were appointed when they direly needed their services. They were giving them one year's extension every year and now the Registrar has written as to what steps they have initiated to fill up the posts on regular basis, why they have not advertised the posts and why the interviews have not been conducted. The idea basically is not to throw these people out, but try to find out ways and means as to what their services could be regularized. Besides, these three, there are other 6-7 persons, who are eligible.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could appoint them through a special recruitment drive.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that extension should be granted to them for one year and it is more important if they have given an affidavit to the DCI.

When it was suggested that some weightage could be given to them, while considering them for appointment on regular basis along with the other candidates competing for these posts, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the same should be got legally examined as to whether they could do this or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that at least they should advertise the posts and since they have enough experience, they would be able to defend their candidature. So far as legally examining is concerned, they should use their brain themselves and examine the same.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the following three Demonstrators working on purely temporary basis (whose present term of appointment was for academic session 2015-16 and expired on 30.06.2016), at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, be re-appointed for further one year w.e.f. 02.07.2016 to 30.06.2017, after one day break on 01.07.2016 or till regular selection is made, whichever is earlier, at the minimum of the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances, on the existing terms and conditions. The person possessing Medical/Dental qualifications i.e. M.B.B.S./B.D.S. are also entitled for Non-Practicing Allowance (NPA) @ 25% of the basic-pay, subject to the condition that the basic pay +NPA shall not exceed Rs.85000/- p.m. in the terms of Senate decision dated 29.9.2013 (Para LX) (Item No. 20(III)):

1. Dr. Harkirat Sethi
Department of Pharmacology
2. Dr. Anupam Vijayvergia
Department of Physiology
3. Dr. Ravi Kant Sharma
Department of Biochemistry

RESOLVED: That the following Committee be constituted to find ways and means as to how can they be appointed on regular basis, examine legally whether any weightage can be given to them while considering their candidature for appointment on regular basis, whether they are on the non-teaching side or teaching side, etc.:

1. Shri Ashok Goyal
2. Dr. Ajay Ranga
3. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa.

**Sexual harassment
complaint against Mr.
Daljit Singh, Senior
Technician, Department of
Physics**

42. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 10.3.2016 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to discuss the complaint of sexual harassment made by Ms. Shalini Tyagi, student of M.Sc. Human Genomics against Mr. Daljit Singh, Senior Technician, Department of Physics, pursuant to the proceedings dated 28.7.2015 of the meeting of Panjab University Committee against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH) and to decide the following issues:

1. application dated 24.06.2016 of Shri Daljit Singh, Senior Technician (G-II), Department of Physics, submitted through the Chairperson.
2. punishment to be given to Shri Daljit Singh, Senior Technician (G-II), Department of Physics, as recommended by the Committee dated 10.03.2016.
3. Grant of Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007;
4. Grant of Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days, as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 1/15/28 & 29 May, 2016 (Para 38) while considering the minutes of the Committee dated 10.3.2016, the Vice-Chancellor asked the Registrar to make available all the relevant documents so that they could consider the item at a later stage of the meeting. In the meanwhile, they should move to the next item. The item could not be taken up thereafter.
 2. Shri Daljit Singh was served a Show Cause Notice along with Statement of Allegation, List of Charges and report of the PUCASH dated 28.7.2015 vide No.1857/Estt. dated 4.2.2016.
 3. Shri Daljit Singh vide his application dated 9.3.2016 informed that he could not reply to the memo within the stipulated period of two weeks due to death of his close relative

(Daughter of Maternal Uncle) in the month of February 2016 and also demanded a copy of the complaint made by Ms. Shalini Tyagi, a student of M.Sc. Human Genomics dated 7.7.2015 to enable him to give the reply to the Show Cause Notice.

Since there was no complaint of 7.7.2015, copy was not supplied to him. As infact the complaint of Ms. Shalini Tyagi was of 17.7.2015.

4. As per rule 1.1 (II) appearing at page 73 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2009, Shri Daljit Singh is a class 'B' employee as the post of Senior Technician (G-II) held by him carries the equivalent corresponding pay-scale to that of the post of Assistants. A photocopy of the relevant page/s of service conduct rules (Volume III) as also Regulations (Volume I) enclosed.
5. Shri Daljit Singh was due to retire from the University service on 31.5.2016 on attaining the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years, his date of birth being 20.5.1956.
6. A detailed office note enclosed.

The Vice Chancellor said that PUCASH has found this gentleman guilty of the misconduct, and the punishment recommended to him was stoppage of just one increment, which according to him is not enough. In fact, the punishment has to be commensurate with the gravity of the offence. Though the person has retired, his gratuity has not been released. He thinks that since it is a serious misconduct, the gratuity should not be paid to him, so that some message could go out.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he would recommend more stringent measure so that a serious message goes out.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is a very old case. It has *inter alia* been mentioned in the minutes of the Committee dated 10.03.2016 that "the Committee also noticed that findings of PUCASH were accepted by the Vice Chancellor on 30.07.2015, but the action has been delayed due to the slackness of Legal Cell. Legal Cell be proceeded against separately".

It was informed that this was the observation made by the Registrar only that there is slackness on the part of the Legal Cell as this item was delayed. It was pointed out by the Registrar that this

person is going to retire shortly and they have to place the matter before the Syndicate for taking the decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that keeping in view the gravity of offence, the gratuity should not be paid to him and they have to find out whether they could do it.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they have to see the entire case from the legal angle. When the report of PUCASH came, the same was accepted by the Vice Chancellor, and after having accepted, he referred the case to the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that he had written "to be discussed with the Registrar to proceed further".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor, in fact, has referred the matter to the Committee.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the incident had occurred at workplace, i.e., within the University Campus.

It was informed that after having been accepted the PUCASH report accepted by the Vice Chancellor, the person concerned was given a show cause notice, which was not received by the office, and by that time they had not received any reply from him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the report of PUCASH had come and accepted by the Vice Chancellor, who was his (Shri Daljit Singh) employer. When it was informed that his employer is the Vice Chancellor, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) said that the employer of Senior Technician could not be the Vice Chancellor, and it must be the Syndicate.

It was informed that it had been mentioned in the note itself that "as per Rule 1.1(II) appearing at page 73 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2009, Shri Daljit Singh is a class 'B' employee as the post of Senior Technician (G-II) held by him carries the equivalent corresponding pay-scale to that of the post of Assistants, and for Assistant the appointing authority/employer is the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this type of person after committing such an offence, when get relief from the Court, it gives a lot of pain to them. According to his pay-scale, his gratuity must be around Rs.10 lac, and if in such a case even the gratuity is paid to him, that meant, they have given him almost honourable retirement.

It was informed that gratuity is given for good order conduct/services rendered by the employee concerned.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that now, there is no need to conduct a Departmental Enquiry, though it could be conducted as pension is there. When it was explained that PUCASH enquiry is as good as Departmental Enquiry, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) said that the Committee has pronounced guilty, and now punishment is to be awarded, which is to be awarded by the appointing or punishing authority, which in the instant case is the Syndicate. If the Syndicate decides to award capital punishment, then it has to adopt the same procedure that since it has been established by such and such, why he should not be

awarded such and such punishment, which they have mentioned in the show cause notice. When it was said that he did not give reply to the show cause notice, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) said that, in fact, the show cause notice should have gone from the Syndicate. Thereafter, the Syndicate could have said that since no reply to the show cause has been received, either his gratuity should be stopped or some other punishment should have been awarded. It is good that he has not replied to the show cause notice. When it was asked has it been attached with the show cause and it was told that it is there.

The Vice Chancellor said that moreover the Committee has recommended that the appropriate punishment would be that one increment of Mr. Daljit Singh, Senior Technician, Department of Physics, be withheld as per the Service Rules of Panjab University.

It was informed that the stoppage of one increment was recommended because by that time the girl has withdrawn her complaint. She had said that she has pardoned him.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that what in the PUCASH report is that the girl has given a statement and there is a witness, who is a cobbler. The girl has given the statement that this fellow has tried to kiss her. But the cobbler said that a conversation was going on between the girl and this person and the conversation was in English, which he does not know. Thereafter, he felt that there is some dispute and he asked Shri Daljit Singh to go away. Then the girl searched him continuously and ultimately found him, and made a complaint against him. They could not say that his (Shri Daljit Singh) involvement is zero, but it is also true that he has problem since long, which he has given in his statement, that he is a habitual drinker even during day time. He has also undergone treatment for this alcoholism for about 8 to 10 years due to which he had also remained absent from duty. He has also admitted that on that fateful day also, he was under the influence of drink, and he does not remember as to what had happened on that day. He had later on also sought pardon pleading that it had happened due to mistake.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if gratuity is not paid to him, ultimately the sufferer would be his family. He suggested that it should be identified as to who are those persons, who drink during duty hours.

Dr. Ajay Ranga pointed out that it has been mentioned in the statement of the girl that the respondent must be punished, but the punishment should not affect his family.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that what he also wanted to point out.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that whatever punishment has been suggested, i.e., stoppage of one increment, that is sufficient because the girl has shown her concern about his family, and if they do not pay his gratuity, it would definitely affect his family.

The Vice Chancellor said that since after two months he has retired, the stoppage of one increment would not affect him at all. Since it is a serious matter, there has to be some exemplary punishment.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to who has recommended that his one increment should be stopped.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee, comprising Dean of University Instruction, Professor Meenakshi Malhotra and the Registrar, has recommended that his one increment should be stopped.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the meeting was held on 10.03.2016 and decided that his one increment should be withheld. In fact, technically everything is inappropriate. How could the Committee decide/ recommend that this punishment should be awarded? He suggested that it does not matter even if the person has retired, is should be kept pending because they have completely gone astray.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have not gone astray. He had written on 30th July 2015, but thereafter the file was misplaced.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the meeting of the Committee was held on 10.03.2016 and a letter was written to him on 14.03.2016, but the matter is being placed before the competent body now. When it was informed that earlier also the matter was placed before the Syndicate, he said that he means to say that the matter was placed before the competent body after writing a letter to him. Could the competent body go beyond what has already been written to him?

It was clarified that the competent body would see the matter in its entirety.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the competent body would see the matter in its entirety, it would say that what is being sought by him should be given to him. Even though the competent body is considering the reply etc., now, but before that the recommendations of the Committee has come to it, which is totally illegal. The competent body should look as if it is by way of its own application of mind, without recommendation or influence of anybody else, it has given its decision. What happens is that the Registrar could write on a slip and give to the Vice-Chancellor about one increment but it could not be on record that it is on the recommendation of the Registrar. That is the law. Even if the Vice-Chancellor has to take action and asks the Registrar, the Registrar could prepare the complete reply but it would not be on record that the Registrar has prepared it. In every set up, there are special cells which prepare the complete record and while signing it is written that I after having looked into the whole service record, I have done this and there is no recommendation of that.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should learn a lesson and tabulate wherever they have gone wrong and put up the procedure and time line in place.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is another view that if the man is not right, he should be punished even by following wrong procedure, and if he wished, he could get relief from the Court.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal, said that it should be done, so that a message is given that the University has taken some action.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the matter be kept pending.

At this stage, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that as Professor Navdeep Goyal had pointed out that Shri Daljit Singh was a habitual drinker even during day time, there are many other people who drink during duty hours. He, therefore, suggested that a circular be issued requesting the Heads of the Branches/Departments to provide the names of those persons, who suffer from alcoholism/intoxication, so that some preventive/corrective measures could be put in place to enable such persons to overcome alcoholism and/or drug abuse.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that the entire campus, including the residential area, could be declared a liquor free area.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the residential area could not be declared a liquor free area.

To this, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that on the one hand, hostel residents are barred from drinking and on the other, the Professors are free to drink.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the hostel being a public area, the terms and conditions on which the accommodation has been allotted, have to be followed by the residents whereas the residential area is a private one.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Registrar to issue a circular to all the Heads of the Departments/Branches as suggested by Dr. Ajay Ranga.

