

**PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on **Sunday, 07<sup>th</sup> May 2017** at **10.00 a.m.** in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**PRESENT:**

1. Professor Arun Kumar Grover ... (in the chair)  
Vice Chancellor
2. Dr. Ajay Ranga
3. Dr. Amit Joshi
4. Shri Ashok Goyal
5. Ms. Anu Chatrath
6. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
7. Dr. Amod Gupta
8. Dr. Ameer Sultana
9. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
10. Dr. Baljinder Singh
11. Professor B.S. Ghuman
12. Dr. B.C. Josan
13. Professor Chaman Lal
14. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
15. Dr. Dalip Kumar
16. Professor Dinesh K. Gupta
17. Shri Deepak Kaushik
18. Dr. Emanuel Nahar
19. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
20. Dr. Gurmit Singh
21. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
22. Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi
23. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
24. Dr. Harsh Batra
25. Shri H.S. Dua
26. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
27. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
28. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
29. Dr. Jagdish Chander
30. Shri Jarnail Singh
31. Dr. K.K. Sharma
32. Dr. Keshav Malhotra
33. Professor Manoj K. Sharma
34. Dr. Nisha Bhargava
35. Dr. Neeru Malik
36. Professor Navdeep Goyal
37. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu
38. Shri Naresh Gaur
39. Professor Pam Rajput
40. Shri Parmod Kumar
41. Professor Promila Pathak
42. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
43. Dr. Parveen Goyal
44. Shri Prabhjit Singh
45. Professor Rajat Sandhir
46. Professor Ronki Ram
47. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
48. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
49. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill

50. Professor R.P. Bambah
51. Ms. Surinder Kaur
52. Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma
53. Professor Shelly Walia
54. Shri Sanjay Tandon
55. Shri Sandeep Singh
56. Shri Sandeep Kumar
57. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
58. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
59. Shri V.K. Sibal
60. Shri Varinder Singh
61. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.)                      ...                      (Secretary)  
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Shri Amanpreet Singh
2. Dr. Amar Singh
3. Professor Anita Kaushal
4. Mrs. Aruna Chaudhary, Education Minister, Punjab
5. Capt. Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister
6. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
7. Professor Deepak Pental
8. Dr. Harjodh Singh
9. Justice Harbans Lal
10. Dr. Inderjit Kaur
11. Shri Jitender Yadav, D.H.E., U.T., Chandigarh
12. Smt. Kirron Kher
13. Dr. Mukesh K. Arora
14. Dr. N.R. Sharma
15. Shri Parimal Rai
16. Shri Punam Suri
17. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
18. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
19. Shri Raghbir Dyal
20. Dr. S. S. Sangha
21. Dr. S.K. Sharma
22. Dr. Subhash Sharma
23. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur
24. Shri Satya Pal Jain
25. Shri Sanjeev Bandlish
26. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar
27. Dr. Suresh Chandra Sharma
28. Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab
29. Dr. Tarlochan Singh

**I.** The Vice Chancellor said, “With a deep sense of sorrow, I may inform the members about the said demise of –

- (i) Shri Baldev Kaushal, Engineer-In-Chief (Retd.), father of Shri Sarvesh Kaushal, IAS, Punjab and father-in-law of Principal Anita Kaushal, Fellow, PU and Dean, Fine Arts, on May 5, 2017.
- (ii) Justice Leila Seth, who was the Chair of the Search Committee which recommended my appointment as Vice-Chancellor in the year 2012.

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

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

**II.**

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

- (i) The research carried out by Prof. Harsh Nayyar, Department of Botany, Panjab University with University of Western Australia has been included in the book on 'Excellence in India" by Group of Eight (Go8) leading research intensive universities with high global rankings. This book was released by Australia's Minister for Education and Training, Senator the Hon. Simon Birmingham, Australia on 10<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 at Taj Palace Hotel, New Delhi. Prof. Harsh Nayyar, Chairman, Department of Botany has co-authored a chapter titled, "Australia and India share heat, drought and salinity.
- (ii) Prof. Sukhbir Kaur, Chairperson, Department of Zoology has been elevated to the pivotal position of the President of the 'Indian Society of Parasitology-ISP' by the Society in its General Body Meeting during the 27<sup>th</sup> Annual Congress of the Society (from 25-27 April, 2017) at NIMHANS, Bangalore. Her term on this position is for a period of two years."
- (iii) Dr. Sunil Bansal, alumnus, Assistant Professor of Physics, UIET has been nominated as L2-Convener of a Key Physics Group in the CMS experiment (the same experiment, which discovered the God particle) at CERN, Geneva for 2017-19. This is the second highest position in Physics Coordination and it is probably the first time that a member from an Indian University stands selected for this honour. Dr. Bansal also stands selected as a member of International Conference titled, 'International Workshop on Multiple Partonic Interactions at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC)'
- (iv) Hon'ble Prime Minister of India, in his capacity as ex-officio President of CSIR, has nominated Prof. Arun Kumar Grover as one of the members of the Governing Body of CSIR for a term of three years w.e.f. January 6, 2017 to January 5, 2020. The Governing Body members are also the members of the CSIR Society. The Society was registered in 1942 by Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar. The CSIR Society meeting is Chaired by the Hon'ble **Prime Minister of India as President, CSIR.**
- (v) Justice B.B. Parsoon, a distinguished alumna and Chairperson of PU Governance Reforms Committee has been selected by the Supreme Court to be a member on a committee constituted for reviewing the Rules and Procedures to be followed in High Courts all over India. The committee comprises of 8 members, viz., 4 High court Judges and same number of district Judges.
- (vi) Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, former Fellow, Panjab University has been elected as President of Punjab & Haryana Bar Association for the seventh time.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the felicitations of the Senate be conveyed to:
  - (i) Prof. Harsh Nayyar, Department of Botany, Panjab University whose research with University of Western Australia has been included in the book on 'Excellence in India" by Group of Eight (Go8);
  - (ii) Prof. Sukhbir Kaur, Chairperson, Department of Zoology on having been elevated to the pivotal position of the President of the 'Indian Society of Parasitology-ISP' for a period of two years;
  - (iii) Dr. Sunil Bansal, Assistant Professor of Physics, UIET on having been nominated as L2-Convener of a Key Physics Group in the CMS experiment at CERN, Geneva for 2017-19;
  - (iv) Prof. Arun Kumar Grover on having been nominated as one of the members of the Governing Body of CSIR for a term of three years w.e.f. January 6, 2017 to January 5, 2020 by the Hon'ble Prime Minister of India, in his capacity as ex-officio President of CSIR;
  - (v) Justice B.B. Parsoon, a distinguished alumna and Chairperson of PU Governance Reforms Committee on having been selected by the Supreme Court to be a member on a committee constituted for reviewing the Rules and Procedures to be followed in High Courts all over India;
  - (vi) Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, former Fellow, Panjab University on having been elected as President of Punjab & Haryana Bar Association for the seventh time.

### **III. Item on the agenda was read out, viz. –**

To discuss the issue of additional grant pursuant to submission/reply of the Panjab University filed in the Hon'ble High Court and Supreme Court in SLP No. 7202 of 2017. A copy of the replies are enclosed. The case would get listed in the High Court on 4.5.20017 i.e. after the hearing by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 24/27.4.2017.

The Vice Chancellor welcomed all the members to this second special meeting of the Senate. Since, the Courts started to attend to the Financial concerns of the Panjab University, he recalled for all of them that the first such meeting happened on 16<sup>th</sup> March and this was in the background the fact that the UGC has filed a Special Leave Petition in the Supreme Court against the order of the High Court. The SLP has been titled UGC Vs. P.U. and it has Panjab University, MHRD, Punjab Government, Bodies as respondents. The SLP hearing was scheduled on March 10 and the next hearing in High Court was due on 15<sup>th</sup> of March. An obstacle has come in the sustenance of the Panjab University because the court had ordered UGC for release of 30.5 crores in order to sustain PU during the previous financial year and the UGC's SLP was essentially against that order. And that order was pronounced by the High Court by the 19<sup>th</sup> of January in order that indiscrimination against the Panjab University could be handled vis-a-vis all other institutions supported by the Central Government, who are being sustained by the Central Government through the same budget by the UGC. The Court gets convinced that they should get the same consideration. And it was such an order which was challenged in the SLP. As they all are aware that the MHRD has bailed them out and they received instead of Rs.30.5

crores, received Rs.21.73 crores and that meant that their budget for the year 2016-17 would be balanced, so that they could meet their all commitments for the year 2016-17. Even though, their commitments for the previous two years had not been met, but at least that got met. So, they moved on, the SLP was not heard on 10<sup>th</sup> March. The SLP was finally heard on 10<sup>th</sup> of April and High Court considered the matter again on 17<sup>th</sup> of April. So, when the High Court met on 17<sup>th</sup> of April, then the MHRD had asked two weeks time to attend to their concerns. So, on 20<sup>th</sup> of April, the MHRD had ordered that a meeting be convened in which the UGC and Panjab University were to sit together. On this 20<sup>th</sup> of April itself, the UGC convened the meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> April itself the notice for this second special meeting of Senate was also issued. Thereafter, Supreme Court was to meet on 24<sup>th</sup> of April and Syndicate meeting was to happen on 30<sup>th</sup> of April. So, the purpose of today's meeting, as was said on 20<sup>th</sup> April when the notice was issued, was to discuss the issue of additional grant pursuant to the submission of replies of the Panjab University filed in the Hon'ble High Court and Supreme Court. Copies of replies filed by PU were sent to all the members as a part of the agenda papers. On that day, they knew that the High Court was to meet on 4<sup>th</sup> of May. But, the Supreme Court actually met earlier on 1<sup>st</sup> of May, and then the Supreme Court met again on 5<sup>th</sup> of May. So, today's meeting happens in the background of all these things. Ever since the first presentation was made by the Vice Chancellor, P.U. in the High Court on 20<sup>th</sup> of October, 2016, numerous pronouncements have come either from the High Court or Supreme Court. So, in order to facilitate the deliberations in today's meeting, these 15 pronouncements were e.mailed to all the members. Also, two paras were e.mailed, which pertains to March 26, of the regular meeting of the Senate in which the recommendations of the Board of Finance were passed and also the fee enhancement was passed, which was to enhance the internal income of the University. So, whatever they passed on 26<sup>th</sup> of March, was based on the deliberations that have happened ever since they started to take cognizance of situation. There have been meetings between the MHRD, UGC and Panjab University one on 15<sup>th</sup> of December, as a pursuant of things in December, certain inputs were provided in January as well as certain inputs were provided in March, copies of all those were also made available, they were asked to give projections on the income as well as their budget requirement over five years. All those have been submitted. Central Govt. had certain stipulation relating to teaching, non-teaching employees. These stipulations are nothing new. These stipulations on manpower have been there, ever since the Central Government came up with the agenda of opening newer Central Universities. They know, earlier there were five-six IITs, at the beginning of this 21<sup>st</sup> Century, it was envisaged that every State will have an IIT, almost every state would have an Institute equivalent to AIIMS or PGI and then every State would have a Central University. So, in all this background, certain stipulations have been made for teaching to non-teaching ratio. Even though, the earlier Institutions did not have these numbers, but you know, Central norms are the Central norms. So, if the Govt. of India desires to enforce those things on all centrally funded Institutions, so, these things are not new, these things were there even when the Central Government came forward to take a larger responsibility on behalf of the Panjab University. The Centre assumed larger responsibility after a certain review, some seven-eight-nine years ago, even at that time the Centre was conscious of teaching to non-teaching ratio, they were also aware of the directions of Central Government, so these things are nothing new. But, they know, when they choose to enforce certain things and with what degree of toughness, these are the only newer things, which have happened in the recent times. So they are meeting today in the background of all these things. He is conscious that too much of information has been downloaded to them, which is not that easy to quickly comprehend, so he has everything uploaded with, for instance, he has uploaded the resolved part, whatever they did on 16.3.2017. Let him skip this for a moment. Let him move on, to give them a very brief executive summary, going back to 1976 when this notion of 60:40 for the first time was put up. Let him read it for them. Then, he asked, whether this was given to all, he has got the copies done, he asked the office staff to distribute it. A lot of things have been done in a hurry, but this was made only by last evening, which is on the table. If not there, they could have another copy. Let him read it out for them, they are all aware of this thing, this is just a very quick summary, so that they are brought to a common level of information. He read out the following information:

“An update for Senate meeting (07.05.2017)

1. Central Government and Panjab Government had been enjoined to meet the annual maintenance deficit of Panjab University since the year 1976 in the ratio of 60:40. The Central Government met the deficit through the budget allocated to the U.T. Chandigarh by Union Home Ministry. In the year 2010, this route was changed from Chandigarh Home Ministry to UGC/MHRD.
2. In the year 2000-2001, the maintenance of Panjab University was about 48 crores and the share of Punjab Government in it was about 19 crores, whereas Punjab Government restricted its contribution to 16 crores. It slowly rose thereafter and after few years Punjab Govt. capped its contribution to 20 crores. The rest of the maintenance was met by the Central Govt., either via Chandigarh UT OR UGC/MHRD UP TO THE YEAR 2013-14.
3. From the year 2014-15, the central Government contribution to the maintenance deficit of Panjab University was capped at 176 crores by UGC without assigning any reason.
4. The budget head from which UGC allocated fund to Panjab University includes several other academic institutions of diverse character. The grants given to all such institutions were not capped while the Panjab University was discriminated against. The funds allocated by MHRD to UGC in the above mentioned budget head, enhanced from 1758 crores in 2014-15 to 2442 crores in 2016-17 whereas the grant released to Panjab University remained frozen at 176 crores. Specifically, in the year 2016-17, when all other institutions supported by UGC received 15 per cent enhancement over their previous year expenses of salary, Panjab University was discriminated against and denied this enhanced contribution by the UGC during the Commission meeting held on 15.11.2016. This is after the High Court had started to take cognizance and on 7<sup>th</sup> November, the High Court said that Punjab and MHRD must submit to the High Court as to what their proposals are for the enhancement in their contribution to Panjab University.
5. The capping of the contribution by Central Government left uncovered deficit of about 16 crores in 2014-15 and about 30 crores in 2015-2016. The revised estimates of maintenance deficit from the previous desired from Central Govt. for the year 2016-17, along with the uncovered deficit from the previous 2 years (i.e. 2014-15 and 2015-16), was such that accumulated deficit amounted to about 3 months' salary budget for year 2016-2017. The sustenance of the University was thus threatened.
6. The Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana *suo moto* intervened on September 8, 2016 and the Vice-Chancellor was asked to make submission on October 20, 2016, which the Vice-Chancellor complied. The MHRD/UGC and Punjab Government were asked to seek instructions for enhancements in their respective contributions to PU by the High Court on 7.11.2016.
7. On 19.12. 2016, the Hon'ble High Court once again enjoined the Counsels of Punjab Government and Central Government to submit their respective plans enhancement in their annual contributions towards the sustenance of the Panjab University.

8. On 19.1.2017, the Hon'ble High Court directed UGC to release additional grant of Rs.30.5 crores in 2016-17, which was 15 per cent more than the utilization certificate submitted by Panjab University for the year 2015-16. Every institution submitted the utilization certificate. Panjab University also submitted the utilization certificate. Everyone has got 15% increase on their salary, but Panjab University did not receive. It was just to end the discrimination and noting that the document submitted by MHRD, they had still Rs.300 crores left and they asked that this money be released.
9. The figure of 15 per cent as chosen, as this was the enhancement allocated to all the institutions which were in the same budget head of UGC from which the grants were released by the UGC. This would have ended the discrimination against Panjab University.
10. UGC did not comply to the directive of the Hon'ble High Court within the stipulated period of one month and chose to file SLP on 21.2.2017. However, MHRD intervened to get released additional 21.73 crores for PU to balance the budget for 2016-17. PU thus received 197.73 crores in 2016-17.
11. During the meeting held on 26.4.2017, UGC and MHRD reiterated to Panjab University to conform to ratio of 1:1.1 as regards the teaching to non-teaching employees as in centrally supported institutions. Such a ratio, however, does not stand strictly insisted upon in almost all other central institutions which are comparable in size and stature to Panjab University.
12. Due to interventions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP, MHRD/UGC have released 20 crores to PU on adhoc basis to ease the immediate difficulty of PU. The additional Solicitor General of India, the Counsel of UGC, has assured the Hon'ble Supreme Court that the concerns of PU are receiving the attention of Govt. of India. He sought time up to July 4,2017 from the Hon'ble Supreme Court, so that UGC and MHRD can attend to the long term financial concerns of PU.
13. The Finance Minister of Punjab had been met on 25.04.2017 and he had assured help. The High Court has asked Punjab Counsel to respond by 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2017 on the plans for enhancement of Punjab Govt.'s contribution to PU.

So, this is a brief summary, which updates you. The next hearing in the High Court is on 15<sup>th</sup> of May, when the Punjab is supposed to tell what they would do and the next hearing in the Supreme Court is on 4<sup>th</sup> of July when the MHRD and UGC are to respond to the needs of the Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor further said that let him read a note to all of them, which he has received.