Issue regarding grant of provisional extension of affiliation to Gujranwala Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Civil Lines, Ludhiana

43. Considered if, provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Gujranwala Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Civil Lines, Ludhiana, for Add-On Course, in Certificate course in Bank Management, under Career Oriented Course Programme, approved by UGC, for the session 2016-17. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: Inspection report dated 21.05.2016 enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 28/29.05.2016 (Para 56).

Issue regarding grant of temporary extension of affiliation to G.M.T. College of Education, Jalandhar Bye Pass, Ludhiana

44. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to G.M.T. College of Education, Jalandhar Bye Pass, Ludhiana, for B.Ed. 1st year for admitting 100 students for the session 2015-16, subject to fulfillment of the conditions as listed in the Inspection Report as well as with the condition that College will observe/follow the other Instructions/Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab

Government/UGC/NCTE. Information contained in detailed office note was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The Vice-Chancellor has allowed to issue the roll numbers of the students of the ongoing B.Ed. course, G.M.T. College of Education, Jalandhar Bye-Pass Chowk, Ludhiana, as requested by the Chairman of the College, which was noted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 01/15/28/29.05.2016 (Para I-xxiv).
 2. A copy of the orders of the Vice-Chancellor dated 23.5.2016 enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 28/29.05.2016 (Para 56).

Issue regarding grant of provisional extension of affiliation to Arjan Dass College, Dharamkot, Moga

45. Considered if, provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Arjan Dass College, Dharamkot, Moga, for Foundation course in Human Rights Education for the session 2016-17, under the UGC Scheme of Human Right Education. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: Inspection report dated 23.05.2016 is enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 28/29.05.2016 (Para 56).

Senate Election

46. Considered if, the Polling booths for the conduct of Senate Election 2016, as recommended by the Committee for the following constituencies (**Appendix-A, B & C**), be approved:

Sr. No.	Constituency	Date and Time of Election
1.	(i) Principals of Tech. & Professional Colleges (ii) Staff of Tech. & Professional Colleges	12.09.2016 09.00 a.m. to 01.00 p.m. 02.00 p.m. to 05.00 p.m.
2.	(i) Professors on the Staff of Teaching Department of the University (ii) Reader/Associate Professors and Assistant on the staff of Teaching Departments of the University	19.09.2016 09.00 a.m. to 01.00 p.m. 02.00 p.m. to 05.00 p.m.
3.	(i) Registered Graduate (ii) Heads of Affiliated Arts Colleges (iii) Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors of Affiliated Arts Colleges	25.09.2016 09.00 a.m. to 01.00 p.m. 02.00 p.m. to 05.00 p.m.

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

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested that this item is an important as it is related with the Senate elections. He pointed out that at page 9 of the table agenda, in the District of Bathinda there are two booths each in MSD Sr. Sec. School and Govt. Rajindra College. There used to be two booths at Bathinda at Govt. Rajindra College and at MSD School as the booth is not set up at DAV College. Perhaps it is wrongly mentioned as in the meeting of the Committee, they had approved only two booths. He suggested the clubbing of Booth No. 69 with 70 and Booth No. 71 with 72.

It was informed that they were taking a decision to merge these booths. As suggested, the booths would be clubbed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal further said that in Patiala, three booths are to be set up. In Govt. Mohindra College, only booth is set up. He suggested that Booth No. 230 should be merged with 231. He said Booth No. 272 has been created at Nihal Singh Wala, the name of the building is not mentioned and it should be notified that Booth No. 272 would be at the Panjab University Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa requested that the polling booths be created at the Constituent Colleges.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that in the elections to the Vidhan Sabha and Parliament, the voting takes place through electronic machines. The number of voters is approximately 1000 and the timing of voting is from 7.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. But in the Senate election voting timing from 9.00 to 5.00 with one hour lunch break, only 7 hours have been given for voting. In the Senate elections, there might be about 50 candidates contesting the election, all the process is manual. His suggestion is that the polling should be started at 8.00 a.m. and at least 8 hours are required for polling. If lunch is required, that could be from 1.00-1.30.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it happens that the people are waiting for voting and the staff leaves for lunch.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the people who were in the line before the start of the lunch have to come again and some of them did not return for the voting which resulted into less percentage of voting. The staff could have lunch by rotation.

It was clarified that in that case, they would have to provide one extra person.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that in other elections also, the staff is having the lunch by rotation and the voting continues.

It was clarified that lunch time is absolutely necessary.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that instead of having lunch for 1 hour, it could be done for half an hour and the people could wait for this time.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they want the voting hours to be at least 8 hours keeping in view the size of the ballot paper, number of

contestants and the voters otherwise the percentage of voters would continue to fall.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that at the time of lunch in one of the earlier elections, some of the voters had left.

It was informed that whatever timings of voting were followed in the year 2012, the same is being followed this time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that sometime the time of starting the polling was 8.00 a.m. as he remembered that at one point of time when he went to cast his vote at 8.15, the same had already been cast by someone else.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the polling could be started early and half an hour lunch break could be provided.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the timings should be from 8.00-1.00 and 1.30-5.00.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the lunch time is not be provided, then an extra person is required for each polling booth so that the staff could have lunch one by one.

It was informed that at least half an hour is required for the lunch break so that the staff could have the lunch.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the timings for the voting should be from 8.00-1.00 and 1.30-5.00 with lunch break from 1.00-1.30 and the instructions be issued that those who enter the booth up to 5.00 p.m, they would be allowed to vote.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested that it should be clearly mentioned in the resolved part that the voters who enter the polling booth would be issued the polling slip as sometimes in the absence of the guidelines with the Presiding Officer, the voters are not allowed to cast vote after the polling hours.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he got 2-3 issues. The Presiding Officer is appointed from the same College. He suggested that the Presiding Officer should be appointed from some other College which would facilitate free and fair voting especially in the private Colleges. He suggested that an Observer be appointed for at least 6 Districts. These issues have been raised by the persons of the professional and technical teachers' constituency as most of the private Colleges are run by the managements and they make sure that their teachers cast the vote in favour of their candidates.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that though he had no objection but there could be a problem if the Presiding Officer from some other College is appointed, there would be no responsibility of the College where the polling booth has been set up. As earlier, the Presiding Officer is from the institution where the polling booth has been set up and in this way there is a check and it entrusts a responsibility to that institution to conduct the free and fair election. He pointed out that Satyam Girls College VPO Syadwala, Fazilka which is just about 6 kms. From Abohar and falls in District Fazilka, has been clubbed with M.R. Govt. College, Fazilka. It would have been better if the College would have been clubbed with Gopi Chand Arya Mahila College,

Abohar (Booth No.82). The teachers of Satyam Girls College are also voters. He suggested that instead of creating the booth (No.100) at Govt. Sr. Sec. School, Guru Harsahai, it should be set up at the Panjab University Constituent College, Guru Harsahai. He pointed out that at Booth No. 268, Shaheed Ganj College for Women, Mudhki, the “*” has not been put as there would be the votes of the teachers of this College also. Therefore, a “*” be put at this Booth No. 268. Similar is the case with Booth No. 205, where the “*” has not been put.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that as Principal I.S. Sandhu had talked about the College at Guru Harsahai Constituent College. The distant is about 11-12 kms. Guru Harsahai is a city where there are already 800-900 votes. They could not shift the 300-400 votes of the city to a rural centre. But the rural centre could evolve as a regional centre in the times to come.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the name of the place at Booth No. 227 is Tappariankhurd.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested the Registrar to record the clubbing which he had suggested. He repeated the clubbing of the booths to be done: 69 and 70, 71 and 72, 230 and 231.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that with Booth No. 184 GN College at Narangwal, Bhai Naghaiya Singh Memorial College, Alamgir has been attached which is at a distant place.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that as Principal I.S. Sandhu has said, he would also like to point out that most of the teachers are Ludhiana based and it would have been better for them to go to cast the vote at SCD Govt. College, Ludhiana.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the timings are from 8.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m., lunch from 1.00 to 1.30 p.m., 1.30 to 5.00 p.m. He said that every time it has been discussed though it is not a relevant point with the item. There are some sensitive booths from where the complaints come every time. It is true, in fact, for all the Colleges. As Principal I.S. Sandhu had said that if the Principal from the College is not appointed as the Presiding Officer, then who is going to take the responsibility. As they do it in the case of conducting the examination that the Principal of the institution where the polling booths are established, he/she could be appointed as Chief Coordinator and Presiding Officer should be from any other College. Secondly, there are Colleges where the teachers especially are supposed to show that they have cast in their favour. So, the last time they had got the videography done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a decision for doing the videography has already been taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Superintendents in the examination hall do work independently except for a few Assistants. This is to ensure that there is no influence. He remembered that in the year 2012, there was almost a fight as the College officials wanted to have their way. This is to be ensured that the Presiding Officer should be from the other College. He/she has to ensure that nobody from that College is allowed to interfere in the fair and independent voting. As far as Graduate Constituency is concerned, in the institutions where the booth has to be set up, it is a long history that

DAV Colleges were excluded. Why there was a concept of excluding the DAV Colleges, there were some DAV Colleges where the entry was not allowed to those who were not known to them. There were some complaints in this regard in the year 2004. Then, it was said that in the institutions from where the people contest the elections, at least those institutions should not be made as a polling booth. Then it was said that if a person from DAV College is contesting the election, the booth may not be set up there. So, the DAV was considered as a central organization. Some booths were set up and some others not and the argument was given that the people from the Government Colleges also contest the elections. But in the Government Colleges, there is no control of any individual or Government officers. So the Government Colleges could not be equated to that. But even if they are creating centres in such institutions where they have interest, they must ensure that nobody is in a position to take undue advantage. It could be in anybody's favour, it could go against anybody. But their aim is to conduct the election in a free, fair and transparent manner. The most difficult task is to ensure that the teachers and the Principals of the Colleges at the behest of the President of the Management, the teachers have to show the voting. When they introduce these stringent steps and then it was said that the photo be taken through the mobile and last time the mobiles were not allowed. It is a difficult task. It is easy to apply this in the Graduate Constituency. But in the teachers/Principals constituency, they have to control the educators, the Principal and the managements.

It was informed that consolidated instructions would be prepared and sent to the Colleges in advance. On a query by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, it was clarified that the same staff would handle the polling of the Graduates, teachers and the Principals.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as Principal I.S. Sandhu had said about the appointment of Observer. They should have a team of Observers to be appointed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that if it seems that there could be problems at some of the polling booths, a check should be kept on such booths.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that if a candidate complains that someone is trying to get the polling done forcefully, a special Observer could be appointed at such a place.

It was informed that these things would be kept in mind.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that since the University teachers would be free after the elections for the constituency of the University teachers, so they could be appointed as Observers.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that all the candidates who fill up the nomination forms, they should be known about their rights.

RESOLVED: That, as recommended by the Committee, the polling booths for the conduct of Senate Election 2016 for the following Constituencies (**Appendix-A, B & C**):

Sr. No.	Constituency	Date of Election
1.	(i) Principals of Tech. & Professional Colleges (ii) Staff of Tech. & Professional Colleges	12.09.2016
2.	(i) Professors on the Staff of Teaching Department of the University (ii) Reader/Associate Professors and Assistant on the staff of Teaching Departments of the University	19.09.2016
3.	(i) Registered Graduate (ii) Heads of Affiliated Arts Colleges (iii) Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors of Affiliated Arts Colleges	25.09.2016

be approved with the modification that

- (1) the polling time be from 8.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. with lunch break from 1.00-1.30 p.m.;
- (2) the voters, who enter the polling booth up to 5.00 p.m., be allowed to cast their vote;
- (3) the booth No. 69 & 70, 71 & 72 and 230 & 231, be clubbed;
- (4) since Principals/teachers of College/s would cast their vote at booth Nos. 205, 268, an '*' be marked against these booths;
- (5) the spelling of Booth No. 227 be corrected as 'Tappariankhurd';
- (6) the name of the building of booth no. 272 be mentioned as Panjab University Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala;
- (7) the teachers of Satyam Girls College, VPO Syadwala, Fazilka, who have been asked to cast their votes at Booth No.85, be asked to cast their votes at Booth No. 82, Gopi Chand Arya Mahila College, Abohar, which is at just 6 kms. distance;
- (8) as suggested by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, the teachers of Bhai Naghaiya Singh Memorial College, Alamgir be asked to cast their votes at SCD Govt. College, Ludhiana, i.e., Booth No. 172; and
- (9) the city-wise Observers be appointed.