“When the tuition fee of the Panjab University students was enhanced, it was also decided that no student at Panjab University is denied education due to enhancement of fee. Some concessions were also pronounced on that day while

enhancing the fee. But after careful examination of the fee proposals and concessions and discussions with different student organizations, there is a view that few modifications are required and the following suggestions deserve consideration:

- All the students, whose family income is less than 1 lakh annually, should be exempted from any fee hike.
- For those students, whose family income is upto 3 lakhs, we had earlier said 3.25 lakh, they could be charged a fees as that of continuing students of that course that the fee hike is for the new people, but they are the continuing students. Whatever is the fee a continuing student is to pay upto 3 lakh, they should pay only the same.
- The Honours school students who are graduating from B.Sc. Honours to M.Sc. Honours, Honours school is considered a continuing course, should be considered as continuing student, you go from B.Sc. Honours to M.Sc. Honours first year, you are a continuing student. Similarly, any student of any graduate course, you have done a B.A. economics, you want to do M.A. in Political Science that is also to be considered a continuing course.
- The students, whose family income lies in the bracket of 3 to 5.75 lakh, we had said 2.50 to 5.00 laks, the proposal is 3.00 to 7.50 lakh could be given an exemption equivalent to 50% of enhancement fee.
- They go further, they said that those students, whose family income is in the bracket 7.50 lakh to 10.00 lakh could be given an exemption equivalent to 25% of enhancement fee (25% concession).
- Fee for all undergraduate engineering courses should be the same as that in UIET.

Besides that, the following possibilities could be explored for the students:

- Some senior students can be asked to take upto six hours of teaching assistance duty per week and in lieu of that their tuition fee can be exempted. This will help the University for better student teacher interaction.
- It is required that the library hours be enhanced in every department. Interested students can be assigned duties in the Libraries in lieu of some incentives which can be provided in the form of exemption from tuition fee or half exemption whatever the person wants to.
- Each department can be asked to prepare a list of those students who are interested in taking tuition work and their list can be uploaded on the University's website.
- In view of numerous information asked by MIS Cell and the Central Agencies, students can be offered part-time data entry operator's job in every department. This job right now is not getting done efficiently on behalf of the University.
- Students can be incentivized for providing assistance in keeping updating the web pages, keeping the recognized data updated, assisting in the placement campaigns etc. etc. and they can be helped.



- Students can provide help in research projects obtained by Faculty members. Some consideration can be given to those.
- Students are already manning the help desk of Dean Students Welfare office for the admission. The same can be extended in all departments. Every department should have an help-desk, which is met all through the year.
- Proper skill training sessions can be organized throughout the year to provide some training. You ask people to do job, but they are not skilled, but they can be trained.

The above steps can be considered by the Governing Bodies of the Panjab University for the welfare of the Students.

So, these are the inputs that he has put before them and now they could discuss the matter. They all know that the High Court is meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> of May and the Punjab has to provide an input and the Central Government has sought time upto 4<sup>th</sup> of July to respond. But in the meanwhile enough assurance has been given that the directive of MHRD to the UGC that one quarter of the grant to them should be released. As the UGC will get their one quarter, UGC, as of now has got only 200 crores out of 2400 crores that they were given last year. So they have received 10%, they have passed 10% to the University out of their 10%, 10 crores. So as more installments would get released the UGC counsel assured the Supreme Court orally that Panjab University's needs would be taken care and if they do not get taken care, Justice Sikri said that summer bench of the Supreme Court is always open, if they feel that they need some certain relief, they could always approach. The UGC counsel assured that such an eventuality would not arise. So, they are hopeful of survival through the summer months. In July the admission would commence and they should start receiving their part of the internal income. Their part of internal income physically comes in the Month of July and later on in the Month of January and the examinations fees come to them in the first week of November and again by first week of March. So, this summary is the position. He added that he did suggest at the last hearing of High Court that Panjab University must take steps to create a Reserve fund for itself, that reserve fund should remain a reserve fund available for every year. They must have a reserve fund as difficulties would arise, so he asked that if the Court could give a directive to Punjab Government to give 40 cores rupees towards a reserve fund as one time donation and the Central Government gives another 60 crores. Towards the reserve fund and the University takes steps to generate from the Alumni, from the teachers from wherever also, 10 crores towards the reserve fund every year so that the reserve fund can be continuously enhanced every year. They should issue appeals and according to him if the University has to sustain itself in a healthy manner, they must build up a reserve fund of the order of 500 crores. This is the kind of reserve fund which the Pune University has, so if one University in India has done this for its sustenance, he sees no reason as to why they cannot think of doing. Campaign for a decade, create reserve fund for the Panjab University to the tune of Rs. 500 crores. Right now, they are a stagnant Institution; they should not be a stagnant Institution. If they are to retain our autonomy to do something new, if for everything they are to go and seek approval from the Punjab Government or the Central Government, then the basic structure of this University basic governance structure of the University is compromised, if they are to retain value of this House in deciding newer things independently, like and what they say blue sky's research, if they are to retain the freedom of blue sky's thought for the progress of this University, they need to create a reserved fund and for that reserve fund, they could appeal to citizens of the city, Punjabi Diaspora all across the world, all kinds of other people who remain connected to the University, so many people are connected to the University, their alumni, people they have honoured with *honoris causa* degrees, people to whom they have made Honorary Professors, so that they

could take the help of well wishers of this University spread all across the globe to generate 500 crores reserve fund. So, they had drafted a vision-2020 document, they could make a vision-2025 document to see that they create a reserve fund of Rs.500 crores so that they can sustain the University.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they should concentrate on the current agenda and discuss the incident that had happened.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that to allow him to finish, as he is nearly concluding. So, this is what he had to say. Now, the issues are open before them, they can raise their hands, one by one he (Vice-Chancellor) will note down the names.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he kept his patience, his only request to the Vice-Chancellor is to please have the patience to listen to others also.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said, yes that is why the meeting has been convened.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he did not know why the meeting has been convened, he was waiting for the Vice-Chancellor to come out with one line to explain as to what for the meeting has been convened because the agenda says that special meeting of the Senate will be held to discuss the issue of additional grant, now the agenda is only additional grant. It has happened for the first time in the history of the Panjab University that any agenda has come only for discussion, not for consideration, not for ratification, not for information. But, he thought that the Vice Chancellor would come out with some details on the basis of which, the discussion on the basis of which took place in the Syndicate, who fixed the meeting of the Senate to be held on 7<sup>th</sup> that may be some light may be thrown, but from the explanation given by the Vice Chancellor he came to know that again this meeting has been convened illegally without any jurisdiction by the Vice Chancellor because he is sure that keeping in view the unprecedented situation which is faced by the University, specially the ugly incident of 11<sup>th</sup> April, which for centuries to come they will have to explain what are the reasons as to how did they fail to control the situation, because had the issue gone to the Syndicate, as per the mandate of the Calendar, the Syndicate would have taken the decision in its wisdom that instead of discussing only additional grant, let them discuss the burning issue of the students' protest, the burning issue of the violence, which took place on 11<sup>th</sup> April, the excesses, which have been committed by the Police or the University authorities against the students. But, now after the Vice Chancellor has given the explanation he has come to know that this issue has never been taken to the Syndicate as far as fixing the meeting of the Senate is concerned. In the last meeting also, he had raised that there was no requisition of 15 Members of the Senate for special meeting, no requisition given by the Vice Chancellor also to the Syndicate and some of his very respected learned senior colleagues said that since it was discussed in the meeting, the date has been fixed by the Syndicate, let it be taken that all those 15 Members of Syndicate, who are also Members of the Senate it should be considered that it was requisition by the Members of the Senate and of course, he immediately surrendered. But, that means, if the law is enforceable on the students, and the teachers of the University and the non-teachers of the University, if the law is enforceable on the Members of the Senate of the University, he is hundred percent sure that none of his senior colleagues can say that the Vice Chancellor and Chancellor is exempted from the Law, the law is enforceable on the Vice Chancellor also. He remembered, about two and half decades ago, the Chancellor of this University, wanted a special meeting of Senate to be convened, the then Chancellor wrote to the Registrar of the Panjab University that a special meeting of the Senate be convened. The request of the Chancellor was placed before the Syndicate, who fixed the meeting of the Senate. But, here in spite of the fact that it was not brought to the notice of the Vice Chancellor and of all the Members of the Senate not once, but for time and again, the Vice Chancellor, who was talking about the value of the bodies like Senate has completely undermined the authority and value of the Bodies like Senate and Syndicate in whose jurisdiction it is to fix the date for the meeting of the Senate. Now, as one of his

friends wanted to raise the issue, he thought after reading the news in the media that the University authorities are inclined to convene a special meeting the Senate at the demand of the Students or at the demand of so many responsible Members of the Senate, who have been requesting in writing as well verbally to the Vice Chancellor that call a special meeting of the Senate, after all these students are part and parcel of the University. Instead of doing that, they started giving justifications that this fee hike is not applicable on the present set of students, it is applicable on the future entrants, as the Senate of Panjab University is not answerable to the future entrants and they are answerable only to present students. Let them not forget they are answerable to society at large, who has sent them here as their representative to take care of the University's interest, the students' interest, of all stakeholders' interests, keeping in view the democratic norms under which the Panjab University is functioning. But, he is very sorry to say that Vice Chancellor has given a complete go-bye to the Regulations, to the Statute of the University. In the light of the Regulations, if this meeting is illegally convened, does it not amount to a meeting of Senate onus of which rests with the Syndicate for calling meeting. He would like to be guided by those senior colleagues, who have told him that time that ultimately let them come to the conclusion that the date for the special Senate meeting, the then special meeting was fixed by the Syndicate. He would like to be guided by them now, please let him know whether the meeting has been fixed by the Syndicate. Whether this issue has ever been discussed in the Syndicate? Why the Vice Chancellor's attention has not gone to the strongest possible protest, which has been staged by the students, which in fact has caused lot of criticism from the Society at large, not only from Chandigarh, not only from Punjab, not only from India, the world over, the eyes are set on the Panjab University and in spite of the fact that they know that in a special meeting nothing can be discussed beyond what the agenda is and he does not know who has put up a note to the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor, who said in the last meeting, that nothing beyond the agenda can be discussed. He remembered that Dr. Gurmeet Singh wanted to raise a very pertinent point in that meeting, he was stopped that in a special nothing beyond the agenda can be discussed. But, here the Vice Chancellor has now brought a note also, which is not on the agenda for consideration of the Syndicate. Instead of looking into the possibility of calling a special meeting to discuss the unrest amongst the students and take appropriate decisions to ensure that students are also made to feel as they are also part and parcel of us. Instead of giving the message, which the Panjab University authorities has been sending to the Members of the Senate that let them not be swayed away, let them not succumb to any pressure of the students, let them remain united as if there is a war between the students and the University authorities. As a Member of the Senate at least he expected that he (Vice-Chancellor) being senior-most, the Chief Executive Officer, the head of the family of which the students are the junior-most members, the Vice Chancellor should have taken the issue seriously. The Students did try to convince the Vice Chancellor to convene a special meeting of the Senate on this issue. The Vice Chancellor said that he could not call the special meeting of the Senate, if they want the special meeting to be held they must go to the Senators, and get the requisition by 15 Members then they can call the special meeting. The students went from door to door only for signatures. And thereafter the Vice Chancellor assured, which was reported in the media also that the Vice Chancellor gave an indication that a special meeting will be called, which satisfied the students. But, now the special meeting, which has been called, does not refer anything about the unrest amongst the students, anything about the decision, which was taken by the Senate in the last meeting about fee hike and nothing is discussed that how to address the grievances of the students. He would like, before proceeding further, to know that under what circumstances, this meeting has been convened by bye-passing all the Regulations and Statute of the Panjab University.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said, Sir that he wanted to raise three points.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, before proceeding, he needs the response.

Dr. Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice-Chancellor should tell whether the meeting is legal or illegal.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that he is conducting the meeting, he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) should not speak without seeking his permission.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is the value of the House. He (Vice-Chancellor) is not interested about replying to a particular person about the validity of the meeting.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that he wanted to say about three points. Number-1, for all the cases he would go in detail, in the time you allow, all the cases should be withdrawn and University should write directly. Number-2, fee concession the views of the Vice-Chancellor are right, but he proposed that fee hike can be across the board at par what enhancement the University has been asking for i.e. 10% fee hike across the board, because the fee hike as per slab system looks good in hearing, but it would difficult to implement it in practical, which needs to be considered. And thirdly, the long term solution, which the Supreme Court has asked, High Court has said that they would not pass any order because the matter is in Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has asked them that in one and half months all the three parties should see what is the long term solution, for which he had given a proposal and he is thankful to the Vice-Chancellor that a Committee has been constituted. One meeting of the Committee has already been held, they prepared a note for circulation, which has not been brought today, some people have objection on the word. His third proposal is that Panjab University be declared an Institution of National importance fully funded by Central Government with its present governing and administrative structure. He is placing these three proposals before them, according to him, the people who had objection would not object to it. He said that it was discussed in the meeting, Dr. Jarnail Singh ji is the Chairman of the Committee, the note which has been prepared by them should be circulated to all within two days and he has got the note photo-copied at his own cost.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Keshav Malhotra objected to this by saying, 'Sir, you are allowing him'.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh, while continuing, said that the incident happened was quite unfortunate and lot of innocent children have got hurt and law of our country says that "*Sau Gunahgaar Chhoot Jaye, Par ek Nirdosh ko Saja Nahi milni chahiye*". Therefore, he requested the Vice-Chancellor and nine to ten members have given it in writing that where there is solid evidence, they do not take disciplinary action. But, due to police cases, the exams are on the cards and they have lot of mental tension when they go for walk, children are sleeping in this hot weather, the Vice-Chancellor must have also seen this, they must send a message, children are sitting and are raising slogans outside, tell them about any technicality in the matter, they are sitting here, they must send a message, the Vice-Chancellor has already said that the University is writing for withdrawal. But, as per his information, he asked the DSW, no such letter has been written so far. There should be no delay in this, not even for a day. Before leaving this House today, they should write a letter to the Police, however, the cases would be dropped in the Court. But, they are the complainant and they withdraw the complaint. His second proposal is about fee hike. This perception made of fee hike makes a big difference, there is 400% increase. In the last meeting he had said that he has been teaching in the Hindi department for the last ten years of his job, every year if they take an intake of 70 students per year, the perception they have made that students come in SUV/cars, But, he could guarantee you that in his department, none of 700 students has a car. He has not seen car with any of the students. The cars are with only 10% students, as they are proposing slab upto 10 lacs, but it would create complications. He has come to know that in the entrance test the number of applicants have dropped. By doing this, overall increase would not be much, as he is suggesting and earlier the Vice-

Chancellor has already done it by increasing it by 5%. It is not so that fee has not been increased earlier. The University can also make an increase for every year for the next four years.

Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu enquired as to whether this is an agenda item or zero hour.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that this point is more important than zero hour. Students are sitting outside, if they go into rule/law, it will not give a good message to students. If they say that this meeting is illegal or whether this point is for zero hour or otherwise, it means that they leave today without doing anything they should not do anything today and call another meeting. If they fix it into any technicality, they would not be able to give any relief to students. As said by Dr. Dalip Kumar, that today they must ensure that every student sitting on road in 40° temperature should leave the place.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked the Vice Chancellor, why he has been allowing anybody to speak anything.

To this, Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that he is not speaking anything. He is speaking about welfare of the students.

At this, Professor Keshav Malhotra asked whether he is talking against the students or talking about welfare of the University.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that he just wanted to say that, first of all, in fact he was of the view that today first of all, that even before his (Professor Keshav Malhotra) statement, he should stand, some of the Members discussed this but then he thought that let him (Professor Keshav Malhotra) speak first, as five minute would not make much delay, but, delay of even a minute is wrong. The House should take a decision first of all, then they will go into technical reasons, that they are writing today itself to Chandigarh Administration that the complaint given by the University is being withdrawn, keeping in view the future of the students. Today itself, they should tell the students about fee hike, the Vice-Chancellor as a leader of this House tell them, that they are increasing it 10% across the board. Such a decision would give a right message to the students and they would leave the agitation. And number-3, as the Vice-Chancellor is saying, to make a fund of Rs.100 crores, making this fund is not a permanent solution. They should go out towards the direction of a permanent solution. If some Members have any problem, more so to the Members of Punjab, that there would be some danger to them, they have attached the Act of Allahabad University with the Note.

Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it is not rightly done. As decided in the Syndicate that the decision of the Committee will be placed before the Syndicate first. He (Dr. Gurmeet Singh) is forcefully reaching to people and to the newspapers and he is insulting the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Jarnail Singh (Chairman of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate) to inform the House about the position.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor is not replying. It is a conspiracy. If the issue of the students is to be discussed, the Vice Chancellor should not have called a special meeting, he would have called ordinary meeting of the Senate wherein the issue of fee hike would have been discussed, wherein issue of students' unrest would have been discussed, wherein issue of withdrawal of cases would have been discussed, wherein issue of grants would have been discussed, wherein the future strategy would have also been discussed. But the Vice-Chancellor did not bring the other things to be discussed in the Senate meeting, that is why he has called a special meeting. The Vice-

Chancellor could even call 12 ordinary meetings in a year. There is no such restriction that an ordinary meeting could not be called. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to reply as to how it is a meeting as per Regulations.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to please sit down and requested Shri Jarnail Singh to continue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that otherwise he is going to write to the Government of India that he (Vice-Chancellor) is a habitual offender and willingly and knowingly always violates the Calendar and the law of the land.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, that is why they have reached this situation because the UGC and Ministry of Human Resource Development says that the University violates the Calendar and he (Vice-Chancellor) has created such a situation to which they have now reached and he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) could prove it. The Vice-Chancellor had been told many times to look into the expenditure and he has increased the expenditure from Rs.100 crores to Rs.200-250 crores. But the Vice-Chancellor did not relent and said that he is a die-hard optimist. But he, as a finance person, told the Vice-Chancellor to be a conservative person to which the Vice-Chancellor had said 'no'.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor used to say that how dare the Government of India say no for grant to the Panjab University and he is a die-hard optimist. They could read the statement which had been given in the Senate and every member of the Senate had said not to take such a strong position. The Vice-Chancellor at that time had said that he has fought this in TIFR, went to such and such Ministry, he fought and succeeded and got so much amount and he is going to repeat that experiment in Panjab University. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) wanted to know where is that suggestion now? They told the Vice-Chancellor to read the writing on the wall that let them not face a day when they would not be in a position to pay the salary to the teachers and non-teaching staff and the Vice-Chancellor used to say not to be so pessimistic.

Shri Varinder Singh said that this entire financial crisis is because of mismanagement.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he had pointed out that they did not have the proper scholarship scheme. The fee concession is not being given at the time when the fee is to be deposited at the time of admission. They could see the records of the minutes. But the University administration does not have a human face but today they are trying to show the human face. He had been reminding the Vice-Chancellor who did not care. That is why the current situation has been created.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the resolution proposed by Dr. Gurmeet Singh came up for discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate and the members had divergent views on that resolution. As such a Committee was formed to prepare a concept note which should be sent to the Senate with its recommendations. Dr. Gurmeet Singh has prepared a concept note which the Committee has not allowed. In the meeting of the Committee, it was discussed that the note may be circulated to the Fellows because the meeting of the Senate is likely to be held today so that some suggestions from the Fellows could be got to prepare that concept note. It was not like whatever has been given to him to circulate. They would discuss it in the meeting of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate and refer those things to the Syndicate. This is the factual position.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that whatever has happened during the last 20-25 minutes. In the light of that, he requested the Vice-Chancellor and all the Senate members that leaving aside the technicalities as to how the meeting could be called, how it has been called, everyone who wanted to talk about that, has given his/her views.

Since they have collected here and the expenditure on the meeting has been done and if they wanted to save the money, they should not allow this to go to waste. The Vice-Chancellor has the authority to convert this special meeting into an ordinary meeting. It is just a twisting of words and there is no issue involved in it. With this, all the attendant issues like grant, fee hike students' unrest and other related issues of the University. It would be better if leaving aside all these things, they talk in the interest of the University. He requested the members that they should take this meeting in that way. He again said that as Dr. Gurmeet Singh had said that they should take an initiative to withdraw the cases against the students. Only then, they could move ahead. He is nobody to pass a judgment, but he has a personal feeling that the matter was not handled appropriately. The matter should have been handled properly by whoever was available on the occasion. It usually happens that the students due to some instigation raise slogans. Professor R.P. Bambah has been the Vice-Chancellor and during his tenure he must also have seen it. He (Shri Bansal) had been a student in the University and taking part in the agitations. But at that time, an amicable solution to the problems used to be found out. To keep the sanctity of the University and maintain the relationship between the students and the University authorities including the teachers, first of all they should withdraw the cases. He would like to talk about the fee issue later on. When he was coming to attend the meeting, he saw that the University looked like a cantonment which does not look good for a University. Even if the students today also wanted to protest in the University, they were sitting and raising the slogans or even could enter the Senate Hall which could have been an extreme step, even then there was no issue. The policemen have cordoned the entry of the administrative block from both the sides in such a way that the members could not easily enter the building and that was not called for. That could also have created a somewhat overreaction situation. Therefore, they should make a start. Whatever he has come to know, he might be wrong and he wished he was wrong, that in the first instance the University framed a sedition case against the students. Even the senior officers did not care for it. When there was discussion as to what kind of allegations had been levelled, then mercifully the case was withdrawn vividly. He requested that the case be withdrawn totally and not make the University like a cantonment as they could see the police all around. He requested Shri Ashok Goyal and all others that let they continue with the meeting by converting into an omnibus meeting as all the issues are comprehensive and the collective issue is the same. They should discuss all this and they would be able to do something good.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a very good suggestion made by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal. While objecting to convening of the special meeting, it is he (Shri Ashok Goyal) who had said that ordinary meeting should have been called which Shri Bansal has now given a suggestion that it should be converted into an ordinary meeting. But before converting it into an ordinary meeting, the Vice-Chancellor may take 5-10 minutes to chalk out the agenda for the ordinary meeting also as to what are the issues that they have to discuss and those issues are to be discussed threadbare so that the decision to the satisfaction of all are taken in today's meeting.

Professor R.P. Bambah endorsed whatever Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has said that there is a problem, there is a situation. Instead of getting into unnecessary discussion, they should try to find solution to the situation. According to him, it was decided in a special meeting that the Vice-Chancellor called the other day, the University is going to withdraw the cases. He requested to do it immediately.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the FIR could not be withdrawn and they could only write to the police. They are continuously writing to the police. Shri Satya Pal Jain had clarified that the FIR could not be withdrawn.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa requested the Vice-Chancellor to supply a copy of the FIR. They should not play with the future of the students as they have come to

University to learn and to be part of the society. They should not make the students criminals. He requested the Vice-Chancellor not to make irresponsible statement.

Professor R.P. Bambah requested the Vice-Chancellor to take necessary steps to withdraw the complaint.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor had said that he has already written. For the satisfaction of all, he requested the Vice-Chancellor to supply the copies of all the letters written to the police withdrawing the complaint lodged by the police.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not written and saying that the complaint is being withdrawn.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then what the Vice-Chancellor is doing. Professor R.P. Bambah had specifically asked whether the Vice-Chancellor had written.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was told that the FIR could not be withdrawn.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there are hundreds of cases which are being quashed by the Hon'ble High Court on daily basis whether on merit or on the basis of compromise or on the basis of the withdrawal of the complaint.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that, as suggested by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, let they try to meet in a serious way and they have requested the Vice-Chancellor earlier also and he has agreed that all the cases would be withdrawn. Now whatever steps are required, they should be taken at the earliest.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are taking the necessary steps. The point is that the Committee says that these people are not seriously involved. He is forwarding all such recommendations.

Professor R.P. Bambah requested the Vice-Chancellor to write to the Governor that these are their students and if they have done something, the cases be withdrawn against them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could write this letter.

Shri Varinder Singh requested that the copy of the FIR should be given to the House so that they could come to know the reality.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the University made a complaint of stone pelting against the students which is unfortunate. Since the police has harassed the students, the University should have filed a cross FIR against the police, what steps have been taken in that direction. The police had committed excesses on the students which is evident from the medical reports.

Shri Varinder Singh said that no negotiation with the students was made and no official went to meet the students on the day when this incident happened. The students have also been injured.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice-Chancellor to take a decision on the proposal made by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal. What is he (Vice-Chancellor) doing and should tell whether this special meeting has been converted into an ordinary meeting.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they all want to leave the meeting if they are not heard. When any incident happens, the Vice-Chancellor imposes it on the Senate, it



being the governing body or on the Central Government. Why nobody is ready to listen to them?

Professor Chaman Lal requested that, to settle down the issue and calm down the tempers, they should accept the proposal made by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and seconded by him and Professor R.P. Bambah that this meeting is an ordinary meeting and anything could be discussed in the meeting so that the meeting could be regularized.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is declared as an ordinary meeting which was endorsed by the members.

Professor Chaman Lal said that now everyone could discuss calmly, quietly and patiently.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has made a suggestion that mostly all the members wanted to speak on the students' agitation, fee hike, etc. He requested that the background papers relating to the violence which took place in the campus on 11<sup>th</sup> April, whatever the Vice-Chancellor is having, like the copies of the complaint which have been filed with the police and all other communications as claimed by the Vice-Chancellor which have been sent to the police or the administration, may be distributed amongst the members of the Senate.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that they have to be clear about the legal position. When one makes a complaint to the police to file an FIR, that FIR goes to the Court. The police could send a request that the FIR be quashed. The police could file that the FIR lodged has no basis and it has to go to the Court. The police have no authority to cancel the FIR and the decision lies with the Court, not with the police. The police have to convince the Court on the basis of the investigation made by them. Now, unfortunately what has happened is that the FIR has been filed. Secondly, the FIR could be filed by anybody. If a student feels something unjust, he/she could also file an FIR. There is no restriction on filing of the FIR. It is again the investigating machinery to investigate and submit the report to the Court and the Court has to decide whether the FIR should be cancelled or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this matter has been discussed even with the Governor in the presence of the Home Secretary and the Advisor. The same was also discussed by the Core Committee formed on behalf of the Senate and this Core Committee had a meeting with the students. In that meeting, Shri Satya Pal Jain explained exactly the same thing that once an FIR has been lodged, once the reports are presented, everyone would be exonerated. The Governor had said that nobody would oppose the bail application. It was told in the presence of the Home Secretary that everybody would be bailed out. By that time, one report from the University was already there which was given to the Governor that this many people were not seriously involved. So all such reports mentioning the names of the persons not seriously involved, would be submitted. Now, the suggestion which Professor R.P. Bambah has made is that they would write that all of the students are not seriously involved, so a lenient view will be taken. There is no issue at all. He would write a letter without worrying about whether the Committee has written something about a student or not. They would not wait for the reports of the Committee and they would say that these people are not seriously involved. He would personally go as earlier also he had three meetings with the Governor. He has no hesitation in going and having a fourth meeting with the Governor calling the Home Secretary Shri Anurag Aggarwal along with him. Then a case has to be presented. They would not withhold the roll number of any student on the plea that there is a FIR registered against that student. Nobody is being prevented from writing any examination at all. If the students are being retained, it is only because that the attendance is less than 50% and there is no way. All the concessions which could be

given on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor, Syndicate, Department, for participation in activities, all the concessions were given. If even thereafter the attendance is not up to the mark, then the student has to be detained, otherwise the UGC would accuse the University that they are not following the UGC guidelines. So, no such thing is being done that somebody is being debarred from taking the examination. The only thing that he has not done is what Professor R.P. Bambah is saying that after the meeting is over, he would go to meet the Governor, whether he is available at the residence or not, but he would go and submit the letter. This was welcomed by the members.

Professor R.P. Bambah suggested that in consultation with Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, whatever they may do, the cases should be withdrawn as early as they could.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would consult Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he supported Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal on technical points and that must be recorded in the Senate and they pass unanimously that the Chief of University Security of the University would immediately withdraw the formal complaint which has been lodged against the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the FIR could not be withdrawn.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the complaint could be withdrawn.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he did not want to bring in the name of the Governor in the discussion. But it is a fact that he had met the Governor even before the Vice-Chancellor met the Governor and held discussions and the meeting of the Vice-Chancellor was fixed thereafter. The Governor had spoken to the Home Secretary in his presence and he came back fully assured that immediate steps would be taken for withdrawal of the case as far as the authorities are concerned. As Shri V.K. Sibal has said, it is right that they could not withdraw the case from the Court. They are not talking of the withdrawal of the FIR. They are talking only of the withdrawal of the complaint against the students by the University. He is talking only of that. That would make a beginning. Then the legal course would be followed. The police would examine the case and put up to the Court and the Court would apply its mind. It is quite possible that the Court might not agree with all of them. But, he is sure that when they all are talking about to create a congenial atmosphere, they should not bring in the technicalities. When they are talking about the withdrawal of the cases, it is not keeping in mind the examinations, but it is for the future of those children. There may be somebody against whom a case has been registered and when he/she fights, he/she would clear it because he/she is going to write the examination. But thereafter, if a student wishes to apply for a job, the police verification would come in the way and the student might not get the job. In such a way, some minor things become large. Therefore, they should think over it. He requested, as said by Professor R.P. Bambah and which was accepted by the Vice-Chancellor, that they should take immediate steps and the matter could be solved early. It could be done certainly and nobody would be interested in just prolonging the matter unnecessarily. He has seen the attitude of the Governor and would like to thank him that he is very positive and also wanted that the matter be solved out at the earliest. But somehow, it is about a month that the matter has not been solved. If they had followed the procedure, the matter would have been solved till now. Even they could do it now and it could be told to the students.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the Panjab University complaint has been converted into FIR by the police.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that whatever has been said by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and Professor R.P. Bambah is right as they are more experienced.

He has some experience also for the last few years. About 4 years ago, in such an incident, the FIR was lodged against the students in which the complainant was the police. He has been raising this issue in the Senate and the Syndicate as to what action has been taken in that matter as the case is still going on because the number of students was very less. He did not know as to why there was a delay in this case. The pendency of the cases are very large and it takes about 3-5 years to take a final decision in a case, whatever be the kind of the case. But in the present case, the issue is somewhat different as the complaint has been filed by Panjab University. The Court could ask that the complainant who is a public servant, how could it withdraw the complaint. First of all, the House should pass and issue the instructions to the University to withdraw the complaint keeping in view the interest of the students. Secondly, if they go into the police proceedings, whatever Shri Bansal has said is right, that it would take about 6 months to one year and if by chance a student could not get the job due to this, then the purpose would be defeated. They could consult Shri V.K. Sibal, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and other legal experts that if they file a quashing petition on the basis of withdrawal of the complaint, they could get immediate relief and the decision could be taken in the case within a period of 2-3 months as it happens normally. Otherwise, the cancellation of the FIR could take a time ranging from 6 months to one year as a lot of time is required in the investigation.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that on the basis of the compromise between the parties, the quashing of FIR could be filed in the Court.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that, in this case the complainant is the public servant and the House being the governing body, issues the instruction to the employee to withdraw the complaint which could be placed before the Court.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he has been observing for the last about half an hour the way the meeting of the Senate is going on. Sometimes, it strikes his mind that they are all educated and there seems a question mark on their education. They have been reading in the newspapers about some unruly happenings in the Assemblies for which they blame the persons involved. But they think that when they would be sitting in the company of educated persons, such things would not happen. But here also he feels the same thing, which hurts him. There might be differences of opinion between the Chair and the members. All of them are at least Graduates and above and they should resolve that whenever one wanted to speak, he/she should seek the permission of the Chair. He would also request the Chair, as he had earlier also requested, to grant an opportunity to all the members to put forth their viewpoints. If the members keep on addressing with one another, it would look like a fish market where everyone speaks in his own way. Therefore, they should address the Chair and whatever decision is taken by the Chair, the members should listen and discuss. Regarding the agitation of the students, it has come to knowledge that the students wanted to meet the authorities. At that time, the students wanted to talk to the authorities and there would not have been any agitation. He does not know, but some officers could not meet the students and the students could not express their viewpoint which resulted into this kind of anarchy. It is not good for the University and the students. The incident which happened on that day is not good for all. Then keeping in view the interest of the students, the issue of withdrawing the complaint against them came up for which they all are taking a decision. Whenever a complaint is made, first it is made in the police station. The FIR is not lodged by a person, but a complaint is lodged by a person and on the basis of the complaint, the police registers the FIR. Once an FIR has been registered, then even the police does not have the authority to cancel the FIR. Then, as said by Mrs. Anu Chatrath, on the basis of compromise between the parties, they could approach the Court for cancellation of the FIR. This was also said in one of the meetings. Once the Vice-Chancellor has clarified that he would take all the steps to withdraw this, now this matter should be closed and they should move ahead. Now when all the members agree