Issue arising out of appointment of Assistant Professor for teaching B.Ed. classes

47. Pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No.15773 of 2015 (**Appendix-XXXV**), to consider the issues arising out of the requests (**Appendix-XXXV**), for appointment of Assistant Professor for teaching B.Ed. classes made by the following Private Un-aided Colleges:

1. Babe-Ke College of Education, V.P.O. Daudhar, Tehsil & Distt. Moga, for B.Ed. and M.Ed. course.
2. Shukdeva Krishna College of Education For Girls, Moga-Ferozpur G.T. Road, Moga, for B.Ed. course.
3. Baba Mangal Singh Institute of Education, Barnala Road, Bughipura, Moga, for B.Ed. course.
4. Satyam College of Education, V.P.O. Ghall Kalan, Ferozpur Road, Moga, for B.Ed. course.

Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXXV**) was also taken into consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that these people are asking for concession and he personally feels that it should not be given.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that they should file a review petition in the High Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that he thinks that they should fight.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that it has been mentioned that if they are to appoint Assistant Professor for M.Ed., then NET is essential. Secondly, with this there would be two set of qualifications – one for aided Colleges and another for self-financing Colleges.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that maybe there was slackness on the part of their Legal Cell and it did not pursue it. Therefore, they should strongly fight it.

Principal S.S. Sangha pointed out that at page 28, it has been mentioned “Any other qualifications prescribed by UGC like NET qualification”, and this is for Assistant Professor for M.Ed. Thereafter, a note has been given that “Faculty can be utilized for teaching in a flexible manner so as to optimize academic expertise available”. The Advocate might not have argued that for M.Ed. UGC-NET is essential.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether they have time for filing LPA or not.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired as to who have to take up such legal cases. Why did the Law Officers not bring it to the notice of the Registrar?

It was informed that Panjab University was the 3rd respondent in this case, and directly they have not even filed the reply.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired how does it affect? How does it affect – whether they are 3rd or 30th respondent? Again he would like to tell them that besides told by him few months before and last year and last to last year also, that these people have got stay where they

said that Dearness Allowance is not admissible to the teachers. In fact, the matter has been ex parte stayed, and the University has not taken any step till date to get the stay vacated, the teachers are suffering. He is also sure that they must have filed some reply to this writ petition and the Counsel must have appeared in the Court and after the judgement had been given in June 2016, when the period of filing LPA has lapsed, the matter is coming to the Syndicate. What does it speak now?

Principal S.S. Sangha said that it goes in their favour that NET is essential for the post of Assistant Professor for M.Ed.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that Mr. Karan Singh Sandhu, Advocate, is for respondent No.3, and he has appeared for the University. How could they say that they had not received the notice? It seems to him that they must have filed a reply.

It was informed that their reply and gone and it is on the similar lines.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if their reply has gone, their application has also been filed under 151, which meant, an interim order must also have been passed.

It was clarified that the only order which has been passed is of dated 3rd June. The Notice of Motion was issued to the University on 20th August and Mr. Karan Singh Sandhu (on behalf of Mr. Anupam Gupta) was appointed Counsel for the University, and he appeared in the Court, on behalf of the University. The case is NCTE versus Self-Finance Management Federation. First party is NCTE, 2nd is UGC, 3rd is Panjab University, 4th is Punjabi University and 5th is Guru Nanak Dev University. They have challenged the letter issued by Panjab University, Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University, pleading that they following P. Sushila versus judgement that Ph.D. is must or otherwise Ph.D. under UGC Regulations 2009, and that has been challenged by the petitioner. The reply of Panjab University was filed by Shri Karan Singh Sandhu on 1st March 2016, which is on record. They have taken the plea that they are violating 4.4.1 UGC Regulation, i.e., the appointment of teachers for self-financing courses should lie with the NCTE, whereas the NCTE Regulations are required to be seen in the light of the UGC. In the meeting of the Syndicate dated 20th September 2015, the Hon'ble members of the Syndicate had pointed out that the conditions for appointment of Assistant Professor are not to be diluted. Thereafter, the Vice Chancellor had appointed a Committee, which had met thrice. The Committee was to implement the post P. Sushila's case. The same thing had been presented in the Court, and thereafter, this has come, and it is only a pendency.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that means, on 3rd orders have come.

It was clarified that it only a pending disposal.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the main case has not been decided. He drew the attention of the House towards the last para, wherein it has been written "In view of these faculty position, CM No.1679 of 2016 is allowed and the respondent-Universities are directed to comply with the NCTE Regulations, 2014 only to B.Ed. course and to consider Non-NET qualified teacher also for

appointment to the post of Assistant Professors in Private Un-Aided Colleges in the B.Ed. course, pending disposal of this petition”.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it means that only CM has been allowed by the Court and it is by way of interim order, which could be challenged. He enquired to which is next date of hearing.

It was informed that the next date of hearing is 16th September 2016.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could also file an appeal against it. He suggested that the file should be shown to Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa because there could be many serious implications.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that best Counsel should be appointed to fight this case.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that whatever cases are filed against the University, those are only known to either the Law Officers or the University authorities, but the persons, who have the knowledge, do not know about those cases and what is happening to them. In this regard, his request is that whatever reply/replies is/are being filed from the University side, that should be made a part of the Syndicate proceedings. In several cases, ordinary people know the best solution, but the reply, which is filed by the University, is something else.

It was informed that the procedure which is being following is that the case is being given to the concerned Branch, which gives the factual position to the Registrar, and on the basis of that the Senior Law Officer gets the same approved from the Registrar. Then it is given to the Counsel for making the complete case/reply keeping in view the parallel judgement(s) and other related issues.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that what he is trying to say is that sometimes the facts are not disclosed even to the Registrar.

It was informed that everything is got done at a very-very short notice and the same is time bound.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there is no problem in filing the reply, but the reply should be placed before the Syndicate. On clarification that it is not possible, he suggested that the reply should be uploaded at least on the University website.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that they should also see from a different angle. In the writ petitions, the individual(s) and private respondents are always there. According to him, the private respondents should also be involved, as they have their self interests. Because they did not engage their own Counsel, they rely upon the University, and if they are involved. If they involve them, then they have to go to the Court on every hearing as a part of their duty, and then they do not have to take leave for the purpose. They should adopt such a mechanism. At least in the case in which the University employees are private respondents, it should be their duty to remain in the Court until the case is heard, and instead of giving them leave for that/those day(s), they should assigned official duty. The day the private respondent involves in the University cases, the 50% of the cases would be solved. Citing an example, he said that if the seniority

of an employee is being got affected and he/she is made respondent No.2, if he/she is going to the Court, at least he/she would watch his/her interest, and if the University Counsel does not pursue the case, he/she would immediately inform the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that if the University itself asked somebody to file a case against it, then what would they do? That is why, he is saying that it is not so simple because here a lot of unusual things had happened.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that, that is why, he is saying that let it be open.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that here also there are vested interests that since the case is against such and such person, he/she should himself face the consequences, and what the University is going to earn or since the case is against him/her, they should get it delayed.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the legal system of the University needed to be streamlined and strengthened.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is only about 4 years back when there was no Law Officer in the University. At that time if their system was not better, then it was not worse than this. At that time, it was said that the University is facing a lot of embarrassment at the hands of the Courts because they are not able to follow up the case. It was only one Superintendent or Assistant to whom the charge of Law Officer was given. At that time, a suggestion was given that if a Law Officer is appointed and everything would be streamlined. Thereafter, a suggestion came that since the work has increased manifold, 3-4 Law Officers should be appointed. Before appointment, a decision was taken that a Senior Law Officer and two Law Officers should be appointed. Though the proposal was to appoint a Law Officer, 3 (one Senior Law Officer and two Law Officers) have been appointed. He does not want to say whether the things have improved or not, and it is for them to assess. With due apology to Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, whosoever Advocates they go, they want everything readymade. They do not have any interest in the fees, but the prestige is attached that they are representing Panjab University, and that is why, they wanted to be on the panel of Panjab University. In Panjab University, since there is not mechanism that they should give a foolproof reply, they have to suffer.

The Vice Chancellor said that the number of cases is also very high. In fact, there are 1200 cases filed against the University during the last four years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that 1200 cases in four years, means, on an average two cases a day, because the High Court does not open more than six months.

The Vice Chancellor said that every day he has to sign few files relating to engagement of Advocates. If they did not sign two-three files pertaining to engagement of Advocates, that day is not complete.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they also have to introspect as to why such a large number of litigations are there.

To this, Vice Chancellor said that since the High Court is near, everybody goes to the Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that earlier also, the High Court was near.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that two Departments are very famous for the legal cases – (i) University Institute of Legal Studies; and (ii) P.U. Construction Office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that recently a large number of cases have been filed by the affiliated Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that somebody wants transfer and some have shortage of attendance and the case is filed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could just now tell to reduce the students' petitions. Have they ever challenged any order passed by the High Court in the case of petition by the students, and in fact, never? The High Court also knows, the students also know that whatever order is passed, it is to be implemented by Panjab University. The moment they file an LPA and they (petitioners) know that they are going to be challenged, neither the Court is going to pass any such orders nor student is going to file any petition. Not even a single order of the Court has been challenged by them hitherto wherein they have clearly favoured the students relating to admission, creation of additional seat, etc.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in one of their cases, the Court ordered to admit a student to 2nd Semester, who had not even been admitted to 1st Semester. When they said that the Bar Council does not permit, the Court said no problem, the candidate would do 1st Semester after 10th Semester.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said, "Alas this luxury is available to the students of affiliated Colleges". The students of affiliated Colleges could not dare to go to the High Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that if they feel that some order of the Court is certain wrong, they file a review petition.

The Vice Chancellor said that right now, the issue before them is Item 47. Is it binding that they have to implement the Court order.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that on today, it is binding because unless and until they get this order reversed from the Higher Court or get the stay vacated from the same Court, it is binding. It seems to him that certain Colleges have also given the advertisement accordingly. When the advertisement has been given, it is as per the direction of the Court, the appointments would also be there, and they would come for approval to the University also, and they have to give them approval also. The candidate to whom approval would be given, his/her interest would also be created, and then he/she would also become the affected party. The problem would be so deteriorated that they would not be able to come out. Therefore, either they have to go to Shri Anupam Gupta or Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, who could tell them the way out that whether they should file an appeal. He suggested that the complete file should be shown to Dr. Dayal

Partap Singh Randhawa and him (Goyal), and most probably they have to file an appeal in this case.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that both his friends (Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa) should be requested to see the file sometime tomorrow.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even if he is asked to come in the midnight, he is ready.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that a photo copy of it should be provided to him.

RESOLVED: That Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa be shown the complete file, so that they could suggest the next course of action in the matter.

Routine and formal matters

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

(i) In pursuance of the judgment of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 6580 of 2016 and CWP No. 2595 of 2016, respectively, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Dr. Jyoti Rattan as Associate Professor (General) in the Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+AGP of Rs.9000/- (subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011).