including the Vice-Chancellor, they should close the matter and discuss further issues. They should talk with the students, so that their unrest could be put to an end. They should also discuss the demands of the students so that their problems could be solved. Last time when a meeting was held with all the groups of the students, then the ABVP group was not called in the meeting. Those students came to him and said that they were not listened to. He requested that whenever the Vice-Chancellor is calling the students for discussion, he should take care that all the student factions are invited for the talks, so that all the groups are consulted. He again requested that they should resolve to run the Senate meeting in a smooth manner and speak on turn and in a proper way as someone after seeing the recording could say that if the members are not discussing the issues in a proper way, how they could pacify the students.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he would like to speak on the problem in totality. First of all, he appreciated the efforts made by the worthy Vice-Chancellor, Professor Arun Kumar Grover in putting up the financial situation of the University in a very systematic manner, not only putting up, rather pushing up also, not only in the public in general but even in the Courts. He has seen no Vice-Chancellor appearing in the Courts. Professor Grover is appearing personally, apart from the University counsel, in the High Court as well as the Supreme Court. He put on record his appreciation for the Vice-Chancellor. However, the things do not end here, he has to go further. The most important thing which is coming up in creating the crisis in the situation is the UGC which is patronized by MHRD. The Vice-Chancellor himself has told so many times how the UGC has been treating not only the University but even the Vice-Chancellor also. The hierarchical position is that the Chairman, UGC is equal to Vice-Chancellor of any University. It is for the first time in many months that the present Chairman of the UGC has chaired the meeting which was proper. Otherwise for the last one year, the petty officials – Deputy Secretary, Joint Secretary have been insulting Panjab University while the Vice-Chancellor is running around and the petty officials just trying to arm twist. The present crisis of the fee hike has been forced by the UGC on the University, which the Vice-Chancellor otherwise is strongly resisting with the UGC and MHRD. Even all the measures that they are taking, whether it is 12.5% increase or 1100% or 400% increase, the total revenue would be Rs.10 crores. The UGC is talking about Rs.250 crores and trying to settle down to Rs.10 crores and this generation of Rs.10 crores revenue created the incident which happened on 11<sup>th</sup> April. The student problem is directly related to University financial situation and the University financial situation forced the University to go for the fee increase, which was an irrational decision about which many people had cautioned earlier, the dissent was also put on record, but the University did not pay attention. The University did not foresee where it would lead to, whatever happened on 11<sup>th</sup> April was directly because of the irrational fee increase. The UGC is not only arm twisting this University. The UGC presently could be called UDC – Universities Destruction Commission. In 1955, the Government passed the Act and created the UGC, the Members of Parliament all across from the Government and the opposition, everybody said that this institution is never to interfere into the academic autonomy of the University. Now, this institution over the years has become such an institution the only function of which is arm twisting the universities by way of grant sanctioning authority and then even interfering into the academic matters, which was never there. The UGC is asking every institution to do such and such thing. There are 750 universities – 250 State Universities and 40 in the Central Sector. The universities are free to make their own courses and academic programmes. That is the most worst kind of UGC that they are facing. If they have to face this situation when they are approaching the Central Government and the State Government, one issue has come as some member said that it should be made a Central University. This issue is because the Punjab Government might think that it might not hurt the cadre. He suggested that there is no harm in becoming a Central University and this University could become more stronger if they name it as Shaheed Bhagat Singh Panjab University. When it is named as Shaheed Bhagat Singh Panjab University, nobody could say that this does not belong to Punjab. This is not the main but just a passing suggestion. He also agreed with the members

that let it become a national institution funded completely fully by the Central Government. He referred the University Calendar, 1932. There was an incident and he read the Senate proceedings "Senate protested against the action of certain police officers and constables by forcibly entering the premises of the DAV College, Lahore on 8<sup>th</sup> October 1930 as reported by the authorities and that College in particular for entering in a Professor's class while he was teaching and beating the Professor and some of the students, it decided to request the Government to establish a convention whereby the police should not ordinarily enter the premises or the building of a College without first consulting the Principal or his representative unless they have a warrant of arrest signed by magistrate or unless they are actually any person or persons believed to be involved in committing the offence". This is what happened in 1930 in Lahore and now it is 87 years later. He showed the news appeared in Punjabi Tribune, which has not been denied by the University, that the police entered the classroom, University security officials took the police to the classroom, where the students were beaten. It is a shame on the University that the police enters the classroom and beat the teacher and the students. He asked the DSW who might know whether this incident has happened. If the incident had not happened, then this should have been contradicted. Since this has not been contradicted, he took it that this incident had actually happened and the police entered the classrooms and beat the teachers and the students. He showed the clipping of The Tribune and Hindustan Times newspapers, as everyone have also spoken that the students who were arrested, were so badly beaten in the police station which is totally illegal. Even the Minister took note of it and the medical was conducted. Even the girl students alleged that they were inappropriately touched. Why the University has not lodged a complaint against the police and why filing the complaints against the students? Nobody is sure as to who is responsible. It is the police which make so much repression on the students which provoked the students which resulted into stone pelting. In such a situation, if the police is doing such illegal things, inappropriately touching, why the PUCASH of the University does not take note of it and FIR should be filed against those policemen who had beaten up the students. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has rightly said. He also feels ashamed and concerned that there is a permanent police bus in the Campus. Why do not they create an atmosphere between the students and the faculty? They know that JNU is known for all these things, but JNU has never called the police. JNU called the JNU Teachers Association and the students and see that nothing happens which could create further complications. Why the University senior teachers, he understood that the Dean of University Instruction just escaped, did not want to meet the students. Why the DUI did not want to meet the students? The Vice-Chancellor was not present and it was the duty of the Dean of University Instruction, why did he not meet the students. If the DUI could not face the students, why he took the senior position, he should resign if could not face the students. Where were the University other senior officials? These are the things which need to be taken care of. He has been supporting the Panjab University status as a heritage University. He has already put on record that the Vice-Chancellor has done very best. The students look to the Vice-Chancellor like a father and if the Vice-Chancellor gets provoked, he should just pardon the students. Everybody would think like it as the Indian society is a feudal society. The Vice-Chancellor, as a head of the family, should protect rather than getting provoked and could also say that a father has the right to snub also and he (Vice-Chancellor) always snubs more and loves less. So he should love more and snub less and try to control his temperament also. Otherwise, the Vice-Chancellor is a good person. He is saying this to the Vice-Chancellor as a friend. Regarding the fee issue, he said that it is totally irrational. He supported a complete roll-back.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then he would be accused.

Continuing Professor Chaman Lal said that if complete roll-back is not possible, a Committee be formed including the representatives of the students and the teachers, Senators, which should comprehensively review and see the whole thing. It is the

humanities and the science streams which attract maximum number of students and those students are poor. If they are increasing the fee from Rs.2,400/-to Rs.10,000/-,which is 400%, while in engineering which is a professional course, it is 1100% which is the highest. He has also written to the Vice-Chancellor that in New York State University, as America is the role model for all, let them follow the New York model where for certain income groups, the fee is zero. Similarly, there could be zero fee for the income group up to Rs.3 lacs and free hostel could also be provided so that the poor students could study. Then there could be the income groups of Rs.3-5 lacs and Rs.5-7 lacs and then increase proportionately. The Punjab Government has put a cap of 8% on private schools and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma has asked for even 10%. Last time one of the members had suggested that 2% fee could be enhanced every year so that it does not come to such a situation. He requested all the Senators that rather than raising their voice, he supported Shri Sanjay Tandon, let them discuss in a very peaceful environment and good manner. It is in the interest of all of them.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma appreciated the Vice-Chancellor's efforts in trying to improve the financial mess which has been created. But he feels bad when the people from Punjab come to meet him during some meetings or other programmes who do not have a good opinion about Panjab University particularly about the incident which happened recently with the students when they were agitating. As Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has told that the agitations in the University have been in the past also. He is in service and is proud to be a trade unionist. There is nothing wrong in agitation and nothing wrong is being done. As far as the students are concerned, whether it is a daughter or a son, the children are the most important part of a family. The students come to the University to study and whatever has happened with them is condemnable. He appreciated the Vice-Chancellor who had said that he would take immediate remedial steps and write to the Governor and other competent authorities for withdrawal of the complaint. But, the Vice-Chancellor should keep it in mind that when a parent goes away from the children even for a day, he/she thinks about ten times a day about the children whether the child has taken the food, whether the child who is unwell, has taken the medicine. In what conditions the parents send their children to them to study, they are the custodians of those children who are the nation builders in the making, who are going to run the country in the coming years and they should not have been this kind of treatment. Anyhow, whatever has happened, they all regret it and he appealed to all the members, the Vice-Chancellor and the staff that a way out be found out so that such an ugly situation does not recur in this campus. In the past also at one point of time, the non-teaching employees wanted to go on agitation, the then Vice-Chancellor sitting in this House had said that they would call the police and the members had then requested that since they are living in a civilized society, such steps should not be taken up for which they have to face embarrassment or there is instability amongst the students. As far as the issue of fee hike is concerned, he also understands that no system could be run without money. To find the ways and means, as suggested by one of the members, the fee could be hiked in a rational manner but increasing the fee by 300% or 400% is irrational. As a part of their duty, they could also help in sorting out the matter, he is ready to offer his services for the welfare of the University, so that it could function normally and become a better governed institution.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it could be that the students might have committed some mistake as anybody could commit a mistake and it could be a result of that. But by profession, the Vice-Chancellor is a teacher and the students are the learners. It is the basic moral responsibility of the teachers to excuse the students, teach them and build their career and it is the duty of the institution to prepare good citizens. As sometimes it is said that only few students came for the meeting, similarly 545 Members of Parliament represent the 125 crore citizens in the Parliament and not all the citizens are involved in the process of law making. Therefore, if there are some student organizations or the activists, they could discuss the issues on behalf of all the

students being the representatives of the students. Such opinions should be discarded. The behavior which they want from the students, first the teachers should implement that on them. The Principal of the DAV College, Chandigarh is here who must be knowing that Dr. Triloki Nath used to be the Principal of DAV College. At that time, if there was any dispute, the police never came to the College and the students had a respect and could not face him. He cited his own example when he was the President of the Campus Students Council and Professor R.S. Grewal used to be the DSW, who had a great impression on the students. Is there any role of the teachers in this to reduce the gap between the teacher and the student relationship? Whether there is a fall in the thinking of the teachers and their interaction and way of dealing with the students? As Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma has said, if a parent goes out even for a day, they talk to their children four times a day on the phone, whether the child has had the food or has attended the tuition. But here the students are sitting on hunger strike, even during the night, the Vice-Chancellor being out of station, is it not the duty of the person second in-charge to the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar or of any of the other authority as to how to deal with the students in such a situation. It is a sensitive issue which has not been dealt with in a proper way. First of all, responsibility be fixed for not handling the situation properly. As members of the Senate, all of them are responsible but since the Vice-Chancellor is executing, he is also responsible. He had earlier also talked about it and again requesting all, including the four Members of Parliament, former or present, leaders of the Congress and BJP whether Panjab University has any place on the map of India. This is the fourth oldest institution of higher learning after the three Presidency Colleges and the first University in the system of modern education. Could this University not be given the status of national importance or heritage status? Could they not work for it? Could the Members of Parliament, former or present belonging to BJP or Congress, keeping aside their political affiliation, sit together and meet the HRD Minister or the Prime Minister and help the members on this issue and bring this issue to the knowledge of the Prime Minister. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and Mrs. Kirron Kher and other political personalities of the House should go and meet the Prime Minister. According to him, the Prime Minister would not turn them away. So they are not going to the root cause of the problem and every year go with a begging bowl in their hand and not working for a permanent solution. As proposed by Dr. Gurmeet Singh, he seconded the proposal that the University should be made a centrally funded institution. If the Punjab Government wanted to contribute funds, it should be welcomed. But they have not given any thought on the basic issue or not acted on that. When the retirement age of the teachers was enhanced from 60 years to 65, he was against that at that time also on the plea that with this they are impinging upon the right of employment opportunity of the younger generation. He even had said that it could lead to social unrest. Whatever situation is created due to this, whether it is law and order or what is happening in Kashmir, he wanted to say that if they as a governing body or the State Government or the Central Government with such insensitivity are diverting their attention from education, today it is the situation in Kashmir, tomorrow it could be from Kashmir to Kanyakumari that each and every student would be having stones in his/her hand and it would become difficult for the army or law handling machinery to control that situation. So, there is a need to think over the issue with sensitivity and to act accordingly. He requested the House that one case which happened in the year 2012 during the tenure of the present Vice-Chancellor and the second incident which recently happened, to solve both the cases, the number of students in the earlier case was very less and there are 68 students in the present incident. Keeping in view the interests of the students, if even a child could not get the job due to this police case, or the career is destroyed, he has read in the legal jurisprudence that the law says that even if 100 scoundrels are scot free, but not even an innocent person should be punished. But they have overturned that. Now, it is for them whether to stop that or not. Secondly, the issue of fee hike is a sensitive one. He has always been saying that all the students groups should be involved and it should be the duty of the DSW to consult the students and give the example that the salaries of the teachers are being hiked and the expenditure on the students is also increasing as compared to previous years, they could hike the fee by 10%. According to

him, no student would be against it. They should enhance the interaction between the teachers and the students. The students would not be able to face a teacher if he/she in real sense is a teacher. He is not talking of a teacher who only looks for the salary, deliver a lecture and goes home. He is talking of a teacher. He requested that such a culture should be inculcated. The Vice-Chancellor, as a person, could be good, but as a Vice-Chancellor, he has different opinion about him. They should develop a culture.

The Vice-Chancellor requested all the members to use a restrained language when one employs certain motives and accusations to the teaching faculty of this University.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he be corrected if he has said anything wrong or he would convince the Vice-Chancellor. He would like to respond to the Vice-Chancellor's last comment. The authority, whoever he/she is, would have to listen to ifs and buts and if need be, self-evaluation has also to be done and would have to amend his/her act and conduct. He could say this even to his own friend. Being a Senate member, if the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor is chairing the meeting or even if the HRD Minister is present in the House and if there is something wrong, he would like to point out the same. It is for that person either to admit the mistake and be convinced or convince the person. This is what he always believes in. Either the Vice-Chancellor should tell him if he has said anything wrong or if the Vice-Chancellor has made that comment as general remarks, then that is a different issue.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he would like to speak on two issues. The first issue is that the incident which happened on 11<sup>th</sup> April in which the case has been filed against the students, he requested that the cases should be immediately withdrawn.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a decision to withdraw the cases has already been taken.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the second issue is regarding legal complications as has been said by some of the members. He has the knowledge of such matters. Practically, the duty of the police is to stop the crime and not to beat the people after picking up from their homes. He condemned the incident which happened on that day as the action of the police was a vindictiveness one. The police had beaten up the students whether they were sitting in the classrooms, library or laboratories. If by chance a young teacher had been present there, the police would have beaten him/her also seeing no difference between a teacher and a student. Is such an action on the part of the police is permissible? He wanted an answer as to who was the duty magistrate who had ordered the lathi-charge? Secondly, if there was lathi-charge, why it was done in the classrooms, library and laboratories. Was this action of the police not a vindictiveness one? A case against the police personnel be also filed after looking into all the video recordings. If the University did not have the courage to save the students, a cross-case should be filed and the police would withdraw the cases on its own. The advocates/legal experts including Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa know that as and when a cross-case is filed, the police would withdraw all the cases. With the police department withdrawing the cases, the University would withdraw the cases and the students would be safeguarded. He would like to read the last line of the the letter dated 18.01.2017 written by Shri Satish Chandra, Additional Chief Secretary (Finance), Punjab Government to Shri Vinay Sheel, Secretary to Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development where it is written that the Punjab Government would release Rs.20 crores every year to Panjab University and asks the Central Government that "you are requested to enhance the grant of Panjab University annually and to also bear the share of the State of Punjab too". In this letter the Punjab Government says that they would release Rs.20 crore to Panjab University and also asked the Central Government to bear that burden of Rs.20 crores. If the Punjab Government did not want to provide any share to the Panjab University, then they could request the Punjab Government to leave the University and let Panjab



University become a Central University for which NOC be issued by the Punjab Government. When the agitation for making Panjab University a Central University was going on, then the issue came up that there would be a problem regarding the service conditions of the non-teaching employees. The ratio of the non-teaching employees would be reduced. An apprehension was spread as if there was a division in the Panjab University which was teaching versus non-teaching. Another apprehension was created that all the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University would be disaffiliated from Panjab University. The third apprehension was created with Panjab University becoming a Central University, the claim of Punjab Government over Chandigarh would end. A letter has been circulated by Dr. Gurmeet Singh in which a very good suggestion has been given. He requested the members not to blindly oppose or support any proposal. Firstly, the proposal should be looked into and worked out. They have to save the University and not the self ego or the status. The universities like Guru Ghasidas University, Bilaspur; Dr. Hari Singh Gour University, Sagar; Hemwati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar; University of Allahabad; Pondicherry University which earlier were State Universities had been converted into Central Universities. Panjab University is having the Senate, University of Calcutta is also having the Senate while other Universities are having the Court. The earlier structure of the State Universities has not been changed but with the same academic and governing structure, these have been converted into Central Universities. If someone has any objection, it should be worked out and studied and if one feels that there could be some effect on the non-teaching staff, teaching staff, colleges or their status, they could discuss those issues. They all say that the University should become a centrally funded University, but the teaching community has an insecurity that they all want to save the Senate and its membership, politics but not Panjab University. He requested that keeping aloft these issues, as they all say that Panjab University is an institution of national importance but nobody is ready to accept and practically show that it is an institution of national importance, they should go to that extent and have discussion at that level to save the institute, but not to save the personal matters, status, membership of the House. If Panjab University could become a Central University without any change in the present structure of the Colleges, no effect on the teaching and non-teaching staff, it would be beneficial not only for the University but for the students also, who could be the children from all sections of the society. They should care for the interest of the students as Panjab University caters to the whole of the northern India. Due to the present situation of the University, there is a mushroom growth of private universities in the vicinity of Chandigarh who are eating into the share and brand of Panjab University. He requested the members that they should write to the Government to grant the central status to Panjab University. If someone has any objection, they could resolve that. If there are some reservations or limitations, they could discuss on that issue. But to his understanding, the matter which he has seen from the record, there would be no problem on the Syndicate/Senate, no problem for the Colleges affiliated with Panjab University, no problem for the non-teaching staff.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it is good that the special meeting has been converted into an ordinary meeting, but the agenda which is to be discussed in the meeting has not been provided. Therefore, either the agenda be announced or it should be declared as a zero hour meeting in which any member could raise and discuss any issue. There were three demands related with the students which now have remained two as one of the demand has been accepted – one related with the fee, second with the cases and the third one related with police. They have taken a decision to withdraw the cases. There are some good things in the fee hike. He requested that there should be no fee hike for the students in the income bracket of up to Rs.2.5 lacs and the previous fee be charged so that there is no effect on the students.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that now this bracket has been revised up to Rs.3 lacs.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it is good and the fee should not be hiked for this category and the students would benefit by it.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to when the income criteria has been enhanced to Rs.3 lacs.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that a suggestion has come forward in this regard.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether this decision has already been taken. Only a suggestion has come forward.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is up to the members to take a decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then it could have been said that a suggestion has been received which is under consideration.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it would be better if the income bracket is revised up to Rs.3 lacs and the previous fee be charged from the students of this category. A Committee of the Senate be formed to look into the other problems of the students, like withdrawal of police case. It is not a good decision to call the police to the campus if some students are agitating since the University is having its own security. The University has belongingness with the students and the students could sometimes commit mistakes and they being like the father of the students, should pardon the students. Since the Vice-Chancellor is fighting the cases in the Supreme Court, they are all with him on this issue.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that when she was coming for the meeting, she was not knowing as to what is to be discussed because in the special meeting like the last special meeting, she thought that they could not discuss the fee hike and the issue of students unrest. But being on the campus, she felt that since 11<sup>th</sup> April, the whole environment on the campus is in different stage. She did not know when the things would normalize and how long it would take. It has been a very unfortunate incident which happened on 11<sup>th</sup> April. So many people have discussed and she would not talk about it just for repetition. It has been discussed as if there was an agitation. The students came and a confrontation took place with the police and then it happened. It was not like that. She would like the incidence to be put in a context in which it happened. For instance, the agitation was going on for a few days before 11<sup>th</sup> April. Rallies were being organized in the Colleges as well as the campus. The students of the Colleges assembled together and used to come to the University. So, for a number of days this was happening. At least 5-7 days, a call for the rally on 11<sup>th</sup> April had been given that they would be coming to the University on 11<sup>th</sup> April, would hold a rally and have a bandh. It was not unannounced, it was announced. Therefore, it was the foremost duty of the head of the institution to leave all other assignments and be there in the University in the office on that day unless there was some other emergency. When the young blood students around 1000 in number came to the University, anything could happen. When they came they wanted somebody to come and talk with them but there was nobody. As some members have pointed out that where was the authority second-in-command to the Vice-Chancellor, the Dean of University Instruction and the Registrar were personally contacted, but she would say it but would say that the Vice-Chancellor should have been there. The way the Vice-Chancellor could have handled the situation no other person could have handled. This was a peculiar situation. At that time, the students repeatedly continued saying that somebody should come and talk with them, but nobody listened to them and that triggered the situation. She would not even blame the police, because an unfortunate thing happened thereafter as was reported in the media, that firstly the sedition charge was framed and the top officials of the police including the Chief of University Security did not know as to what is meant by sedition. Why do not they discuss the facts here?