NOTE: 1. A copy of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court in CWP No. 6580 of 2016 and CWP No. 2595 of 2016, respectively enclosed **(Appendix-XXXVI)**.

2. Appointment letter dated 01.07.2016 issued to Dr. Jyoti Rattan enclosed **(Appendix-XXXVI)**.

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has extended the term of appointment of Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor, purely on temporary basis, at Centre for Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering Institute of Emerging Area in Science & Technology, P.U., up to 30.06.2016 with one day's break on 02.05.2016 (01.05.2016 being Sunday) 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.

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

(i) re-appointed the following Assistant Professors purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date they will start work for the academic session 2016-17 against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in on regular basis whichever is earlier, under

Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which they were working earlier, in the P.U. Constituent College as mentioned below against each:-

Sr. No.	Name	Subject	Name of the College
1.	Dr. Kamalpreet Kaur	Punjabi	Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshehar
2.	Dr. (Ms.) Poonam Dwivedi	English	
3.	Mr. Hari Nath	Hindi	
4.	Ms. Gurdeep Kaur	Punjabi	
5.	Ms. Sukhjit Nahar	Sociology	
6.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	Commerce	
7.	Mr. Hari Krishan	History	
8.	Mr. Ramandeep Singh Nahar	Commerce	
9.	Mrs. Ruby	Mathematics	
10.	Mr. Inder Bhagat	Computer Science	
11.	Mr. Deepak	Computer Science	
1.	Dr. Gurdeep Singh	Punjabi	P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur
2.	Dr. Resham Singh	Punjabi	
3.	Dr. Kumud Manohar Meshram	Hindi	
4.	Dr. Harnam Singh	Physical Education	
5.	Ms. Simarjeet Kaur	Mathematics	
6.	Ms. Nishi	Commerce	
7.	Mr. Mohammad Sazid	Commerce	
8.	Mr. Harjinder Singh Bhardwaj	Political Science	
1.	Dr. Parminder Singh	Punjabi	P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singhwala, District Moga
2.	Dr. Harjeet Singh	English	
3.	Dr. Shashi Kant Rai	Hindi	
4.	Ms. Rajni Bhalla	Commerce	
5.	Ms. Monica	Commerce	
6.	Mr. Sandeep Buttola	Sociology	
7.	Ms. Ritu Mittal	Economics	
8.	Mr. Ashim Kumar	Mathematics	
9.	Mr. Rajiv Kumar	Political Science	
10.	Ms. Simranjit Kaur	Computer Science	
1.	Dr. Inderjit Singh	Political Science	P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib
2.	Dr. Sukhjeet Singh	Punjabi	
3.	Dr. Ram Singh	Commerce	
4.	Dr. Sumit Mohan	Hindi	
5.	Mr. Sukhdev Singh	Punjabi	
6.	Mrs. Navdeep Kaur	English	
7.	Mrs. Mamta Rani	Commerce	
8.	Mr. Harpreet Singh	Economics	
9.	Mr. Rajesh Chander	History	
10.	Ms. Lakhveer Kaur	Physical Education	

- (ii) approved the appointment of the following as Assistant Professors on contract basis as a special case w.e.f. the date they will start work for the academic session 2016-17 against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in on regular basis whichever is earlier at a fixed salary of Rs.30400/-

on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier in the P.U. Constituent College as mentioned against below against each:

Sr. No.	Name of Candidate	Subject	Qualifications	College
1.	Ms Shaffy Girdhar D/o Shri Satish Kumar	Computer Science	MCA	PUCC Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib
2.	Shri Varun Maini S/o Shri Bhagwan Dass Maini	Computer Science	MCA (Hons.)	PUCC, Guru Har Sahai, Ferozepur
3.	Shri Pawan Kumar S/o Shri Om Parkash	Computer Science	PGDCA, M.Sc. MCA	PUCC Guru Har Sahai, Ferozepur

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Ravinder Kumar, Assistant Professor in Punjabi at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, w.e.f. 30.01.2014, under Regulation 6 at page 118-119 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, as he has been confirmed as Associate Professor at University of Delhi w.e.f. 30.01.2014.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 6, page 118-119, Calendar, Volume I, 2007, which reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months’ notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

Explanation: long leave would mean leave for one year or more.”

2. Dr. Ravinder Kumar is on EOL w.e.f. 30.01.2014, on account of his appointment at University of Delhi

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Gurpreet Kaur, Assistant Professor (Temporary) in Anesthesia, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, w.e.f. 02.04.2016, as she has given one month notice from 01.03.2016 to 01.04.2016, under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

NOTE: Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, reads as under:

“The service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted EOL without pay to Dr. Kapil Kumar Sharma, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, P.U., from 31.05.2016 to 16.08.2017, under special circumstances, as per Regulation 11 (G) at page 139-140 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, to enable him to complete his contract at South Asian University, New Delhi ending on 16.08.2017.

NOTE: 1. Leave Cases Committee dated 25.05.2016 has recommended the case of Dr. Kapil Kumar Sharma for grant of Extra Ordinary Leave without pay up to 16.08.2017, w.e.f. the date he is relieved from the Department, under Regulation 11 (G) at page 139-140, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, to enable him to complete his contract at South Asian University, New Delhi ending on 16.08.2017, with the rider, as below:-

1. Dr. Kapil Kumar Sharma has to request for keeping his lien to the post of Assistant Professor, unless this leave cannot be granted.
2. This leave be treated as last spell of EOL without pay granted to him.
3. The probation period of Dr. Kapil Kumar Sharma as Associate Professor will be extended for the period he is on EOL without pay i.e. up to 16.08.2017. His confirmation

will be done, as per provisions in P.U. Calendar, by excluding the period of EOL without pay.

2. Request dated 30.05.2016 of Dr. Kapil Kumar Sharma enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVII**).

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

- (i) extended the term of appointment of Dr. Manoj Kumar, Assistant Professor (temporary), Centre for Public Health, IEAST (already approved for the session 2015-16) w.e.f. 03.05.2016 to 30.06.2016 with one day break (01.05.2016 being Sunday & 02.05.2016 as break day), in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/-+ two increments, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) re-appointed afresh Dr. Manoj Kumar, Assistant Professor, Centre for Public Health, IEAST purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2016-17 w.e.f. the date of start of classes i.e. 07.07.2016 as the first opening day after the summer vacation or till the posts are filled in through regular selection whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/-+ two increments, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007

(viii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

- (i) extended the validity of Advt. No. 3/2015 in respect of the post of drivers for one-year more from the date of its expiry i.e. 11.06.2016 to 10.06.2017.
- (ii) authorized Dr. Pardeep Kumar Sharma, Chief Coordinator, UIAMS, P.U. to conduct the 'Written Objective Type Test' of 188 (eligible) + (provisionally eligible) candidates as per the criteria laid down by the Screening Committee duly approved by the Vice-Chancellor to complete for 08 posts of Drivers & all expenditure to be incurred on Paper setting, admit cards etc. will be met out of the Budget Head 'UIAMS Examination'.

NOTE: 1. The post of drivers to be filled on regular basis was advertised vide Advt. No. 3/2015. The validity of the said post was up to 11.06.2016.

2. An office note enclosed.

(ix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-employed Shri Pritam Chand, Senior Technician (G-II), Department of Biotechnology, P.U. (who retired from the University service on 30.04.2016) on contract basis for six months or till the post is filled on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on fixed emoluments i.e. half of the salary last drawn (excluding HRA, CCA & other special allowances) rounded off to nearest lower 100 irrespective of the fact whether he has opted for pension or not, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty after issuing of the office orders. His salary be charged/paid against the post of Senior Technician (G-II), Department of Biotechnology vacated by him on his retirement.

(x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the assignment to the Faculties to the following Fellows mentioned against their names:

Professor Dinesh K. Gupta Dean of University Instruction Panjab University Chandigarh	1. Business Management & Commerce 2. Education
Shri Jitender Yadav, IAS Director of Higher Education, U.T., Administration Room No. 312, 3 rd Floor U.T. Secretariat Sector-9, Chandigarh	1. Languages 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology
Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha President Panjab University Non-Teaching Staff Association (PUSA)	1. Languages 2. Law 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Education

(xi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the BOF/ Syndicate, has sanctioned the double payment of honorarium to:

- (i) the supporting staff as well as Centre superintendent who performed the duty at outstation for P.U. (CET) 2016 examination.
- (ii) the staff members who performed duty more than 12 hours during the CET Exam-(UG) held in 2016.
- (iii) the staff who will perform duty in any entrance test conducted by the Panjab University as and when the duration is more than 12 hours w.e.f. 11.06.2016 (till further orders).

NOTE: A copy of the circular with regard to rates of remuneration for various assignments for the conduct of entrance tests w.e.f. 31.03.2012 for Chandigarh and Punjab enclosed **(Appendix-XXXVIII)**.

(xii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Regulations/Rules for the

B.C.A. (Semester System) (**Appendix-XXXIX**) implemented from the admissions of 2014-15 as recommended by the Administrative Committee dated 21.01.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIX**) of the Department of Computer Science and Applications.

- (xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the Committee dated 24.05.2016 (**Appendix-XL**) constituted by the Vice Chancellor to finalize admission Guidelines (for affiliated Colleges), for the session 2016-17.
- (xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendations of the Youth Welfare Committee dated 05.05.2016 (**Appendix-XLI**) and has also allowed to incorporate the same in the Information and Rules Booklet of the Panjab University Youth and Heritage Festivals.
- (xv) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Joint Academic & Administrative Committee dated 27.01.2016 (**Appendix-XLII**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has increased the number of seats for various M.Pharm. Courses at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, from the academic session 2016-17 onwards, as under:

Name of the Course	Already admitted during the session 2015-16	Proposed to be admitted during the session 2016-17	Total No. of seats increased
Master of Pharmacy (M.Pharm.)			
M. Pharm. in Pharmaceutics	Category A: 06 Category B: 01	Category A: 08 Category B: 02	3
M. Pharm. in Pharmaceutical Chemistry	Category A: 06 Category B: 01	Category A: 08 Category B: 02	3
M. Pharm. in Pharmacology	Category A: 02 Category B: 01	Category A: 04 Category B: 01	2
M. Pharm. in Pharmacognosy	Category A: 02 Category B: 01	Category A: 04 Category B: 01	2

NOTE: A copy of letter No. 2738 dated 22.06.2016 and letter No. 443 dated 29.01.2016 respectively, of the Chairperson, UIPS, are enclosed (**Appendix-XLII**).

- (xvi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the fee structure (**Appendix-XLIII**) of the new course of M.A. in Comparative Study of Religions in the Department of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies from the academic session 2016-2017.
- (xvii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the fee structure (**Appendix-XLIV**) for Bachelor of Library & Information Science course, as earlier approved for Master of Library & Information Science course (1st year) (**Appendix-XLIV**) in the Department of

Library & Information Science from the academic session 2016-2017.

(xviii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed MoU (**Appendix-XLV**) between Department of Physics and Sophisticated Analytical Instrumentation Facility (SAIF), Panjab University and Cosmic Ray Laboratory (CRL), TIFR, Ooty.

(xix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Sardar Swaran Singh National Institute of Bio-Energy, Kapurthala (**Appendix-XLVI**).

(xx) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

- (i) accepted an endowment of Rs.5,00,000/- made by Professor Brij Mohan Arora, Department of Electrical Engineering, IIT Bombay, Powai, Mumbai, in the name of Hari Ram Arora and Bhajan Kaur Arora Medals for Best Paper Awards in the Science subjects for young researchers (Students, Post-docs, Faculty) up to the age of 38 years and has also allowed the office to invest the said amount in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh and the interest so accrued be credited annually in the SET A/c No. 10444978140.
- (ii) approved the guidelines (**Appendix-XLVII**) for institution of the above said award.