Top officials including the Registrar have given a statement, that might be wrong, but the Chief of University Security says that he did not know the meaning of sedition. Does he deserve to be a Chief of University Security and he should accept the responsibility of whatever happened. Why are they talking of the facts, let them fix the responsibility. Where is the accountability? As Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa had talked about the teacher, she absolutely agreed with him. A teacher should be a teacher in real sense. Merely because they are drawing the salaries, they do not become teachers. Let them put the things into the context. How could they escape the whole situation and put the blame on the police. They themselves are responsible as the police did not know as to who are the students and to be picked up from which of the classrooms. Why the police entered the classrooms and why the students were picked up and beaten. Even the teachers went with the police, she knows it. There are teachers and persons of all kinds. Some are coward and hide. There are some teachers whom she personally knows that they went with the students as they were innocent and poor also. As is being said that the parents when being out of station talk to their children whether they had food or not. The parents of these students did not know that their ward is in the police station.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the teachers went to the police station, informed the parents of the students and also bailed out the students.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the teachers went to the police station and informed the parents of the students.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in those teachers, the number of lady teachers was high. This gesture of the teachers was appreciated by the members with the thumping of desks.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that those teachers were not appreciated but some senior teachers told them that what was the need to go to the police station. How such persons could be teachers? What kind of teachers are they? Just deliver the lecture, that is also not whether they deliver the lecture or not, and take the salary. Nobody from top to bottom played their role. But the leader of the University, leader of the institution was responsible, had to take the responsibility and should regret. Who is a good leader? A good leader is a person who should show the grace and accept the responsibility that such an incident should not have happened in his/her institution. That was the most unfortunate thing that has happened. There is suppression of communication. They had appreciated Shri Hamid Ansari when he had delivered a lecture on the day of Convocation on the topic of dialogue. They would have to sit across the table face-to-face with the students. Even one could not control his/her own children with domination which is resisted by them. How could they control these students? They have to sit with the students and convince them and tell them that presently there is a financial crisis in the University and they could not help it and they have to raise the fee. They could ask the students to sit and suggest wherever changes could be made. They should negotiate with the students. They could not control the students by use of force. It is not known as to how to fill the gap which has been created between the teachers and the students and that is going to survive. Thereafter, she has observed for some time now, unfortunately again the authorities always, including the members of the Senate, try to brush everything under the carpet and do not try to face the realities and solve. For instance, most of them have said that Panjab University is of national importance. Yes, it used to be of national importance and it still is a national institute of importance. But there is difference between reaching a status and to sustain that. She had said in the last meeting of the Senate that it is very easy to lose that status. As Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma has said, wherever one goes across the country people ask with surprise that the condition of Panjab University is very bad. To lose a status is very easy and it is very difficult to rise to a status. So to maintain the credibility of this institution of national importance is a big issue and they have to address that issue as to why it has happened.

She would like to know from the senior colleagues who are the members of the Senate for the last so many terms, are experienced, experts in politics, legal and financial matters, as to how many members have carefully read the financial statement or the budget of the University when it is presented as an agenda in the Senate meeting for approval. They have never tried to see as to what are their problems, how could they improve. They are talking everything except the crux of the matter. For the last many times, she had been repeatedly asking some information from the University. It is not that she is doing it just for a hobby to collect the information. She tried to examine where they have gone wrong and where there is a problem. She has been provided the wrong information every time. She had asked for the information in the Senate also. Sometimes it is said that the information would be provided later on and sometimes some information is given while other is not given. Even under the RTI Act, wrong information is provided and one has to go to the CIC. Otherwise also in the Senate, it had been said that one could go to the Court if he/she had any problem as the University had done whatever it wanted. They have to ask themselves these questions. She had read the balance sheet and would like to know from the Finance and Development Officer, as he is the expert in the financial matters, where the money of more than Rs.2 crores of the pension scam is being reflected in the financial statement. It should have been reflected. She is an uneducated person in the matters of finance. These answers should be provided on the floor of the Senate. Why it is said that the information would be provided later on.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh intervened and said that the students are continuously raising slogans and they have taken a decision, they could go and inform the students.

Professor Shelley Walia said that to interrupt the lady speaking, is a discourtesy to the lady teacher. This shows how educated they are.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that he had asked Professor Rajesh Gill.

Professor Shelley Walia said that this is outright discourtesy.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this is a reality. She does not bother now as she is totally thick skinned now. She did not feel but felt only when Professor Shelley Walia had talked about it and made her conscious.

Professor Shelley Walia hoped that he had made the others also conscious.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she hoped so. Now she feels bad no more. She takes it all. She does not bother about whether one is talking something in good taste. She again went to the financial statement and the budget. Why hostel, sports, publication are put under one heading as other income. She had also said last time that there are two ways to come out of the financial crunch – one to enhance the income and the other to control the expenditure. When they see the financial statement, every expenditure is given in break-ups of two-three headings, why is it so, she fails to understand. If they club those expenditures, it becomes a huge amount. An amount of Rs.10 crores that they are going to collect from the fee hike, is nothing if they look at the financial statements. The closing balance of the hostel funds as on 1.4.2016 was about Rs.18 crores, that amount is not reflected. The details of the hostel investments have not been attached. She requested that the details of the investments and the expenditure met out of the hostel funds, sports funds be provided to her. The Vice-Chancellor in the beginning had used the phrase blue sky's thought for this University, very fancy thoughts. Certain suggestions have been given as to how the poor students belonging to certain income bracket would be given the concession. She responded to 2-3 of those suggestions. One of the suggestions is that the teaching work would be assigned to some students, who would be these students, would they be Master's students? When they are talking about the fee hike, they have undergraduate and postgraduate students.

Practically, they should not be biased, if any student has to be given the teaching assignment, how would they allot this to the students in their Departments. Do they allot it on merit, do they allot it on objectivity? But it is done like that a student of a particular teacher is assigned while the other is not. Is it going to be implemented like this?

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa pointed out that the Professors themselves are teaching as Guest Faculty and drawing double salary.

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill said that they are talking of giving teaching assignment to the students, do they have such a work culture. Are the teachers prepared for that? Secondly, the students can help in research projects which are being run by the faculty and the students can be given something. Is it so easy? Supposing if a research project is going on and the Peon has left the project. If a substitute has to be recruited, it is a painful procedure to recruit a Peon. So, it is not practical at all to involve the students in the research project and pay something. Let them give practical suggestions and practical solutions. How could it be done that first the students attend the classes and then tuitions while others remain free. It is not a solution. She had also said in the last Senate meeting that the proposed fee hike is not justifiable in the subjects of Languages and Humanities and it should be reconsidered. The amount of Rs.10 crores is not a big amount. If the members study the financial statements as to what is the income and expenditure, whether the expenditure is reflected or not, whether the income is reflected or not, what is the bank balance, what is the number of FDRs and ask all this information, they could come to know all. If this information is provided to the members, she would also be able to get it. They should try to see where they are going.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not an amount of Rs.10 crores which is at stake. Over a period of four years, it is going to become Rs.30 crores. During the current year, the income from self-sustaining courses is Rs. 52 crores, Rs.9 crores from the traditional courses. The proposal that is passed by the Senate would apply to the new students. The amount of Rs.9 crores would become Rs.18 crores next year and the next year it would be Rs.23 crores and ultimately it would reach to Rs.28-29 crores.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it was according to the original proposal which was given in the last Senate. But if they incorporate all the suggestions and concessions probably, the calculations would be different.

Dr. Dalip Kumar, first of all, appreciated the untiring efforts so far made by the Vice-Chancellor for ongoing struggle on financial issues. He mentioned that on 17<sup>th</sup> April, there was a meeting of the National Mission Authority which was chaired by the Hon'ble HRD Minister and was attended by the Education Secretaries of all the States of the country along with the Education Minister. Why this is important because whatever happened on 11<sup>th</sup> April, actually, on that day, the Vice-Chancellor was not on the campus. On that very particular day on 17<sup>th</sup> April, the Vice-Chancellor had talked with the Administration that under the circumstances prevailing in the University, he could not attend because the meeting is to be attended by the Chairman of the State Higher Education Council. Even then the Chandigarh Administration appreciated the concerns of the Vice-Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor had deputed Professor Manoj Arora, the Vice-Chairman, State Higher Education Council to attend the meeting. So, this is not a question whether the Vice-Chancellor is having a concern or not, under those circumstances, the Vice-Chancellor had cancelled his meeting with National Mission Authority. Secondly, even the Fellow colleagues have mentioned that there is a different situation all around in the campus. He requested that the two main barricades, one at the Vice-Chancellor's office and the other at Registrar's office should be immediately removed to give a situation of peace and calmness. There is a temperature of 24°C in the Senate Hall whereas outside it is 41°C. According to him, when the Vice-Chancellor has

announced that all the complaints would be withdrawn immediately, he has heard the sound beating of the students, the authorities of the Panjab University should take immediate steps that they offer a juice of trust calmness and assurance to the students to make the campus healthy and peaceful. Regarding the fee hike, according to him, they do not have any rationality on this issue. Perhaps, if they have 10% increase across the board without considering the students who are the future students of the campus or the current students, if that 10% increase is there, they could review the 10% also after the decision of 15<sup>th</sup> May and 4<sup>th</sup> July. Perhaps, the judiciary is also quiet what they have read in the newspapers or through the mails sent by the Vice-Chancellor that they are considering this issue in a very serious note. After that they could consider. But for the time being, they could go for 10% increase. Even the colleagues have mentioned that there should be a better faith or interaction amongst the teachers and the students. He also knew that in front of his teachers, he was not in a position even to stand and agitate in any way. They should inculcate that environment in the campus also. It could be by way of orientation or mutual understanding. The amount of Rs.52 crores which the Vice-Chancellor has mentioned and Rs.9 crores from the traditional courses, they could review and 10% would substantially increase the demand which actually they are facing just to generate the income revenue.

Professor Dinesh K. Gupta said that he has been referred to by a couple of members of this august House. Let him tell as to what happened on that day. He never escaped as one of the members has said that he (Dean of University Instruction) escaped. First of all, let him explain. That was an unfortunate thing. Prior to that, a number of times probably, he went and talked to the students who were agitating because the Vice-Chancellor has been so busy. Today he (Professor Dinesh K. Gupta) has completed 11 months in the office of Dean of University Instruction and the Vice-Chancellor has been so busy in the financial matters that he has not seen the Vice-Chancellor even once not drafting or re-drafting the communication which was meant only and only for financial constraints of the University. So, the Vice-Chancellor has been travelling a lot. He has been addressing the agitators a number of times in the past prior to 11<sup>th</sup> April incident. Secondly, he is not aware of the tradition of the University, he interacts with maximum number of student representatives of different shades everyday because of the nature of the job that he has. On that day what happened. Three days prior to that there was a dharna outside the office of the Vice-Chancellor. He requested Professor Chaman Lal to give attention to it what he is saying. The SHO of Sector-11 Police Station came and asked him (Professor Dinesh K. Gupta) to talk to the students. Everybody was saying that since the students are agitating, he should come and talk with them. He did not take even a single second to accept the offer. The Dean Student Welfare and the Chief of University Security (CUS) requested him not to go there. On the way from the Vice-Chancellor office to the dharna site, both of them (DSW and CUS) kept on saying not to go, but he said that since there are students, let him go and talk. Once he went close to the group, two strong built people came on his both sides, he could not make it out whether they were policemen in plain clothes or their musclemen. When he went ahead, he found that nobody/no policeman is around him, then he thought that he has committed a mistake because he was surrounded by the students. Anyway, he did not leave. He took the mike and talked to the students what help he could do. The students said that why they (University) have increased the fee. He told them that they are equally aware of whatever the financial constraints of the University are. The students asked him to roll back the fee hike to which he said that he did not have the authority and he hurriedly came back out of that. Three days after that, this incident happened. He was in his office. Series of meetings were going on because his office called certain Chairperson for finalization of the Handbook of Information. There were so many ladies in his office. He was aware that an agitation is going on. His officials, Dean Student Welfare and Chief of University Security were in touch with the students and were briefing him as he was sitting in his office. Had it been pointed out in time, he would have forewarned the Chairpersons not to come to his office. He did not know that this is going to happen otherwise he would have stopped everything. There were ladies in his

office. It is very easy to pass the judgment, because one did not know the realities through which they have saved the people who were present in that office. Let him explain. For the first time, he met a Deputy Superintendent of Police (DSP) who came to his office and asked him to go outside and talk to the students. The SHO was already there. He said that he would not go as 3 days earlier he went out and that was his experience and asked the DSP to bring the students inside and he would talk to them. He (DSP) was about to leave his office and he (Professor Dinesh K. Gupta) asked him as to how many students he (DSP) would bring in. There were large number of students outside. If the DSP would have brought hundreds of students inside, it would not have been possible for him to manage. He asked the DSP as to how many students he would bring in he said that four students, to which he (Professor Dinesh K. Gupta) said that he could bring in 5 students. The DSP went outside and never came back. He did not know what was happening outside. The DSW and the Chief of University Security kept on frequenting his room and nothing was unusual. They could see the video recordings themselves as to what was the trigger point. One should not say that nobody went to talk to the students which was the trigger point. They should see the video and try to make out what was the trigger point which resulted into such a strong reaction from the students. He did not want to go in for that. Immediately there was a thud, a tear gas shell entered the Vice-Chancellor office. They never experienced that inconvenience. It was absolutely closed. The whole of the office is air-conditioned. They could imagine that the ladies frequented his room. He brought the female Chairpersons from the Vice-Chancellor Committee Room to his own room and locked his office while he remained standing outside so that at least the ladies are safe. That was the situation and in a situation where the policemen were looking for refuge, do they think that a person could have gone and talked to the students. He requested not to pass such judgements. That was the state of affairs. Through the backside gate he ensured that all the ladies safely moved out of the Chemical Engineering. He personally saw that those ladies reached their destination. He came back to office and did not escape. He had a very personal meeting on that day. Every month he leaves come what may, it was that day, the day of *Poomima* (full moon day), he does not stay in Chandigarh. But on that day, he stayed. For half day, with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor, he left the office and talked to the Registrar and passed on his charge to the next person, i.e., Director, Research. This was the situation. This was all what he wanted to inform. Moreover, he does not know whether Professor Chaman Lal knows it or not that the Dean of University Instruction is not appointed with a request which the Dean of University Instruction makes for appointment. The Dean of University Instruction is appointed by the Syndicate. Since the Syndicate has appointed him (Professor Dinesh K. Gupta) and if the Syndicate wanted to remove him, he is ready to go.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that many members have raised the questions that no negotiation or dialogue was held with the students. He informed the House that the offices of the DSW, Vice-Chancellor, Dean of University Instruction were continuously in touch with the students and four meetings were held with the students and the Vice-Chancellor addressed all those meetings. It is wrong to say that there was no dialogue with the students. They took the Students' Council and representatives of various organizations into confidence. He said that except 1-2 students' organizations, majority of the organizations were in their confidence and none wanted to come into this clash. As far as the incident of 11<sup>th</sup> April is concerned, he was present at that time and when the students entered from one side, the Wardens and he requested the students on which they sat there. Thereafter, the leaders of the students' organizations started targeting the authorities including the Wardens and him and the police asked them to go inside as the students were targeting them. Then saying that the negotiations were not held with the students is wrong as from time to time they had been meeting the students. But the students had become vocal and were in anger that no student felt it appropriate to talk with them. Even when the President of the Students' Council, Mr. Nishant Kaushal came inside, they told him that they are ready for talks and asked him to bring 5 representatives of any of the students' organizations. When Mr. Nishant Kaushal went

out to bring 5 students representatives and talked to the students, some students' organizations said that this is not the time to hold talks and they would indulge in violence, it is their will and they started throwing the stones, that was the turning point.