(xxi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors, P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Una Road, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, up to May, 2016, with one day's break as usual, 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 of Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of Assistant Professor	Branch/Subject
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.	Mr. Anish Sharma	ECE
7.	Ms. Harman Preet Kaur	ECE
8.	Mr. Gurpinder Singh	I.T.
9.	Ms. Divya Sharma	I.T.
10.	Ms. Ritika Arora	I.T.
11.	Ms. Tanvi Sharma	I.T.

12.	Mr. Ajay Kumar Saini	Mech.
13.	Mr. Gurwinder Singh	Mech.
14.	Mr. Ramandeep Singh	Mech.

(xxii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation of the Board of Control dated 14.01.2016 (**Appendix-XLVIII**) that UIET and Dr. SSBUCET will join Direct Admissions of Students Abroad (DASA) (A Scheme of Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India) for admission of Foreign/National/PIO/NRI seats under DASA 2016-17 in UG course for the session 2016-17 and has also granted permission to write to Director, NIT, Sri Nagar for inclusion of seat matrix of UIET and UICET in the Admission Brochure of DASA (**Appendix-XLVIII**).

(xxiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed the following as Laboratory Instructors on purely temporary basis at U.I.E.T. (whose present term of contractual appointment for the academic session 2015-16 expired on 30.04.2016) in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800 + GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules as under and has also allowed to charge/pay their salary against the vacant posts of Technical Officers/Workshop Instructor/Senior Workshop Superintendent/ Deputy Librarian as mentioned against each in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology as before:

Sr. No.	Name	Post against which salary to be charged
1.	Mr. Nand Kishore (I.T.)	Technical Officer
2.	Mr. Sandeep Trehan (M.E.)	Technical Officer
3.	Ms. Seema (Biotechnology)	Workshop Instructor
4.	Mr. Lokesh (C.S.E.)	Senior Workshop Superintendent
5.	Ms. Sunaina Gulati (C.S.E.)	Deputy Librarian

(i) w.e.f. 02.05.2016 to 05.07.2016 or till the vacancies are filled in on regular basis whichever is earlier; and

(ii) for next Academic session 2016-17 w.e.f. 08.07.2016 to 31.05.2017 i.e. upto end of semester Examinations, (after one day break on 07.07.2016, 06.07.2016 being holiday) or till the vacancies are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier.

(xxiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XLIX**) between Panjab University and Deakin University, Australia.

(xxv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation of Administrative Committee of Computer Centre, Panjab

University, that w.e.f. July 27, 2016, the Computer Centre, Panjab University, be renamed as **“A.P.J. Abdul Kalam Computer Centre, Panjab University”**.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(viii), Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he had pointed out several times and they have still given the advertisement for the posts of Drivers, but it has come to his notice today only. He urged the Vice Chancellor to ask him to prepare the pool of Drivers, if none is able to prepare the same.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that once Professor Keshav Malhotra should be asked to prepare the pool of Drivers. He had been pleaded for the last so many years that double entry system should be introduced in the University, but his advice was not heeded to. They introduced the double entry system, when they were caught. In fact, there is no need to appoint more Drivers. He, therefore, suggested that the validity of this advertisement should not be increased. If the information is given to him, he would prepare the pool of Drivers even at home.

It was informed that the advertisement has already been given and they are getting it revalidated, because the screening has also been done and only interview is to be held.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is no need to conduct the interview as they have already surplus Drivers.

The Vice Chancellor said, “Alright”.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(xxxiii), Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired are there the posts of Laboratory Instructors? What are these posts and what are their qualifications? According to him, the minimum qualification for these posts should be B.E. How many such persons are to be appointed at UIET? Earlier, they had appointed 40-50 persons at UIET on contract basis and at that time it was enquired as to how many of them are NET qualified and how many are non-NET. At that time, it was assured that the report would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that anyway it has to be checked through the manpower audit.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that its workload and requirement should be got checked through the Dean of University Instruction, and till then it should be deferred.

The Vice Chancellor said that since it is for ratification, there is no need of deferring it, especially at this stage.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said how could they make appointment of Laboratory Instructors against Technical Officers? At least to him, it does not look proper.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it could be expedited, especially in view of the fact that there is a feeling that there is overstaff in certain very big Departments. This could be got checked with the help of either the Dean of University Instruction or a Committee. This needs to be done at the earliest. However, instead of cutting down the surplus staff, they are adding more and more. Especially, as has been

pointed out, there is enough surplus staff at University Institute of Engineering & Technology.

It was informed that the Manpower Audit Committee has done this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that at that time, it was thought that there is surplus staff at UIET, but when he went there as a member of the Manpower Audit Committee, everything was found in order.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, in fact, what they are doing is that wherever there are budgeted posts, all are being filled up. In his own Department (Department of Evening Studies – Multi-disciplinary Research Centre), when he was told that there are four budgeted posts, he immediately said that the process for filling up these posts should be initiated. But later when he assessed, it was found that the workload is only of one and a half teacher, even after advertisement he ordered that the posts should not be filled up.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that the workload of UIET could also be checked.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the workload of UIET has already been checked.

It was informed that during Manpower Audit, the Committees constituted for the purpose, have cut down certain faculty positions, but in the case of non-teaching staff, they have not cut any post as people had tried to justify that they need this much staff very much, whereas on their own they have found that there are certain posts, which they were discussing earlier, like Bhisty, Khalasi, Duplicating Machine Operators (DMOs), Typewriter Mechanic, etc., which are no longer required. Thus, they need not be there. They have to be taken as multi-tasking staff, and they could merge them and use them somewhere else, wherever they could justify and consider to make the posts as diminishing cadre. So that kind of action is being taken by their Manpower Audit Committee, and they have reached at well in advance stage. Since for the last 2-3 meetings, Shri Dogra, who is from the U.T. Administration, could not come, they have to postpone the meeting(s). Now, they could resume the task. Maybe in one to two sittings they would be able to complete the task.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the information contained in **Item-48-R(i) to R-(vii) and R-(ix) to R-(xxv)** on the agenda, be ratified; and
- (2) the information contained in **Item 48-R(viii)**, be not ratified.

Routine and formal matters

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

- (i)** Since the interim orders dated 18.05.2016, 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. (9306 of 2016), the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Prem Lal Sharma, Professor, V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur 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.
- (ii)** Since the interim orders dated 26.11.2015, 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. (9306 of 2016), has now been adjourned to 13.06.2016. The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Naval Kishore, Professor, Department of Geology 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.
- (iii)** Since the interim orders dated 18.05.2016, 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. (9306 of 2016), the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Varinder Kumar Walia, Professor, Department of Zoology 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.
- (iv)** Since the interim orders dated 11.2.2016, 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. (2775 of 2016) have now been adjourned to 24.05.2016, Dr. Meena Sehgal, Professor, Department of Psychology has been 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.
- (v)** The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed afresh the following faculty members at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on temporary

basis w.e.f. 03.06.2016 for 11 months i.e. up to 02.05.2017 with one day's break on 02.06.2016 or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP of Rs.8600+NPA and Rs.15600-39100+ GP of Rs.6000+NPA+Allowances respectively, as admissible as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Dr. Shipra Gupta	Associate Professor
2.	Dr. Lalit Kumar	Associate Professor
3.	Dr. Vishakha Grover	Associate Professor
4.	Dr. Poonam Sood	Assistant Professor
5.	Dr. Neha Bansal	Assistant Professor
6.	Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal	Assistant Professor
7.	Dr. Sunint Singh	Assistant Professor
8.	Dr. Puneet	Assistant Professor
9.	Dr. Rose Kanwaljit Kaur	Assistant Professor

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed afresh the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Rural Centre Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 07.07.2016 or the date of start of the classes for the academic session 2016-17 or till the 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, with one day's break as usual, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the faculty member
1.	Dr. Gurjit Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi
2.	Mr. Munish Kumar, Assistant Professor in Computer Science
3.	Mr. Surinder Singh, Assistant Professor in Political Science
4.	Ms. Seema, Assistant Professor in Physical Education

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 01/15/28/29.5.2016 (Para I-(xix) (**Appendix-L**) has extended the term of appointment of the above faculty members up to 31.05.2016

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor has acceded to the request dated 06.04.2016 (**Appendix-LI**) of Ms. Sudipa Kaur, Assistant Professor (Part-time), UILS, P.U., Chandigarh and accepted her resignation w.e.f. 06.04.2016 (A.N.).

NOTE: 1. A copy of office order No.5698-99/Estt.I dated 25.05.2016 enclosed (**Appendix-LI**).

2. As per Rule 16.1 appearing at page 82, P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 three calendar months notice period is required in case of Class

'A' and 'B' permanent employees and one calendar month notice in case of Class 'C' employees. However, as per rule 16.2 at page 83 of the said calendar, no notice period is required in case of work charged staff and appointment of temporary nature without any specified period or till further orders. A photocopy of rule 16.1 and 16.2 enclosed (**Appendix-LI**).

3. Keeping in view the provision in the above said rules it has been observed that proper rule/s should be framed in respect of the appointment of Part-time nature, through the Syndicate that at least one month notice, be made mandatory to enable the University to make alternative arrangement.

(viii) The Vice-Chancellor has given the additional charge of the post of Dean College Development Council, P.U. to Professor Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examinations, Panjab University, Chandigarh, w.e.f. 01.06.2016 till the advertised post of Dean College of Development Council is filled in.

(ix) The Vice-Chancellor has allowed to close the Account No.2845101000871 related to seminar/ conference etc. opened in Canara Bank, Sector-14, , as no expenditure is being made out of this account and the balance of the said account be transferred to Non-Plan Budget.

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

(x) The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang, U.S.O.L. will continue to perform the duties of academic In-charge of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies as she is introducing a new two year M.A. programme. However, the DUI will be the Administrative head of the Guru Nanak Sikh Studies.

(xi) The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Committee dated 08.04.2016 (**Appendix-LIII**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, has approved the following qualifications for the post of Principal in Education College having B.Ed. or M.Ed. OR M.Ed. & B.Ed. Courses:

- (i) Minimum 55% marks in postgraduate degree in related discipline.
- (ii) Minimum 55% marks in M.Ed. degree
- (iii) Ph.D. in Education.
- (iv) Teaching experience/professional experience in the teaching education to be considered and followed as per NCTE Regulations already adopted

by P.U., i.e., 8 years of teaching experience in a Secondary Teacher Education Institution for B.Ed. Course and 10 years of professional experience in teaching education for M.Ed. Course.

- (v) A minimum score as stipulated in the Academic Performance Indicator (API) based Performance Based Appraisal System (PBAS) as set out in this Regulation in Appendix III for the direct recruitment of Professors in Colleges.

(xii) The Vice-Chancellor has approved the appointment of Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, as Principal on contract basis for a term of two years w.e.f. 01.07.2016 at GGSDS College, Haryana, District Hoshiarpur.

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor has allowed that the Govt. College of Commerce & Business Administration being run in the temporary building in Sector-42, Chandigarh be shifted to permanent building at Sector-50, Chandigarh.

NOTE: 1. The Inspection Committee dated 20.05.2016 (**Appendix-LIV**) has strongly recommended that the present campus of Government College of Commerce and Business Administration, Sector 50, Chandigarh is suitable and meet out all parameters for full-fledged and functional campus. This campus is quite suitable for expansion and diversification of academic programme as per vision of Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD).

2. The UGC Regulations-2009, Para 8.2 regarding shifting the premises to a different location is reads as under:-

“If an affiliated Colleges ceases to function or is shifted to a different location or is transferred to a different society, Trust, individual or a group of individuals without the prior approval of the University, the affiliation granted to the College shall lapse automatically on such ceases, shifting or transfer, as the case may be, and it shall be treated as a new college for the purpose of future affiliation. The University/ Government shall have the duty to alleviate the educational future of the affected students in an

appropriate manner as per its decision”.

3. An office note enclosed
(**Appendix-LIV**).

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Sudesh Gulati W/o Late Shri Girish Gulati, Assistant Registrar, Election Cell, P.U., Chandigarh (who expired on 10.04.2016, while in service):

1. Gratuity (In the Event of death, while in service) : as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007
2. Ex-gratia grant : as admissible under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009
3. Earned Leave Encashment Upto the prescribed limit : encashment of earned leave upto the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Mr. Sumit (Minor Son) through his father and natural guardian, Shri Subhash H/o Late Smt. Om Wati, Cleaner, Department of U.I.P.S., who expired on 08.03.2016, while in service:

1. Gratuity (In the Event of death, while in service) : as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia grant : as admissible under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
3. Earned Leave Encashment Upto the prescribed limit : encashment of earned leave upto the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(xvi) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Swarna Devi W/o Late Shri Ram Partap, Peon, U.S.O.L., P.U., Chandigarh, who expired on 23.04.2016, while in service:

1. Gratuity (In the Event of death, while in service) : as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia grant : as admissible under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
3. Earned Leave Encashment Upto the prescribed limit : encashment of earned leave upto the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(xvii) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Mrs. Adarsh Sharma W/o Late Shri Raghbir Chand, Electrician (Technician G-II), P.U. Construction Office, who expired on 08.03.2016, while in service:

1. Gratuity (In the Event of death, while in service) : as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia grant : as admissible under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
3. Earned Leave Encashment Upto the prescribed limit : encashment of earned leave upto the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(xviii) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Parvati W/o Late Shri Ram Nath, Security Guard, Girls Hostel No. 2, P.U., who expired on 24.03.2016, while in service:

1. Gratuity (In the Event of death, while in service) : as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia grant : as admissible under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
3. Earned Leave Encashment Upto the prescribed limit : encashment of earned leave upto the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(xix) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits in respect of Late Shri Kulvinder Singh, Clerk, Re-evaluation Branch, (who expired on 11.02.2011, while in service) to be distributed in equal share/proportion to Mrs. Kamaljit Kaur (Wife), Mr. Jagot Singh, Mr. Prabhjot Singh (Both Sons, minor) and Smt. Paramjit Kaur (Mother) as per the succession certificate issued by the Hon'ble Court:

1. Gratuity (In the Event of death, while in service) : as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia grant : as admissible under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
3. Earned Leave Encashment Upto the prescribed limit : encashment of earned leave upto the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(xx) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Hardeep Kaur W/o Late Shri Ajmer Singh, Mali, P.U. Construction Office, who expired on 26.01.2016, while in service:

1. Gratuity (In the Event of death, while in service) : as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

2. Ex-gratia grant : as admissible under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
3. Earned Leave Encashment Upto the prescribed limit : encashment of earned leave upto the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(xxi) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Shri Ram Karan S/o Late Shri Devinder, Cleaner, P.U. Construction Office, who expired on 17.02.2016, while in service:

1. Gratuity (In the Event of death, while in service) : as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia grant : as admissible under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
3. Earned Leave Encashment Upto the prescribed limit : encashment of earned leave upto the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(xxii) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Shri Sanjay Sharma H/o Late Smt. Pushpa Rani, Senior Assistant, Department of Public Health, P.U., who expired on 18.02.2016, while in service:

1. Gratuity (In the Event of death, while in service) : as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia grant : as admissible under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
3. Earned Leave Encashment Upto the prescribed limit : encashment of earned leave upto the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(xxiii) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Laxmi Devi W/o Late Shri Lalit Parkash, Cook, Guest House, P.U., Chandigarh, who expired on 05.04.2016, while in service:

1. Gratuity (In the Event of death, while in service) : as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia grant : as admissible under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
3. Earned Leave Encashment Upto the prescribed limit : encashment of earned leave upto the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Dr. Prem Lal Sharma Professor V.V.B.I.S. & I.S. Hoshiarpur	11.09.1981 (JRA) 01.06.1989 (Lecturer)	31.05.2016	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 and 15.2 at pages 131-132 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007.
2.	Dr. Swinder Singh Professor of Public Administration University School of Open Learning	04.07.1986	30.06.2016	(ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to him/her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.
3.	Dr. A.K. Vashisht Professor UBS	23.12.1986	31.07.2016	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183-186 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007.
4.	Dr. R.K. Gupta Professor of Commerce USOL	14.08.1976	30.06.2015	(ii) Furlough as admissible (maximum for six months) under Regulation 12.1 (B) at page 121 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007; and (iii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to him/her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

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

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Devinder Kumar Marwaha Deputy Registrar Estate Branch	28.12.1974	31.05.2016	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Shri Pardeep Kumar Deputy Librarian USOL	05.03.1979	31.07.2016	
3.	Shri Dharam Pal Sharma Assistant Registrar Examination Br.-II	29.05.1979	31.07.2016	
4.	Shri Kuldeep Sobti Assistant Registrar Establishment Br.-I	04.04.1974	31.03.2016	
5.	Shri Ranbir Singh Khanna Assistant Registrar USOL	20.10.1976	31.05.2016	
6.	Shri Pardeep Kumar Assistant Registrar Accounts Branch	25.05.1976	31.05.2016	
7.	Shri Devinder Singh Sodhi Assistant Registrar Examination-IV	22.05.1978	31.03.2016	
8.	Mrs. Mamta Ghai Assistant Registrar Accounts Branch	10.10.1975	30.06.2016	
9.	Shri Damodar Dass Thakur Superintendent Accounts Branch	04.09.1975	31.07.2016	
10.	Shri Kartar Singh Laboratory Superintendent (G-I) Department of Zoology	11.02.1978	31.05.2016	
11.	Shri Kamal Kumar Superintendent Office of Director, Research Promotion Cell	09.12.1975	30.06.2016	
12.	Shri Chanchal Singh Senor Technical Assistant (G-I) University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences	23.04.1974	31.07.2016	

13.	Ms. Urmil Gupta Personal Assistant FDO Office	01.03.1982	31.05.2016	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
14.	Shri Ashwani Kumar Joshi Superintendent Establishment Br-I	05.03.1982	31.05.2016	
15.	Shri Lajja Ram Hans Superintendent Account Branch	22.05.1978	31.05.2016	
16.	Shri Subhash Chand Superintendent College Branch	04.02.1987	31.05.2016	
17.	Ms. Bimla Kochar Superintendent Colleges Branch	29.10.1985	31.07.2016	
18.	Shri Prithvi Raj Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Dr. S.S.B.U.I.C.E.T	23.10.1982	31.07.2016	
19.	Ms. Darshana Devi Stenographer Centre with potential for Excellence in Bio-Medical Sciences	22.06.1984	30.04.2016	
20.	Shri Mangu Singh Work Inspector (Jr. Technician) P.U. Construction Office	01.08.1976	31.07.2016	
21.	Shri Nathu Ram Semi Professional Assistant (Provisonal) Registrar's Office	01.02.1984	31.07.2016	
22.	Ms. Vandana Senior Assistant R&S Branch	21.09.1989	31.03.2016	
23.	Shri Tirath Ram Painter, Techn. (G-I) P.U. Construction Office	14.07.1987	31.07.2016	
24.	Shri Kartar Singh DMO-cum-Daftri General Branch	26.02.1969	31.07.2016	
25.	Shri Panna Lal Security Guard Department of Evening Studies- MDRC	22.06.1991	31.05.2016	
26.	Shri Jagir Singh Mali P.U. Construction Office	27.01.1993	31.05.2016	

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

(xxvi) Since the interim orders dated 24.05.2016 & 30.05.2016, 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 in CWP No. (10209 of 2016 & 10860 of 2016), the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Jaspal Kaur Kaang and Dr. Swinder Singh, Professors, University School of Open Learning be allowed to continue until the judgment is pronounced by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it. Therefore, their retiral benefits be kept pending till the final outcome of CWP No. 11988 of 2014.

(xxvii) In terms of the interim order dated 28.06.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 12763 of 2016 (Dr. Shveta Mahendra Vs. Panjab University and others), the Vice-Chancellor has permitted Dr. Shveta Mahendra, Assistant Professor to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years, as per orders passed by the Hon'ble Court in the similar Writ Petition subject to the outcome of CWP No. 11988 of 2014 (Dr. B.S. Ghuman Vs. P.U. & Others), which has been reserved for pronouncing judgment. Therefore, her retiral benefits and re-employment may be kept pending till the final outcome of CWP 11988 of 2014.

(xxviii) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.02.2016/ 14.03.2016 (Para 42), has accepted the recommendation dated 17.06.2016 of Chairperson, Department of Mathematics for discontinuation of B.Sc. (Hons. School) Mathematics and Computing in the Department of Mathematics, P.U., from the session 2016-17.

(xxix) As authorized by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 30.08.2015 (Para No. 28), the C.O.E. has approved the award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) to the following candidates:

Roll No.	Name of the candidates	Father's Name	Faculty / Subject	Title
3386	Parul Gupta	D/o Dinesh Kumar Bansal	Science/ Microbiology	BIOLOGICAL INACTIVATION OF N-ACYLHOMOSERINE LACTONE MOLECULES BY LACTONASE AND ITS POTENTIAL IN TREATING <i>PSEUDOMONAS AERUGINOSA</i> INDUCED BURN WOUND INFECTION
3387	Parvinder Kaur	D/o Avtar Singh	Science/ Biotechnology	STUDIES ON CLINICAL ISOLATES OF <i>STENOTROPHOMONAS MALTOPHILIA</i> : IDENTIFICATION, EPIDEMIOLOGY, ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE AND VIRULENCE FACTORS

3388	Rohit Kumar	S/o Jagtamba Prasad	Science/ Biotechnology	ALLELIC VARIATION IN PUROINDOLINES IN INDIAN WHEAT CULTIVARS, THEIR ASSOCIATION WITH HARDNESS AND STARCH GRANULE PROPERTIES
3389	Poonam Sangwan	D/o Vijay Kumar Sangwan	Science/ Chemistry	QUANTUM-MECHANICAL STUDIES TO EXPLORE THE ROLE OF ELECTRON-CORRELATION IN THE DEPROTONATION ENERGIES AND ISOMERISATION OF POLYANIONS OF AROMATIC ORIGIN
3390	Priya	D/o Subhash Chander	Science/ Nuclear Medicine	DEVELOPMENT AND PRECLINICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF RADIOLABELED TRASTUZUMAB FOR ASSESSMENT OF HER2/NEU EXPRESSION IN BREAST CANCERS
3391	Dipti Salhuria	D/o Yudhvir Salhuria	Arts/ Women's Studies	WOMEN AND HINDI CINEMA: A STUDY OF DEPICTION, ROLES AND RESPONSES
3392	Rajiv Kumar	S/o Om Parkash	Arts/ Psychology	NATURE OF LONELINESS IN RELATION TO PERSONALITY, NEGATIVE COGNITION, CREATIVITY AND OPTIMISM
3393	Arun Kumar	S/o Hari Krishan	Languages/ English	ROLE OF AFFECTIVE FACTORS IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE URBAN-RURAL SCHOOLS OF FEROZEPUR DISTRICT
3394	Vandana Kumari	D/o Santa Singh	Languages/ English	POLITICS OF CULTURAL MEMORY: A CRITIQUE OF HAROLD PINTER'S SELECTED PLAYS
3395	Mrinalini Kashyap	D/o Santosh Kashyap	Languages/ English	DECODING HIERARCHIES IN ANCIENT SANSKRIT DRAMA (A STUDY OF KALIDASA'S <i>ABHIJANANASAKUNTALAM</i> , BHASA'S <i>SVAPANAVASAVADATTA</i> AND SHUDRAKA'S <i>MRICHHAKATIKAM</i>)
3396	Sheetal Kapoor	D/o M.L. Kapoor	Languages/ English	FROM DEIFICATION TO COMMODIFICATION: WOMEN ON THE HINDI CELLULOID (WITH REFERENCE TO <i>MOTHER INDIA</i> , <i>ARTH</i> AND <i>FASHION</i>)