On a point of order, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he was a part of the agitation when he was the students' leader. They had some confrontation with the U.T. Administration. They brought the Home Secretary, the Education Secretary to *Matka Chowk* who sat with them at the *Matka Chowk* and held discussions. They tried to resolve the matter and it was decided there and then. Why they were asking the students who were full of emotions to come and hold talks. Why could not they go to the students, sit with them and ask their problems.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that he had met the students and sat with them and discussions were held. If the students say that pelting stones is their right, what could they expect from them. Such statements of the students could also be brought to the notice as to who were the students who said that pelting stones is their wish and would do stone pelting. That was the turning point. Thereafter, the students struggled with the DSP, which was the turning point. As a point has been raised by Professor Chaman Lal, he (Professor Emanuel Nahar) had never said in any statement, whatever incident happened is unfortunate and the students were beaten is also unfortunate. As has been said that since the students were tortured, nobody went to the police station to enquire after the students, the Wardens went to enquire after the health of the students. Even they had got booked the rooms for the relatives of the injured students. As Shri Sanjay Tandon had said that one of the students' organization namely ABVP was not called for the meeting, they had authorized the President of the Students' Council to call 10 representatives of the students. By chance, the President did not have the contact number of the ABVP. That is the reason why the ABVP could not be contacted and called. There was no other reason that ABVP was not called.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that he had a separate meeting with the ABVP representative a few days earlier. No other students' organization had sought a separate meeting with him. He had a separate meeting with them and they discussed the matter at length. He explained everything to them. At some point, it became this thing that who is permitted to enter the University and who is not permitted to enter the University. He was told by a ABVP leader that even the Hon'ble HRD Minister could not enter the University without their permission. He said that he decided not to speak to those students from then onwards because as far as he is concerned, they are a centrally supported institution. He could not accept somebody coming and telling him that Hon'ble HRD Minister has to seek permission from ABVP before he/she enters the University. He had said no to it. He did not stop at that. He immediately rang up Shri Sanjay Tandon who had just landed up at the Delhi Airport and told him everything. He said that he would look into it. It is not true that the ABVP has not been kept in a loop. They (ABVP) had sought the meeting separately and he had talked to them at length and his communication with them broke down only when they said this, and this to him was personally unacceptable, when somebody comes and says such things.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that thanked the Vice-Chancellor for accepting something which otherwise he never accepts, a good thing as he has experienced it during his two terms in the Senate. The Vice-Chancellor, on suggestion by many members, had accepted to convert the special meeting into a general meeting, for which he thanked the Vice-Chancellor. Today's issue is a burning issue as the senior Senators have also talked about it. When some people ask him as to what is happening in the University, he feels it being the Senate member. He was surprised to note, as pointed out by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, that the earlier police cases have not been withdrawn till date. He was a part of the meeting when the decision to enhance the fee was taken and in the Senate meeting it was discussed that they would hold discussions with the students. He and the



then DSW Professor Navdeep Goyal had gone to meet the students and told them that the Senate had taken the decision to withdraw the fee hike and withdraw the cases filed against them. But he is surprised to note that for the last four years the cases are going on and have not been withdrawn. He had also talked on the issue of fee hike in the meeting. The people have an impression that the students coming to study in University are having costly cars and could afford to pay high fee. This time it seems that the Vice-Chancellor has selected an intellectual person who is not a member of the governing bodies, Syndicate or Senate, for enhancing the fee in such a way that the people could not know what is the fee structure. This fee hike was a decision like the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which the people still are not able to understand as to what happened and felt the after effects. Similarly, the students came to know of the fee hike very late that the fee has been hiked by 1100%. The Dean of University Instruction and the Hostel Wardens have given their explanation. Did not they know that the students had already taken a decision, it was published in the electronic and print media that they would organize a big rally and protest on 11<sup>th</sup> April in the University against the fee hike in front of the Vice-Chancellor office? The Vice-Chancellor should not have gone out of station on that day and should have been present in the meeting which was very essential keeping in view the crisis of such a kind. He has come to know that the Vice-Chancellor was not in his office on that day and his presence in the University on that day was very essential for important decisions. As the Dean of University Instruction went and talked to the students that it is not within his power and what he could do. When any authority of the University is going to hold discussions with the students and has no authority to take decision, then there is no use of holding the discussion. If the Vice-Chancellor had talked that the fees have been hiked and a special meeting would be convened and probably the agitation would not have happened. As the students are being accused by many members, according to him, the students were provoked for this incident to fizzle out and defame the agitation and the students, some people provoked the students. With this, the students got provoked. As is being said that the DSP asked the officials not to go outside to talk with the students, the students do not throw stone on the teachers or insult the teachers in any way as he has experienced it being a student and contesting the elections, if the teacher has not committed any mistake. If a teacher has committed some mistake, the students would not leave such a person. No student insults the teacher unnecessarily. He had been a student and whenever he faces any teacher starting from the school to the college level, he bows his head in respect to the teachers as it is because of the teachings of the teachers that he is here. So it is wrong to accuse the students. He had earlier also said that they should have an experience of the year 2013 when they had hiked the fee, there was agitation due to which the University's image has been maligned and the people take a negative view of it. They should have thought over it. Whether it is the Government, MHRD or the UGC might not have said that the University should enhance the income only by enhancing the fee. So much discussion has already taken place in the House. There is a need of manpower audit to curtail the expenditure of the University. Keeping aside the manpower audit, he did not know whether it is needed or not, they have re-employed the teachers. As Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa has also said that the age has been enhanced from 60 years to 65 years. If they had done the manpower audit, perhaps the burden of Rs.8-9 crores which they are going to pass on to the students, that could have been saved with the manpower audit. They have not paid attention to it. But they think it an easy way to issue a circular, hold a meeting of 10 persons and enhance the fee. He had said this in the first meeting of the Senate in 2013 that if they had not enhanced the fee for so many (8-10) years, it was not the fault of the students, it was not the fault of the parents of the students. This is their own fault. If they had gradually increased the fee by 2.5-5% annually since the year 2012-13 by having a target of about Rs.2-4 crores, they would have achieved the target which they have thought of now. Let they did not work in that direction. He appreciated the House that they have taken a decision to withdraw the case which has been filed against the students by the University. The sedition charge has been framed. He was surprised to note that the Chief of University Security did not know as to what is the meaning of sedition. They have framed such a

charge against the students who are the future of the country and must be the children of poor parents lodged in the lock-up. He was not present here and has read all this in the newspapers. It has been reported in the newspapers that the students were forcibly taken out of the library, classrooms and were beaten. He does not accept that all the students might be involved in the agitation, there could be some students who might be wrong. But it is wrong to involve all the students. Who is responsible for this? It is not the student or the police who are only responsible for it, but the University authorities are also responsible for it. The University authority who is responsible, should be charge sheeted and explanation should be called for as to why that person has not performed the assigned duty properly. If that person would have performed his/her duty properly, the situation would not have taken the shape of an agitation. He requested that the fee which has been hiked should go as per the earlier practice. They are having the Regional Centre and a Library at Ludhiana. He also observed that an agitation is also going on there. Most of the students studying there belong to the lower middle class. Earlier, the library security was Rs.2,000/- and the fee was Rs.500/- which has been enhanced to Rs.4,000/- and Rs.2,500/- respectively. Earlier, the students could take 4 books from the library, the number of which has now been reduced to 2 books. The poor parents who had dreamt of making their wards IAS officers, PCS officers or bank officers, are not able to pay the fee and their dreams have been shattered. That is why the students are agitating. By generating an income of Rs.8 crores, they could not meet their deficit of Rs.250 crores. He requested that if the fee is to be increased, it should be increased rationally. The students are ready to pay as also their parents. The fee should not be enhanced irrationally. If they are thinking of taking the University to higher standards, it is being reported in the newspaper, there have the statements of the Vice-Chancellor also that the University has achieved such and such ranking. After achieving a high ranking, such an incident happens and the public says that the University has no good ranking, it is just a drama. He said that they could enhance the fee and no Senator would be against the fee hike but the hike should be rational. It is the duty of the Government of India and the demand of the general public that every child should be educated. It is the policy of the Government also that every child should be educated and the educated children would make the future of the country. Therefore, the Government should perform its duty. In the morning also they are talking about the fee hike issue. He would like to be excused, all the wards of the teachers are getting 50% concession and the number of teachers not availing the 50% concession might be very less. Could those teachers not pay the fee of their children?

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is a very valid point.

Continuing, Shri Naresh Gaur said that there are so many teachers who are getting the 50% concession for their children. While there are poor parents also who could not afford food and shelter to their children, how could they afford to pay the fee to educate their children. He had earlier also said that they should depute a Chowkidar or the Security Officer on the gates of the University and see how many students come in their own cars. There are about 14-15000 students in the University and they could observe that not more than 1000 students would be coming in cars. Those remaining 13000 students who have been sent by their parents to study in the University to fulfill their dreams and would become the future of the country, they are depriving those students of the education. He has been elected by the general public from the Registered Graduate Constituency and knows the ground realities. The fee could be enhanced systematically for which no student would agitate. But if they do something in an irrational way or even if a person tries to control the behavior of his/her child, or does not listen to the child in a rational way, one's own child could also become defector. But these children are the students. He requested that the fee of the campus and the fee for the Regional Centre Ludhiana could be enhanced systematically. As has also been pointed out by Professor Rajesh Gill, whatever e-mails he has sent being a Senator, no reply to those e-mails has been provided. He has served the previous term of four years.

For the current term he had made his mind not to contest the election as the Senate membership is like a game having different groups. He has observed during the last four years that groupism is more from the Chair's side than the other side. Since he has been in the union, he knows how to manipulate and as to how to run the union. There are some more members on one side while less on the other side and every decision is taken accordingly. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to come out of such things being the head of the University and run the University by becoming a leader so that the people could remember him for his good works as the martyrs like Bhagat Singh, Rajguru, Sukhdev and Udham Singh are remembered by the people. If the Vice-Chancellor would do good things, he would also be remembered by the people.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal requested that the issue of fee of Ludhiana should also be kept in mind.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that on 26<sup>th</sup> March when the decision on the fee hike was taken, he had left the House when it rose for lunch and did not come after that. But he did see from the minutes that a good number of Senators opposed the move that day and they opposed the move after having considered all aspects of it. Today, since the Vice-Chancellor permitted all matters to be raised, he wished to make a few points. As it has been said by Shri Naresh Gaur, it is not that the fee was not increased in earlier years. He has a chart which has been prepared by the University, he finds from it that after 2001-02, fees were increased, if not substantially, in 2006-07, 2014-15, 2015-16 and then again in 2016-17 before the present hike. In the year 2015-16 and 2016-17, it was not substantial increase, but it was an increase. Having said that, he did not want to take much time of the House, he brought it to the notice of the House which he and Professor R.P. Bambah were discussing, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) in the year 2000-01 was 406 and in the year 2016-17, they did not have the figure for 2017-18, it was 1125. That meant that the increase in the CPI is less than 3 times during these years. But in the case of increase in fees, they have been talking about the fee which has been increased this year, vis-à-vis the last year's fee, when they say that the fee has been increased in 2-3 courses it is 1100% or so, but the reality is that if they take the year 2001-02, the fee has been increased from as much as 9 times in hobby classes but he would not discuss that. But in others the increase is as much as from 10% to mind boggling 48 times, that means 4800%. It has been increased 54 times, that means 5400% increase in the fee. It is just unjustified and could not be acceptable to anybody. Let them accept the fact and the authorities must know that Panjab University is not a private University. It is a State University and its history, as the Vice-Chancellor has been talking of many times and the learned members have also referred to it briefly. As Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is the fourth University after the Presidency Colleges and its heritage is well accepted. He has enough space and opportunity to speak on matters which have political overtones outside, he would scrupulously try to avoid that here, he only wished to talk as a Senator of this University irrespective of his political affiliation. He felt that since this is a public University, it is the Government's primary responsibility to provide for education and there is no gains saying this again and again that majority of the students come from very poor and/or modest background. A girl dropped in the other day and he mentioned it in the meeting when they met the other day, she put the first question to him that why the fee has been increased. Instead of giving an answer to her, he asked the girl as to what is the profession of her parents to which she told that her mother is an Anganwadi Worker. The girl had passed 12<sup>th</sup> class. If they show these charts to those students that for such and such category, they have provided for such and such concession, the students would not be able to understand it and they would have to appoint more non-teaching staff for keeping the records of all such students. There would be different kinds of talks on that. He suggested that, there would be no loss of face in it, a Committee be formed to take an early decision and could extensively hold discussions with the students. The Committee could have senior members like Professor R.P. Bambah and some others and in

consultation with the students, simplify the matter that such is the only increase. As the 10% increase has been suggested by someone. He would also not evade his responsibility, it would be justified to increase the fee by 10% over the fee of last year. He is ready to take the responsibility that he has taken such a stand outside and has said the same thing in the meeting. If the students do not accept this, he would not feel bad that he has accepted this increase. If they increase the fee in such a way for all the courses, there would be no difficulty. For the next year, they could think over again. As is being said that it should be dynamic, the UGC should look into the accounts of the University and every year they could enhance the fee accordingly. It is necessary to look into it and a solution could be found out. He liked one thing done by the Vice-Chancellor, it is not just symbolic, it would have a great impact. When they give a clarion call to the alumni of the University, they should not just discuss the issues and then forget, if they could invite them during alumni meet, it would be better to motivate them. He has gained so much from the University. In a real sense, being a student in the University, he learnt the politics from here as he contested the election and had been elected as Secretary. He remembered Dr. Suraj Bhan, the then Vice-Chancellor. During his (Shri Bansal) student days, an agitation also was held. Six students were expelled from the University and the University was shut down. When he took up the matter with the Vice-Chancellor, he did not say that he would not talk to anyone, but invited all the students. All the 6 expulsions were revoked, all the cases against the students were withdrawn and through newspapers it was advertised that the University is open and the University ran smoothly and there was no problem. He remembered both Dr. Suraj Bhan and DSW Dr. Gurdev Singh Gosal with whose initiative they had solved the matter. They could even now take care of such issues and the Vice-Chancellor has made a beginning by withdrawing the cases against the students. When talking of alumni, as he has gained a lot from the University, as a humble beginning, it might not be much, to begin with he would donate an amount of Rs.2 lac per annum to the University and whenever he would like to opt out that beyond a certain period he would not be able to contribute, he would donate an amount of Rs.20 lacs and exit from this option. He thanked the Vice-Chancellor for creating a good environment in which the today's meeting has been conducted. As it is always said that the beauty of democracy is that it is the reason of democracy which prevails over the voice of the democracy. So, they are happy that the reason of democracy would prevail and the members discuss in a good manner.

The members appreciated the kind gesture of Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal of making an announcement to donate an amount of Rs.2 lac per annum and payment of a lump sum amount of Rs.20 lacs whenever he would like to exit from this option.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that on this very positive note, they shall break for lunch and come back. That would also enable him to go and announce this thing to the students. They would come back at 2.00 p.m.

Dr. Parveen Goel said that they should withdraw the police case of the incident which happened on 11<sup>th</sup> April, but if possible, they should also take legal action for the excesses committed by the police. If they are withdrawing the cases, there might be some innocent students. But there were some anti-social elements also and if they withdraw the cases, it would create an atmosphere of fear amongst the teachers. They should prepare a compromise to be signed by the parents of the students.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired if the Vice-Chancellor is going to address the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Senate has asked him and at that time everybody accepted it that at the initiative of the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor had not allowed all the people to speak on the issue and is going to make an announcement and if thereafter somebody

wants to make some statement, what would be the relevance of that. He said that he is not saying that the announcement should not be made but if the Vice-Chancellor is going to address the students that the Senate has taken the decision to withdraw the cases. If the students ask any further question, what answer would the Vice-Chancellor give to them.