3397	Suman Lata	D/o Sat Parkash	Education/ Education	EFFECT OF ONLINE MASTERY LEARNING ON LIFE SKILLS IN RELATION TO SELF REGULATION AND SELF ESTEEM
3398	Kamaljeet Kaur	D/o Amar Nath	Education/ Education	PARENTAL CONTROL ON INTERNET USAGE OF ADOLESCENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR PSYCHOLOGICAL HARDINESS AND PEER RELATIONSHIPS
3399	Arun Bansal	S/o Gurbarn Singh	Education/ Education	EFFECTIVENESS OF SELF-DESIGNED LESSON PLANS IN COMPUTER SCIENCE AT SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL
3400	Savita Sindhu	D/o Bharat Singh Sindhu	Bus. Mgt. & Comm.	CORPORATE CYBER REPORTING PRACTICES: A STUDY OF SELECT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL COMPANIES
3401	Priyanka	D/o Shri Niwas Garg	Bus. Mgt. & Comm.	SUSTAINABILITY REPORTING PRACTICES - A STUDY OF SELECTED COMPANIES IN INDIA
3402	Chhanda Charan Danta	S/o Bipin Bihari Danta	Pharmaceutical Sciences	SYNTHESIS AND STUDY OF PIPERAZINE DERIVATIVES AS POTENTIAL COGNITION ENHANCERS
3403	Ritula Thakur	D/o Yash Pal Singh Thakur	Engg. & Tech.	DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF A MICROCONTROLLER BASED MOISTURE CONTENT MEASURING DEVICE FOR CEREAL GRAINS USING THEIR ELECTRICAL PROPERTIES
3404	Avanee Khatri	D/o Pankaj Khatri	Science/ Anthropology	ANTHROPOLOGICAL DISCOURSE ON TECHNOLOGY: EXPLORING SOCIAL REALITIES AND CONSTRUCTION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IN KHANYARA REGION OF DHARAMSHALA, HIMACHAL PRADESH, INDIA
3405	Sukhjait Kaur	D/o Nirmal Singh	Science/ Physics	STUDY OF FRAGMENTATION AND ASSOCIATED PHENOMENA IN NEUTRON-RICH HEAVY-ION COLLISIONS
3406	Pratibha Bansal	D/o Subhash Bansal	Science/ Chemistry	FABRICATION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF METAL OXIDE/SULFIDE NANOPARTICLES FOR CATALYTIC AND OTHER POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS

3407	Gargi Singh	D/o Tejpal Singh	Science/ Botany	TAXONOMIC STUDIES ON CORTICOLOUS FUNGI OF TREES OF UNION TERRITORY OF CHANDIGARH AND ADJOINING AREAS
3408	Arvind Kumar	S/o Prittam Chand	Science/ Botany	IMPACT OF CELL-PHONE ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELD (EMF) RADIATIONS ON THE PLANT GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT
3409	Aabhishek	S/o Gulab Singh	Science / Envi. Science	STUDIES ON PHOTOCATALYTIC DEGRADATION OF MONOCROTOPHOS AND QUINALPHOS IN SURFACE WATER USING SUSPENDED AND IMMOBILIZED TIO ₂
3410	Gurjinder Singh	S/o Piara Singh	Science / Maths	ON SOME NUMERICAL METHODS FOR SOLVING INITIAL VALUE PROBLEMS OF ORDINARY DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS
3411	Gurjeet Kaur	D/o Baldev Singh	Science/ Public Health	PREVALENCE, PATTERN AND DETERMINANTS OF EXCESSIVE DAYTIME SLEEPINESS AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS OF CHANDIGARH
3412	Meenakshi Madaan	D/o Raj Krishan Madaan	Arts / Public Admn.	GOVERNANCE REFORMS IN PUNJAB: A STUDY OF REFORM THRUSTS, IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES
3413	Asghar Osatieraghi	S/o Gholamabbas	Arts / Economics	EFFECTIVENESS OF EXPECTATIONS CHANNEL OF MONETARY POLICY TRANSMISSION MECHANISM IN INDIA
3414	Harbans Singh	S/o Kapoor Singh	Arts/ Geography	TERRITORIAL ORGANISATION OF ADMINISTRATION IN PUNJAB BY PUBLIC, PRIVATE AND NON-GOVERNMENT AGENCIES. A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS
3415	Ingudam Yaipharemba Singh	S/o Ingudam Surendro Singh	Arts / Defence & Strategic Studies	AN ANALYTICAL STUDY OF DISPUTES IN SOUTH CHINA SEA AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIA
3416	Aakash Deep Sharma	S/o Yoginder Sharma	Arts/ Police Admn.	TRAINING OF NON-GAZETTED POLICE OFFICERS AT PUNJAB POLICE ACADEMY, PHILLAUR: A STUDY

3417	Promila Kanwar	D/o Surinder Singh Kanwar	Arts/ Public Admn.	WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT THROUGH URBAN LOCAL BODIES: A CASE STUDY OF MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, SHIMLA
3418	Jagpreet	S/o Harbans Singh Sidhu	Engg. & Tech.	DESIGN AND SIMULATION OF INTEROPERABLE TRUST MODEL FOR DETERMINING THE TRUSTWORTHINESS OF SERVICE PROVIDERS IN CLOUD ENVIRONMENT
3419	Parmvir Singh	S/o Gurpreet Singh	Education/ Education	ACHIEVEMENT IN MATHEMATICS AMONG SCHEDULED CASTE STUDENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR MATHEMATICAL ANXIETY, CREATIVITY AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS MATHEMATICS
3420	Japneet Kaur	D/o Rajinder Singh	Business Mgt. & Comm.	INFLUENCE OF ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND INTERNAL MARKETING ON COMMITMENT: AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF SELECT FINANCIAL SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.8.2015 (Para 28) has resolved that, in order to avoid delay, the power to approve the award of Ph.D. degrees, be delegated to the Controller of Examinations, and if need be, the information be given to the Syndicate.

(xxx) To note the letter dated 18.07.2016 (**Appendix-LV**) of Professor Rajesh Gill with regard to pay fixation of Directly Recruited Professor as per UGC Regulations.

At this stage, the members started general discussion.

- (1) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they had reserved seats for border area/s students and there somewhere it has been written that the student concerned must have done 10th and 12th or somewhere either 10th or 12th classes plus five years' study from border areas. However, what Guru Nanak Dev University (GNDU) is following is that either 10th or 12th class plus five years' total education should be from border area. No teacher is happy to go and teach in the border areas. He, therefore, suggested that as followed by GNDU, they should also make eligible those candidates, who have done either 10th class or 12th class plus five years' education from border areas, for reservation under the border area seats. A similar case had come in M.E. (Chemical), but the Dean of University Instruction said that this year, they could not do anything like this because the rules are such. So he is of the considered opinion that this year, what happened is happened, but next year, this should be rectified.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha suggested that it should be done only in the reservation provided for border areas students and not in reservation for rural areas students; otherwise, the candidate would do 12th from a village after doing 10th from Chandigarh.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired then how they would meet the five years' condition.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that they would do the in-between classes, e.g., 1st to 5th or so on from the village and become eligible. Keeping that in mind, they have done this so that only the students belonging to rural areas get advantage. If they want, they should change in border and not in rural.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that in border, they should make either 10th class or 12th class plus five years education from border areas. He handed over papers relating to this to the Registrar on the floor of the House.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that while framing the modalities, they had taken a practical view. He suggested that they should follow the same conditions for reservation of seats for both border and rural areas.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that Dr. Randhawa is giving a right suggestion.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that there are very less schools in border areas.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it is right, they should move forward.

- (2) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in the case of University Institute of Legal Studies, he had a Detailed-Marks-Cards of 15 students, wherein in the paper of Company Law, either the students have been awarded zero mark or five

marks or 10 marks, but in other papers, they have first division. It must be in the knowledge of Controller of Examination. Handing over the documents to the Vice Chancellor, he urged him to examine the issue and get the papers re-evaluated from the external examiner.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the report of this should be placed before the Syndicate.

- (3) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa pointed out that, as per UGC, in eligibility for LL.M. there is no minimum percentage of marks determined. Certain passed out students had brought to his notice that when there is no bar of the UGC, why the University has imposed a condition of minimum percentage of marks.

The Vice Chancellor said that University could always have a condition higher than the UGC.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that when there is an Entrance Test, they should welcome everybody and let them compete.

The Vice Chancellor asked that, what does he propose and what the University is demanding?

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the University is demanding 55% of marks in LL.B. for being eligible to appear in Entrance Test for LL.M. On asking, he suggested that any student, who has LL.B. degree with any percentage of marks, should be made eligible for appearing in Entrance Test for LL.M.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Fine", he (Dr. Randhawa) should give it to him in writing and he would refer the matter to the Board of Studies of Laws, Department.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to examine it because perhaps recently they have put a condition of 60% marks in LL.B. Maybe, last to last year, Late Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath had got that reduced to 55% marks. Even if the Bar Council or the UGC does not stipulate, the Vice Chancellor is right that they could put a higher condition.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could not answer to them off-hand, and he has to go to those people, who gave his the recommendations. So he does not think that the Syndicate should approve such things. Dr. Randhawa has raised a valid point and he would get the same examined from the Board of Studies of the respective departments.

- (4) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in the Department of Laws, admission against the seat of 'Single Girl Child' could not be made because it was challenged in the Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that, off-hand, he could not answer this question. He (Dr. Randhawa) should give him writing, so that he could get the same found out.

- (5) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that lastly there is a word of appreciation, which he would like to share with his colleagues. In fact, he would like to appreciate one of the acts of Professor Manish Sharma, who proved to be very good host when the team of School of Architecture, Jaipur, visited the Campus. If the House agrees, this good gesture on the part of Professor Manish Sharma, Department of Gandhian Studies should be appreciated.

The Vice Chancellor said that though he would write a letter of appreciation to Professor Manish Sharma, they are expected to do all such things.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa remarked that this how the work culture could be enhanced. He still remembers, Professor Shelley Walia once suggested that the student, who was very passionately doing his job, should be appreciated. He has never met nor seen Professor Sharma, and he does not know how he looks.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, he wants to bring in this University a real work culture, but the person should not work on the phone call of anybody. Panjab University people should feel that they are the host.

- (6) Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he has seen a letter in the table agenda, which is from the teachers of Dental College. Tomorrow is the meeting of the Board of Finance and the policy of Dental College teachers is on the agenda, but how would they make the requisite amendments/changes.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter is already with a Syndicate Committee. Right now, the matter before the Board of Finance is to compare the policy with others, etc. When they discussed the matter in the Syndicate, it was observed that there are few people, who could be left out, and they have to make comprehensive plan to cover them, but for a variety of reasons, the comprehensive plan could not be made till today. Hopefully, it would be prepared only with the passage of time. When earlier the matter was placed before the Board of Finance, it was not an issue that the plan should be prepared for all of them. At that time, the only thing which was to be addressed was, that the relevant information should be collected from all Institutes. So that matter could be taken back to the Board of Finance and let them see that the Board of Finance accepts whatever is presented to it, in the light of the information which has been collected. However, the remaining part, is left, that they have to do, on behalf of the Syndicate. They would try to do that and then take it to the Board of Finance again. Right now, this is an interim way to respond to the concerns of these people.

- (7) Shri Raghubir Dyal said that he has been saying to the people of his area for the last 2-3 months that tenders for construction of building of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib and the construction is going to be started soon.