When the meeting resumed after the lunch, the Vice-Chancellor said that he would give an opportunity to all the colleagues who have not spoken so far. Before the first person speaks, he wanted to share a small input. The Core Committee of Senators had a meeting with representatives of the students. In that meeting, whatever Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal shared with the members that was there in the form of a chart of progression of the fee increase, etc. All this was also shared with the students. It was also shared with as to, what was the fee structure and how the fee structure progressed ever since the University commenced operations at this campus.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that they did not share this chart with the students. They were talking with the students was simply that the Government is pushing down the throat of the University this fee hike. The students' clear view is that the fee should be completely rolled back and were trying to understand what could be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the chart was available with the students. This chart is that when the University commenced operations at Chandigarh campus. What has come to Chandigarh is Departments of the Government College, Hoshiarpur. In these departments as they arrived in Chandigarh, initially the fee structure was the same that came from Hoshiarpur. It was the same fee for the graduation courses on the Panjab University campus as it was in the Colleges all across Punjab even before reorganization. The B.A./B.Sc. students roughly pay the same fee everywhere. So, now as the University progresses, for a long time, the campus fee was not touched because the number of students enrolling in a given department on the campus was very small. The Honours Schools typically have 35-40 students. In basic medical sciences, there are 25 students per class. The University Departments typically were very small. The enrolment of the students in the University was also not very large and these students enrolling on the campus were some of the best students from all across the region and they had to compulsorily stay in the hostel as the city was not developed. If one stays at home there are expenses involved, but if one goes outside there are different expenses involved. Keeping all this in view, it is his perception looking back at the old things, that the costs at the campus were kept much lower. The tuition fee was the same as in the Colleges and the hostel charges were kept very-very low. The time progressed and the stay in the hostel had to be made self sufficient by way of enhancing fee in the hostel while the tuition fee typical was not touched. It was not touched for about 30-40 years. The first time the tuition fee was increased when Professor T.N. Kapoor was the Vice-Chancellor and it was again increased when Professor K.N. Pathak became the Vice-Chancellor who had increased the fee @ 5% for 5 years in a row, after initial increase. There has been a pressure all through that the University internal income must be enhanced because the University used to run on internal income. The Government never supported Panjab University prior to independence and after independence also when the State was common, most of the University income was from the examination fee. It was the examination fee which was sustaining the University. The University always had internal income. Whenever they ask the Government(s) to provide grants, the Government always asks the University to enhance the internal income. When the conduct of examination of schools went out of the University System, then the internal income had to be substantially enhanced. So the self-sustaining campus were commenced with the purpose of enhancing the internal income. At one time, the deficit was Rs.48 crores and 40% of that came to Rs.19.3 crores but the Punjab Government said that they would give only Rs.16 crores. How could they meet the deficit? An easy

way was thought that the engineering course be started and a fee of Rs.50-60,000 per student be charged and if they admit 50 students per stream and 4 streams be started, then they could earn around Rs.1.40 crores. An amount of about Rs.30-40 lacs would be spent and there would be a saving of Rs.1 crore and by the time, they would reach 4<sup>th</sup> year, an amount of Rs.4 crores would be earned. It is this kind of a thought that the internal income of the University from the campus part of the University was created to be enhanced. It continued for some years. In 2006 when the new Vice-Chancellor came, he again had a pressure and what could he do. They reached the year 2007 when the students from the engineering courses passed out and got employment. So, the internal income again had to be enhanced. Either the fee be increased all across the courses as is a proposal being made that 10% fee be increased for all the courses. Professor K.N. Pathak had generated the income by starting self sustaining courses in 2000-2001, (i.e., 2006-2007). By that time, the UGC had come out with many schemes, like, opening of newer Centres. So, lots of Centres were opened and courses were commenced. But in these, the fee was not that was prevailing in the traditional departments. These fees were somewhere between the engineering and traditional fees. So, the income of the University from the students studying in the campus, that portion was enhancing but not increasing all across the board. New courses are for the new students, and the fee increase(s) apply only to the new students. A little income had to be enhanced, that could be enhanced from those courses. The time passed. When he became the Vice-Chancellor and the first meeting of the Board of Finance happened, then there was no MHRD/UGC representative in the meeting. Only the representatives of the U.T. Chandigarh and Punjab were there in the meeting. The finance officers of the U.T. also belong to the Punjab cadre. The Punjab Government had already frozen its contribution and the officers of the Punjab Government asked PU to increase the fee, under this budget head. So, at such a suggestion, they tried to enhance the income. When they tried to enhance the income, somehow it could not be published in the Handbook of Information in time. Since it could not be put in the Handbook of Information, they could not enhance the tuition fee for one year. But the Punjab Government again asked. By that time, the representative of the MHRD had started to come to the Board of Finance meetings. Everybody noticed as to where the income could be enhanced and it was surmised that the University students are not contributing enough to the internal income of the University. As is being proposed now that the fee be enhanced by 10% all across the board. Then it was said that it be increased only @ 5% all across the board on the fee level of 2016. In the case of a course where the fee was Rs.1 lac, the increase would be Rs.5,000/- whereas in the course where the fee is Rs.2,000/-, the increase would be just Rs.100/-. So, this was immediately found very incongruous. Some students said that why they should pay extra Rs.5000/- as compared to Rs.100/- by other students. So, they decided that the hike should be minimum Rs.500/- and the maximum Rs.1,500/-. When the matter came to the Senate, there was the same sentiment that the fee should not be enhanced. The students also protested. They narrowed down that band and it was fixed as minimum Rs.500 and the maximum Rs.1,200/-. So, it continued for two years. When a meeting was held on 15<sup>th</sup> December, presided over by the MHRD Secretary, the UGC Chairman was also there and then another issue came up that Panjab University is not charging the tuition and examination fees as are being charged by the Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University. The students of the Panjab University campus are privileged ones. So, the University was asked to enhance the tuition fee and also impose a development charge on all the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University in the same way like the Directorate of Sports and College Bhawan had been constructed. To run and maintain the campus, all across the board, a development charge should be levied. The tuition fee should at least be enhanced to the extent being charged by Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University. This all is recorded in those letters/affidavits that the University has received. In the background of all this, there was a big Committee of University Professors having Professors from UIET, UIPS, Chemical Engineering, traditional Departments, self-sustaining Departments. The Committee held so many meetings under the Chairpersonship of the Dean of University Instruction. He (Vice-Chancellor) was not a part of the Committee. This Committee had

checked each and every department as to where there was a scope for enhancement of fee and where not. The Committee took an implicit decision that all the students should have a share in the enhanced fee. It should not be such that in one case the burden on a student is only Rs.100/- while on the other, it is Rs.3,000/-. The Committee submitted this proposal in this background. As of today, the income of the University is Rs.60 crores and this has to be enhanced to Rs.90 crores within a period of 3-4 years. The source of income of the University is examination, tuition fee and a little income from some other sources. Every head has to contribute in the internal income of the University. This was first told and later on it was also put in the affidavit in the SLP the Panjab University is given an amount of the order of Rs.200 crores every year and the number of students is in the range of 12000-15000. So, the contribution of the Central Government per student on the campus is over Rs.1 lac per student. So, there is a need to cap the deficit otherwise if it is Rs.200 crores this year, next year it would be Rs.220 crores, Rs.250 crores the year after next Rs.300 crores the year thereafter. The per student contribution of the Central Government should be capped in some way. At present, the grants to the University are given from the non-plan budget of the Central Government. Therefore, in October, 2013 it was decided that the deficit of Rs.163 crores plus 8% increase on that would be met by the Central Government. So in those documents of the Government, there is nothing more than an increase of 8% or 10%. The year 2016-17 is an exceptional year when the Central Government gave an increase of 15% to every Centrally funded institution, which earlier was kept at 10-12%. But the increase for Panjab University was zero. That was the anxiety of the University. So whatever the proposal is submitted by this Committee of University Professors headed by the Dean of University Instruction, it is all in that background. The Centre had asked the IITs to enhance the fee which would apply only to the future students and not to the existing students otherwise there could be court cases on the plea that they had joined the course on such and such terms. The Committee could not consider this thing that the fee all across the board should be enhanced by a heavy percentage. The Committee could suggest the hike in fee of Rs.500 to Rs.1200 or some fixed percentage. If the fee is enhanced by a fixed percentage, in some cases the increase would be very less while in other cases, it would be very high. The Committee kept in view the fee which the students are paying in the Colleges of U.T. or Punjab for B.A./B.Com./B.Sc. and recommended that the minimum fee in the University be fixed at Rs.10,000/- and in the courses where the fee is higher than other courses, the increase could be about Rs.18-20,000/-. There is some unwritten rationale that the Committee followed. Nothing such has been explained anywhere in the minutes. He had asked the Dean of University Instruction as why the fee has not been increased across the board, why in some of the courses, the fee had not been enhanced at all, why in some courses the fee has been reduced. This is the kind of a comprehension that he got by personally talking to some of the members. When the fee hike proposal was accepted on 26<sup>th</sup> March meeting of Senate, it was accepted in that background and the President of the Students Council had continuously participated in the meetings who said that all the students in income group of up to Rs.10 lacs should be given some concession. It is in this background that parleys have continued with not all but some of the students' representatives. Some suggestions have also been made by those students to increase the band. As Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal had talked about the girl of an Anganwari worker, they could not deprive such students of education. If such students come in the merit, the University would enable them to study. So, it was suggested that every teacher of the Department would carefully examine the admission form of the students, would have discussions with the students and ensure that no child is deprived of the education. So, the proposal which is before them, it is in that kind of a background. It is not that there could not be an alternative proposal, alternative proposal could be there but the target could not be changed and that target is that the income which presently is Rs.60 crores, during the next 3-4 years, they have to increase it up to Rs.90 crores. The UGC asked the University to provide the projections for the next 4-5 years and until that projection is given, the case of the University for enhancement in grant would not be taken up for consideration. The UGC had even written, though now they are backtracking, that if the

University did not submit the projections, it would have to bring the deficit to zero. Whatever grant is being given would not be refused but for the next year, the case of the University could be considered only when the University would submit the details as to when the deficit of Rs.176 crores would be brought down to zero. This is very strange condition that the UGC put. When all these things were made known to the Court, then there was backtracking. The capping (of UGC) meant that on what amount the enhancement be capped per year. The 8% increase at one point of time was decided, the Government is now saying to cap that 8%. It is the annual enhancement that the Government wanted to cap over the next few years. So, this is the talk that the Government is doing now.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that it is only an interim arrangement. There is a letter of 7<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 by the HRD Ministry to the Secretary, UGC, a copy of which has been supplied with the agenda.

The Vice-Chancellor intervened to say that if the SLP had not been filed, such letters would not have come to their knowledge.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal read out a few lines from the letter "funding of Panjab University under non-plan is not a new item of expenditure... is not to be considered as a special grant... there is scope to attending of funding of Panjab University from within their non-plan grant...for inclusion of requirement of Panjab University in composite demand of UGC, the UGC will have to make an assessment after critical examination of the requirement excluding the share of the Punjab Government of Rs.21 crores, and the funds generated by the University from its self-financing courses...this assessment should be sent to the bureau at the earliest and not later by June 2013 so that it could be included in the projection to be made by the Ministry of Finance for finalization of the revised estimates". In the letter dated 25<sup>th</sup> September 2013, it is written that "while the assessment is being finalized, the UGC may work out an interim amount and disburse it to Panjab University out of its non-plan head". This again is the letter by the Ministry to the Secretary, UGC. In the last part, it is mentioned that "since there is scope for attending to funding of Panjab University by UGC under non-plan head, the UGC should undertake inclusion of annual requirement of the University". This decision is a dynamic one as is being visualized by the Government. "it should undertake inclusion of annual requirement of the University in its budget projection every year". Every year, it is a continuous process. He appreciated the office staff who had done it well. It has further been explained that the exercise has not been done and the matter did not go the CCEA. Again it is written that "it may be noted that allocation of Rs.163 crores has been included in the Revised Estimates for the year 2013-14 allocation in respect of UGC non-plan head for Panjab University...for R.E. 2014-15, a uniform growth of 8% has been given". So, this is only for one year. Therefore, he suggested that all these things be made known to the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the exercise was not done and unilaterally (they) stopped the grants. All these documents had been submitted and that is why the High Court is giving the relief; why even the Supreme Court is ready to give the relief to Panjab University.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be brought to the notice of the House that when the SLP was filed, what was the order of the Supreme Court. According to him, none of the members of the Senate has been conveyed that what order has been passed on 10<sup>th</sup> April to which the Vice-Chancellor said that all the orders have been given. To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that this has been given now. Nowhere it has been said what was the order passed on 10<sup>th</sup> April.



The Vice-Chancellor said that the order of 10<sup>th</sup> April was uploaded on the website of the Supreme Court on 1<sup>st</sup> May.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor must be knowing as to what was the order as he was in the Supreme Court on that day.

The Vice-Chancellor said that verbally something is said and something otherwise gets written.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that according to his knowledge, the direction given by the High Court that release Rs.30.5 crores has been stayed by the Supreme Court to which the Vice-Chancellor said, 'yes'. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that but it has not been brought to anybody's notice and the Vice-Chancellor is saying that the Supreme Court is giving the relief.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, the direction was stayed but before that itself Ministry of Human Resource Development has accepted in the last week of March and released Rs.21.73 crores. The stay is only on Rs.8 crores.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the High Court gave a relief and as per the directions an amount of Rs.30.5 crores should have been released. He was wondering all these days that when the Supreme Court had not stayed that order, the SLP is pending, does it not amount to the contempt of Court on the part of the UGC who have not released Rs.30.5 crores. He was also wondering why the University is not filing the contempt case. Then only he thought that there has to be something in the order which has been passed by the Supreme Court because the UGC could not defy the order of the High Court. There, he found a line that, that order was stayed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the order was stayed only on 10<sup>th</sup> April. But Justice Saron took cognizance of it that since the SLP is pending and the UGC counsel said that the matter is pending, Justice Saron said that until the Supreme Court says something, he would not come in the way. In the meantime, the MHRD gave a direction to release an amount of Rs.21 crores to the University. The UGC took 10 more days to release the amount of Rs.21.73 crores. The matter of contempt was not by Panjab University but by the President, PUTA in the Court that there becomes contempt. But the University did not press for any such thing as they were dealing with the Government.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they did not go for the contempt because the issue was already under consideration in the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court finally stayed that order. In the meantime, the MHRD notwithstanding the order passed by the Punjab and Haryana High Court, directed the UGC to release Rs.21 crores. MHRD was within its purview even to order release Rs.40 crores but that did not change the status of their case which was pending in the Supreme Court. The fact of the matter is that the orders passed by the Punjab and Haryana High Court are stayed by the Supreme Court and notwithstanding what is happening in the Court, the Government of India has already about Rs.190 crores for the year 2016-17 and probably for this current financial year, they have released Rs.20 crores also as he has come to know about it from the media. It was only to bring to the notice of the House. Now if the Vice-Chancellor permitted him, he could continue further otherwise Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal would be talking.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he personally felt that in the whole matter, they all could not do anything. Certain things are being forced on the University. As he had said in the beginning, that there is no space to talk outside, he would like to talk here. The University has raised its hands and that is due to some others whose responsibility is to provide education to the students. It is the primary duty of the