The Vice Chancellor said that he also wants to have the construction commenced, because otherwise, he has not face

to go there. He understands his (Dyal's) anguish, but it is his anguish as well. His last four months have been consumed just by the University's financial crunch. Since his entire attention is somewhere else, he is not able to attend to large number of University matters.

- (8) Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that it should be checked on phone whether interviews for appointment teachers, including guest faculty, at both P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib and P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, have been conducted there or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has told him how to do it and he is following it.

- (9) Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wants to raise a very pertinent question that about 9-10 years a new practice has been started by certain private Colleges, which hold the interviews for appointment of teachers in hotels instead of holding the same in the Colleges. To stop that practice, a conscious decision was taken by the University that the interviews have to be held in the College where the appointment is to be made, but going out of the way, a special concession was given at the instance of D.A.V. College Managing Committee, and it was added "or at the Headquarter of the College Managing Committee. Due to that, the D.A.V. College Managing Committee started holding the interviews at Delhi and earlier also they were holding the interviews at Delhi. The private Colleges, especially rural area Colleges where there is nothing to show, they started requesting the University to allow them to hold the interviews at P.U. Guest House. And all the Colleges started holding the interviews at P.U. Guest House, and subsequently at College Bhavan. Before that when a rush was created in the Guest House, they were allowed to hold the interview at Golden Jubilee Hall. Now, the candidates do not know for where they are giving the interview/s and where they have to join. An unmarried girl came from Baroda for appearing an interview and a message came that a girl is coming to appear in an interview in Panjab University, when he sought the information, he was told that the University is not conducting any interview. Finally it came to be known that some College in Hoshiarpur District was conducting the interview in the University. A letter had gone from here that she is to come to appear in the interview at College Bhavan of Panjab University, Chandigarh. She came to the interview here and returned, but here she came to know that the interview was for a position in a College. She was clearly told as to why she has applied and come here, as they would pay only Rs.8,000/- p.m. and she has to live in a mud house. If somebody does not know where his/her work place would be, would he/she would be able to decide whether the join or not. So his request to him (Vice Chancellor) is that strict instructions be issued that the interview(s) must be held in the same College, where the appointment(s) is/are going to be made. The practical difficulty is where some of the members of the Selection Committee(s) say that the interview should be held only at P.U. Campus.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would try to put only those persons on the Selection Committee, who are ready to go to the College concerned for the interviews.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the members of the Selection Committee must go to the place of the interview, and if they do not want, somebody else should be appointed in their place. The concession which was given to D.A.V. Managing Committee, so far as Panjab University is concerned, Panjab University has no connection with D.A.V. Managing Committee, Delhi. The University has connection only with the Governing bodies of the Colleges, which are affiliated with it. So even the D.A.V. Governing bodies should also be asked to hold the interview in the Colleges premises. They are pained that more than 150 candidates apply for a single post and all of them have to go to Delhi. They have no place to stay and also face several problems. Why the interview could not be held in D.A.V. College, Chandigarh or D.A.V. College, Abohar, and so on? Why a special concession is being given to them. It has come to his notice that a local College of Sector 45, having its Management Office in Sector 36, instead of holding the interview in Sector 45, is holding it in Sector 36.

The Vice Chancellor said that the interview should be held in the premises of the College concerned so that the person must know where he/she is going to work.

Shri Ashok Goyal apprehended that though there would be a lot of pressure on the Vice Chancellor or on the members of the Syndicate/Senate, and they have to resist that.

RESOLVED: That instructions be issued to all the affiliated Colleges to hold the interviews for appointment of teachers/Principal in the premises of the College concerned, so that the person must know where he/she is going to work.

- (10) Shri Raghbir Dyal said that there is centralized counselling for M.C.A. courses being offered at Panjab University Campus and P.U. Regional/Rural Centres, which is usually done at Chandigarh, which is very good. But this facility is not there in Law and there is a lot of mismanagement in the P.U. Regional Centres.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the people of Regional Centres say that there should not be centralized counselling for Law course(s) being offered at P.U. Regional Centres.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that as the teachers of MBA came to P.U. Campus, from next year, there should be centralized counselling for the Law course(s) offered at P.U. Campus and P.U. Regional/Rural Centres. What is going on is that the merit lists are being prepared several times and there is complete chaos.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has a good Dean of University Instruction (DUI). He requested Shri Raghbir Dyal to give in writing and he would mark the same to the DUI for necessary action.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa pointed out that there is centralized counselling for admission to five-year Law.

- (11) Professor Shelley Walia stated that there are people who go for leave without pay during the middle in the session or when the session is in full swing or the semester is in full swing, it becomes very difficult for the administrator to manage guest faculty.

The Vice Chancellor said that people should go on leave without pay during the session only when it is compulsive academic pursuit, i.e., only if they have to do some experiments in sciences for which they have been allocated time in international facilities or they have to go and present some work in conference which in their area is very important, they could go for the same. They could make guidelines as to what are the compulsive academic activities, which are in the interest of the University for which they could be given extraordinary leave, but they cannot take an extraordinary leave for private purposes other than the medical reasons. The IITs have very strict rules for extraordinary leave, while encouraging their faculties to do their obligations, and he would find out whether the same rules apply also in IISER, Mohali because their time tables are very strict as they have to do marking and so on. They have reasonably good guidelines while protecting the interests of their faculty members. Anyhow, he would talk to the Dean of University Instruction and try to generate a consensus.

Professor Shelley Walia intervened to say that last time also, he (Vice Chancellor) had said that he would bring the matter to the Chairpersons meeting. However, he was also thinking that it takes 2-3 months to appoint guest faculty.

- (12) Principal I.S. Sandhu said that several temporary extension of affiliation to Colleges are pending and perhaps, the last date for the admission to various courses with late fee with the permission of the Principal is 31st July. He requested that whichever cases for grant of temporary extension of affiliation to Colleges are pending, the letters to the concerned Colleges should be issued within 2-3 days, so that the Colleges could make admissions.

It was informed that most of the cases of grant of temporary/provisional extension of affiliation to the Colleges have been cleared and letters have been issued. Only 2-3 cases are pending, which would also be cleared soon.

Continuing, Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that he agrees with Shri Ashok Goyal that the Colleges have started holding the interviews at University Guest House/College Bhavan, but somehow they are also responsible for that because majority of the times the University peoples are reluctant to go to the Colleges for the interview.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has enough people in the Colleges who could be sent to the Colleges as member/s of the Selection Committees.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu added that one of the female faculty members has been appointed on the Selection Committee as a Vice Chancellor's nominee, and she is saying that at the moment she could not go to the College. If such problem/s is/are faced in future, the Dean, College Development Council should be authorized to send substitute/s.

The Vice Chancellor said that whether it was the former Dean, College Development Council or the present, whatever decisions they have taken in the interest of the University, he has always ratified those and has never come in their way.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that through him (Vice Chancellor), he would like to point out that there is a feeling in the minds of certain people that there are handful of people in the University, who are regularly going as members of the Selection/Inspection Committees, as Vice Chancellor nominee, as Dean, College Development Council nominee, subject experts, etc. There are another handful of people, who are completely isolated and have never been put on any Committee. He is not trying to pass the blame on anyone, but the system needed to be streamlined, and if need be, a roster should be made for the purpose. He added that even now the things have not changed.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had tried at the time of previous Dean, College Development Council also, and would now also make data so that they could know everything.

Shri Raghbir Dyal remarked that this is for the first time that Shri Ashok Goyal is raising this point.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not that Shri Ashok Goyal is raising this point. The point is that he has not put in the system in place. This University has been running like this from time immemorial, and if they could not rectified the things in the last 25 years or so, how do they expect him to do things in a Jiffy.

- (13) Principal S.S. Sangha said that the teachers, who have been appointed on contract basis against Grant-in-Aid posts, whether their appointments have been approved by the University or not.

It was informed that, earlier, a Committee had looked into this case and a legal opinion was also sought from Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu. If there is any representation with regard to the issue raised by Principal S.S. Sangha, clarification could be sought from Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, wherever the approval letters have been issued for the term of their appointment.

Continuing, Principal S.S. Sangha said that some of such teachers have been enrolled as voters. He added that certain files were sent to his (Vice Chancellor) office on 21st July 2016 and it was assured to the Dean, College Development Council that the files would be cleared from there, and the Dean, College Development Council has got the name/s included in the list of voter/s, but the files were

cleared at 5.00 p.m. Earlier, the files remained pending in the Administrative Block and for five days those remained in the office of the Vice Chancellor. He does not know as to where the lapse is. Since the files came at 5.00 p.m. or thereafter, the names of certain teachers have not been included in the list of voter concerned.

It was informed that the Vice Chancellor came in the morning and he requested him (Vice Chancellor). The files have started coming to him and only 3-4 cases have come back. Before they prepare the final list/s, certain members have got the unrevised list/s and left.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if something got omitted by mistake, they could add it and there is no problem in it.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that when they discussed the issue of advertisement of 1925 aided posts on contract basis, they had at that time also pleaded and suggested that the University should give the panels and also grant approval to the appointments. But what Principal S.S. Sangha has said, he does not know whether he is talking about the appointments made against those 1925 posts or appointments made by the Colleges themselves.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that he is talking about only those appointments, which have been made against 1925 aided posts.

Continuing, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that only 3-4 cases relating technical and professional affiliated Colleges, which come under the grant-in-aid scheme, would there, and the others are all new Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it was also discussed in the last meeting of the Syndicate and earlier two meetings also that those who have been appointed on contract basis under Punjab Government Scheme and are being paid a sum of Rs.21,600/- p.m., which was subsequently reduced to Rs.15,600/- p.m. Despite Syndicate taking another decision, he has been given to understand now that some Committee took the decision that the cases be approved. After that without taking the Syndicate into confidence, they seem to have sent the cases for legal opinion also. Even if they presume for a minute that the cases were approved for three years or for the period for which they have been appointed, could they be considered as whole-time employees working as such, especially when they are not getting full salaries. Whole-time definition is that they are getting full salary. He thought that objection has also been received, and if the same is lying in the Election Cell, they should get the same examined legally by telling full facts and take the decision accordingly. What he has been given to understand is that they did not tell the full facts. So that correction could be made.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if the link it to the salary, then 90% of the affiliated Colleges are not giving full salaries to the teachers. Therefore, they should stick to their decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that they accepted it under duress. He thinks that for all practical purposes, they are appointed against grant-in-aid posts. Actually, there is no provision for appointing somebody against the grant-in-aid post in a non-temporary notion. It is a difficulty of Punjab Government that they have decided to appoint them for a period of three years. In fact, the grant-in-aid posts are regular positions. These people are likely to continue. If they are to be voters, they should be voters.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that 'No', they could not be voters, that is what, he is trying to tell them. If they see the history of the University, they would find that they had been approving the teachers for one/two years, but they had not been considered to become the part of the election. Why because, could anybody elect a representative for a period of four years, when his/her own term is one or two years? He, therefore, requested the Vice Chancellor to get it legally examined from the same Legal Retainer.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Legal Retainer is not going to give them any more wisdom. In fact, the wisdom has to come from them, who understand the system.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he is surprised to hear this from Shri Ashok Goyal. They are not taking this decision today, and in fact, they had taken the decision before filling up these 1925 posts.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever decision should come, that should happen by wisdom and not on legality.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even if they accept that their appointments be approved, would anybody allow them to attend the Refresher/ Orientation courses. Could they be treated at par with the regularly appointed teachers?

The Vice Chancellor said that he is neither a technical nor a legal person. As an academician, he would treat them members of the faculties, and for their academic progression, if he has to take a decision, he would let them go for the Refresher/Orientation courses.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that technically, it could not be done. He added that if any objection has been received, it should be got legally examined; and thereafter, the objection could be overruled.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE-CHANCELLOR