Government to provide for education and health as taxes are collected by the Government. If the Government did not enhance the grants to the University and asked the University to enhance the fee. Since in B.A. courses, the lab work is not involved, the increase could be minimal while in some other courses where the expenditure on the studies is more, the increase could be a little higher. Even in some courses, the fee earlier was prescribed less keeping in view the necessity and the situation of those times. He furthered his argument that 10% increase could be effected as is the view of most of the members, they would have to work it out as to how much money they would collect through this. But according to him, as the Vice-Chancellor had said that the income was Rs.60 crores, it would be Rs.66 crores and the next year it would Rs.72.6 crores, then Rs.80 crores and then Rs.88 crores.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this would apply to all the students. The existing students would also have to pay 10% extra fee like an engineering student of 2<sup>nd</sup> year would have to pay 10%, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> year student would also have to pay 10% extra. The student going from the 3<sup>rd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> years in the next year, he/she would have to pay 20% extra.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the self-financing courses were started only to generate income. When the University has to advertise its course, they should distinguish the self-financing courses from the traditional courses so that the students could know that he/she is taking the admission on such and such prescribed fee in such and such department. The uniformity in the fee could be brought only through this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not switch back the clock 17 years now. Anyway, these decisions are taken collectively by all the members. His personal opinion/decision does not matter in it. He has taken part in getting the recommendations of the Committee approved, he was convinced of the arguments that the Committee gave to him. He is personally convinced given the fact that in enhancing the fee 10% all across the board, the people would say that the Government of India did not give any direction to enhance the fee of the existing students even in IITs, NITs. He got convinced with the proposal that came to him because he found some rationale in the Committee's proposal. The Committee did not submit the table of fee. But he got this table prepared on his own initiative. He got all the old Handbooks of Information and asked the Finance and Development Officer to have a look on all the old records. He did not have a deep understanding of these things but he was convinced of the arguments given the facts as they were presented to him.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath first of all congratulated the Vice-Chancellor because she salutes those persons who fight legal fights even against the higher authorities because they have the guts to fight for their rights. The Vice-Chancellor had contested in a very nice way and with guts against MHRD and UGC. For that, she appreciated the concern of the Vice-Chancellor for the interest of the University during this financial crisis. When she got the agenda, she could not understand as to what they were going to discuss in the meeting because the agenda for the special meeting was only to discuss the financial condition. As a legal person, as the information has been given that both the Hon'ble High Court and the Supreme Court have been very kind to accommodate the Panjab University given the financial condition and the Courts were giving very short dates and on various occasions, the Courts have even granted the interim relief also. So, she believed that as the matter is already sub-judice, discussion on this and information of all the documents could be placed before the Senate members for information only. Any discussion on the issue could happen over arguments even before the Supreme Court and the High Court because the matter is parallel being argued there. When the matter is already fixed on 15<sup>th</sup> May in the High Court and 4<sup>th</sup> July in the Supreme Court, according to her, no more discussion could be held on this agenda. Regarding the fee

agenda, she is thankful to Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and persuasion of the members, that this meeting has been converted from a special meeting to an ordinary meeting. The decision on fee hike was taken in the Senate meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> March, 2017 and according to her, on the same day all the students' organizations/bodies started raising protests and agitation started in the University campus against the fee hike because it an impression was given that they are about to increase the fee 1100% to all the ordinary residents. This was being objected by various organizations and also the ordinary person that this would deprive the kids from getting education in the University campus. On 26<sup>th</sup> March, 2017 when the protest started, this incident is the unfortunate incident in the history of Panjab University that happened on 11<sup>th</sup> April. There was a lot of gap between 26<sup>th</sup> March and 11<sup>th</sup> April. There was an advance notice by the students' bodies that they would be protesting at a very high level on 11<sup>th</sup> April. The authorities that were holding the Chair or officiating on the Chair as a Vice-Chancellor on that day because she has heard the Dean of University Instruction (DUI) and the statement given by the DUI that he went to meet the students and told them that he could not do anything. Whatever statement he gave to the students, she believed that as a mother, as a lady member, as a female, as a Senator, if they are trying to persuade the students that these are the circumstances and they are under compelling circumstances and compelled to do it but anyway after considering the facts they could have a special meeting of the Senate on this issue. Many of the Senators signed on the statement of the students that a special meeting of the Senate be called on this issue. But there was no agenda on that issue in this special meeting. The DUI gave a statement that he went to the students to tell them that he could not do anything, then there was no occasion to go to the students because whatever the Vice-Chancellor would have gone and told the students that they could request the authorities or Senate members to hold a special meeting considering these circumstances. The impression which they all gathered and Shri Naresh Gaur has rightly pointed out that they are representing various organizations. She has been elected from the Registered Graduates' Constituency for three terms. When she goes to the residents and even to her colleagues in the High Court the question she faces is that what is happening in Panjab University, what is wrong with the Panjab University administration, why the Panjab University administration allowed to happen such a bad incident on 11<sup>th</sup> April. If the DUI would have held the meeting with the authorities and the Vice-Chancellor would have held the meeting with the students' bodies from 26<sup>th</sup> March to 11<sup>th</sup> April, according to her, the situation would not have happened.

The Vice-Chancellor said that 4 meetings were held.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that but they were not able to convince the students. As per the information of the students' organizations, the students have also been visiting the members also, when the Vice-Chancellor and the DUI came, they said that they have no alternative except to do it. This was the only reply which was given by the students' organizations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not correct, the DUI did not go and made that statement on that day.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that if from 26<sup>th</sup> March to 11<sup>th</sup> April, a special meeting could be called on an issue which is already sub-judice before the Hon'ble High Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court, why a special meeting was not convened on that issue. That is a matter of concern. They invited the situation to be worsened. They waited from 26<sup>th</sup> March to 11<sup>th</sup> April and they invited the incident of 11<sup>th</sup> April. There are different WhatsApp groups of different bodies and they have got even the videos to that. Some members have shown concern, by the police authorities and even by some students also that some students might not be the students of this organization, this institution. There were 2-3 wrong elements who created the whole scene and as a result from outside persons, the students had to go to the jail and remained in the jail for 4-5 days. Many of

those students were innocent and had examinations especially in the last year. The Vice-Chancellor has done a right thing that they would be withdrawing the cases. Earlier the legal information given to his (Vice-Chancellor) office was wrong that FIR could not be withdrawn because the basis of the FIR was the complaint given by the University officers. When the base is lost, the base of the FIR becomes weak. On that basis that the complaint has been given by the University authorities, that could be done. Being Dean of the Faculty of Law, she shared with the members of this august House that they have a Regional Centre at Ludhiana. She appreciated the Vice-Chancellor that when any faculty member or Chairperson or the Director sends a message to him regarding any problem being faced, he immediately responds that he is in office or at any other place and those persons could come and meet him. Professor Sandhu, Director, Regional Centre, Ludhiana specially came from Ludhiana to Chandigarh to discuss certain things regarding students' problems as well as the student's issues with the DUI's office. The reply which was given by the DUI office is "how you have come, today you were not given any appointment". Today, the Vice-Chancellor has even accommodated all the Senate members by converting a special meeting into an ordinary meeting only seeing the fact that so many members have come from distant places. If a Professor or their own Director comes from Ludhiana to discuss the students' issues and the reply which he gets that he did not have the appointment and when the Director asks as to when he could, he is given an appointment 28 days later on which he could come. This is not the administration. If there are three elements of the University administration, teaching, non-teaching and the students, they have to keep a balance. The students are sitting on the roads for the last 15-20 days, it is a matter of great concern. If as a father or a mother they think if their own kids are sitting on the road, then they would blame the administration. They are the custodian of those children as the students are their own students. Even in families also, whenever there is a dispute, the elders leaving aside their ego have to resolve the matters. But from 26<sup>th</sup> March to 11<sup>th</sup> April, they did not even give a message to the students that they are ready to have discussions with them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that she (Mrs. Anu Chatrath) is not correct. He has held 4 meetings with the students.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that but the reply given by the office was that they could not do anything.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has held 4 meetings with the students. He had asked the President of the Students' Council to call all the Departmental Representatives (DRs) also. Two of the meetings were held in Bhatnagar Hall and the students walked out.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the solution that they are discussing today after so many days. Had they discussed then that they are reducing and coming back to 10% increase, they should have done this homework from 26<sup>th</sup> March to 11<sup>th</sup> April, the situation of 11<sup>th</sup> April would have never come. If they had done this homework prior to the day of 11<sup>th</sup> April, when the students had given the prior information and notice that there would be a protest on 11<sup>th</sup> April, this homework they are doing just now in the special meeting, in that situation they could have done at that time also. If they go in the public, the name of Panjab University, as has rightly been pointed out that some of the seats in the admission would also be affected. If they talk about Panjab University, it is not simple Panjab University of two-three persons, it is a University which has a great reputation. If these types of news appear in the newspapers that Panjab University does not have funds to pay salary to the staff and the statement that there is agitation, tear gas, lathi charge. The moment these news items come, this brings the reputation of Panjab University very down. This would affect the future admissions and the ultimate result for which they have done, that they would not be able to gain. She is very thankful to all the members that they have shown concern for the students today because they are

for the students. If there are no teachers, there would be no teachers. Professor Vijay Nagpal who was Chairperson of the Department of Laws shared with her one incident that there was one IAS officer. At the moment, when he used to come, the IAS officer was smoking. When the officer saw him, he held the cigarette in his hand and for about 15-30 minutes, he kept on talking with him, his total hand was burnt. That was the time in the University when there was a respect of the teachers. There is a need for the teachers also to see their conduct as to why the students do not respect the teachers now. Why the teachers remained and locked their rooms from inside on 11<sup>th</sup> April, whatever may be the correct information, the impression and the information which is in the public that the University administration on 11<sup>th</sup> April, only the DSW, Professor Rattan Singh and the Wardens were before the students and were facing the students. Any authority which does not have the guts, she strongly supported Professor Chaman Lal on this issue that any authority which does not have the guts to face the students, then they have no right to continue.

Shri Varinder Singh said that when the Vice-Chancellor had gone to the students and told them that he would talk with the Governor and the Home Minister. There was a resolution in the House that the complaints be withdrawn on behalf of the Senate. This was resolved. But when the Vice-Chancellor went to talk to the students, he said that he would talk to the Governor and the Home Secretary. He enquired that is it the status of the resolution that they would withdraw the complaints on behalf of the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has to give a half line reason "because of inadvertent involvement".

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice-Chancellor to tell them what is resolved.

Shri Varinder Singh requested as to what is resolved so that there is no confusion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that before he goes and gives a written part, he would send e-mail to all the members.

Shri Varinder Singh said that in the incident, both the parties, the police and the students, were hurt. On that day, Professor Emanuel Nahar, the DSW has also told that there was no official on that day who negotiated with the students. Whenever there is a negotiation between the police and the students, something has to happen as sometimes one of the parties could be in some other mood due to which provocation takes place. It should have been their duty to show greatness which now they have shown by taking a decision that the cases against the students would be withdrawn. Secondly, to see that no such incident happens in future, the Vice-Chancellor should also behave politely with the students like an elder or head of a family and should meet the students. The students, with whom the Vice-Chancellor had held meetings, were part of the meeting in which the decision to enhance the fee was taken. The President and the Secretary of the Council were part of the earlier meetings in which the decision to hike the fee was taken. So, there is no use of holding meetings with those students but they should hold discussions with other students in common.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had invited all the Departmental Representatives (DRs), the executive members and also all those persons who did not win the election. So it is not correct to say so.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the income slabs of Rs.3 lacs, Rs.5 lacs or Rs.7 lacs are not practically possible. There is a reason behind it. The lower income certificate of income up to Rs.2.5 lacs is generally prepared by the Tehsildar. No such certificate of income of Rs.3 lacs or Rs.5 lacs is issued. In this way, how could they verify the income

of students? Even the students in the income group of Rs.10 lacs or Rs.5 lacs could say that they did not have that much income. When they had taken a decision to enhance the examination fee, the students belonging to rural backward areas did not have the knowledge or were not given guidance about the income criteria for exemption in examination fee, and many students could not deposit the examination fee. Now, such students are approaching the Controller of Examinations with requests to allow them to deposit the fee. When they talk about the UGC and MHRD, they did not have a clear stand of their own. According to him, their own stand is not clear. If the UGC has asked the University to raise resources and the same is being done, even then they have to fight with the Government. When the Government asked the University to organize Yoga Day, it did so. When the Government asked to enhance the fee, they did so. But as on date, they are in the same situation and fighting with the Government and visit Delhi and the High Court. The Vice-Chancellor is working hard in the matter in spite of the age and increased stress level, but according to him, the direction of this hard work is not right. The reason behind is that there is no coordination between the Senate and the University officials and the students due to which all these problems are arising. There is no coordination between the teaching, non-teaching, students and the University officials. It is due to the lack of coordination that the incident of 11<sup>th</sup> April happened in which stone pelting took place and students were hurt, which should not have happened. This all happened due to lack of cooperation. Otherwise what is the need to call the police as they are having their own security. This problem has arisen for the last three years. Before that everything was going on smoothly. Why these problems are occurring, everyone knows why it is so. Even then they are discussing why these problems have arisen. It is all due to political reasons, but he did not want to hurt anybody. It is due to a grudge that the funds are not being release. But the University is doing whatever the Government asks. Their own stand is not clear. The fee Government wanted the fee to be hiked in its own as the fee structure that has been prepared along with the comparative fee chart of other universities like Landran, Patiala and Amritsar. It means that they on their own want to enhance the fee. It should be made clear whether the University enhances the fee due to arm twisting by the Central Government and not release of grants by the Punjab Government or the University wanted to enhance the fee at par with other universities. A feeling to fight is not created in them because they have no coordination amongst themselves. Even he has sometimes heard that the Senators do not allow Panjab University to become a Central University, the Senators are scoundrels and they feel ashamed for this as the people say that being Senators, they could do so many things. But he feels ashamed that nobody listened to him. The members have given very good views, he has less knowledge as compared to others, they should adopt the same. The administration could be run with politeness but not with ego. The issues of the students could also be solved in the same manner. It would be easy for the students as also for them. There should be coordination and only then they work together. There should be no discrimination. He has seen that there is lot of discrimination. He requested that with the reports which have been given to the members, along with these the information like who have been assigned the duties and where they have been assigned, who has claimed TA/DA and who has not, all such details should be provided.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he had been talking on this issue for the last four years.

Shri Varinder Singh requested that whenever the papers related with the Courts are provided to the members, all in the papers related to whatever is internally happening in the University should also be provided like such a person has gone for duty, for selection, claimed so much TA/DA or member of such a Committee. The Vice-Chancellor being the head of the University/family has to maintain a balance amongst the members with love. He, including the members, is with the Vice-Chancellor in the efforts he is making. It is right that they have taken a decision to withdraw the cases. The fee

enhancement should also be kept at 10%. Regarding the re-employment, the age of retirement in the Central Government is 60 years, in Punjab Government it is 58 years. Even then the University is going up to the age of 65 years. On some matters, the University does not accept the directions of the Government. If they think it beneficial, they take decision on their own, if not then the matter is sent to the UGC. It meant that there should be transparency. There should be no burden on the students, but everyone should contribute equally.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that according to him, the matter is not only sub-judice under active consideration of the Hon'ble High Court and Supreme Court. This has also been a subject of intensive discussions between the Vice-Chancellor and the MHRD/UGC. It would be a good idea to provide some inputs to strengthen or support the Vice-Chancellor in the difficult task that he is carrying out. He agreed with everybody that the Vice-Chancellor deserves to be congratulated for the success that he has achieved, but that is quite clearly not enough but more is required and they have to strengthen the hands of the Vice-Chancellor by giving the arguments with which he could counter the arguments that he is facing with. He suggested two points and both of these are stamp of discrimination against the University by the UGC as the Vice-Chancellor himself has pointed out and he would like to add to that. The first is the question of the teaching and non-teaching ratio. The Government has been proved wrong in its contention that they are out of sync with similar ratio is being maintained by other centrally funded universities. The Vice-Chancellor has produced facts which prove that the Government is wrong. But quite apart from that, the point that he wishes to make is that when they are talking about the teaching non-teaching ratio, there are two ways of improving it. One is to reduce the number of non-teaching staff and according to him, that exercise has already been undertaken. There has been an audit of the manpower. But beyond a point, they could not do that because the requirements of each University are different. Another way of bringing this ratio in sync with what the UGC desires is to increase the number of teachers. They also have the requirement of teachers and there are vacant posts of teachers but they are not allowed to fill up the posts because of resource crunch. Here, there is a vicious circle being created. He also referred to requirement of another authority NAAC which has problems with the teacher-student ratio and want the University to improve that ratio by increasing the number of teachers vis-à-vis the students. So, the requirement of NAAC as well as UGC could be met by increasing the number of teachers, but they could not do because there is a resource crunch. So, there is a vicious circle. The resource crunch prevents them from improving the ratio and they could not get more resources because they could not improve the ratio. So, this is the argument which should not stand in the way for considering the case on merits and also in the light of the fact that there are other centrally funded universities which are comparable or even worse from point of view of UGC. Second is the question of percentage increase annually. What is the UGC trying to cap, sometimes it says that it is trying to cap the total, sometimes to cap the cap which is rather complicated. But, according to him, it is a very regressive idea to try to determine the requirements of a progressive University by simply considering how much percentage increase it deserves over the last year. That is a recipe for stagnation, in his view. He has been associated with the budget making process in the United Nations' many bodies where they have a concept of zero-based budgeting. There is no question of percentage increase. Every year, one has to start from zero and justify every single item of expenditure by justifying what is going to be spent. If a progressive University which is trying to improve its ranking globally, requires the increase in expenditure in many ways which might be beyond the percentage these people are thinking of. For example, one might use better technology, laboratory equipment, infrastructure, increase or improve interaction with foreign universities which resource crunch is preventing from doing. If one needs to improve the performance of the University in all these areas, and if the goal is to improve the ranking globally and nationally, the only criterion should not be that how much percentage of increase is required over last year. In any case, this should be maintained that the expenditure or the grant in real terms by at least compensating for the increase

in the inflation. When they talk of phasing it, it does not make a sense and again there is discrimination because the Government is allowing increases to other universities beyond what is given to Panjab University. So, it puzzles him. This also brings which he did not want to preempt a discussion on the question of making this University a Central University because that could come only after a process has been gone through. A Committee is working on that and the matter would come to the Syndicate and then to the Senate. But he cautioned that by rushing into a Central University status, he hoped that they are not going to increase the tyranny of the UGC. The UGC's role as a regulatory body has actually been called into question by the HRD Minister himself and is thinking of eliminating its role and giving only limited powers and taking away the regulatory powers. There are independent studies which have shown that the less regulation is there, the better is performance. Actually, there is a correlation between greater autonomy and better performance. He did not want to go into those details and would like to discuss when the question of Central University would come up.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would just like to remind the Vice-Chancellor though his memory is very sharp starting from the year 2012. But before that he would like wholeheartedly like to congratulate the Vice-Chancellor for having submitted the beautifully drafted reply and which he knows is not the job of an Advocate and it is the job of only Professor Arun Kumar Grover. The same confidence they had in 2012 when the Vice-Chancellor came and gave a statement not in this House only but in the Syndicate also that this increase in fee is just symbolic. The universities are not run on the basis of the fee to be charged from the students and he had said it is really belittling that sitting in a University like Panjab University asking for an amount of Rs.10 crores, Rs.20 crores, Rs.50 crores, he wondered, why not ask for Rs.100 crores. He remembered that the Vice-Chancellor made this statement not once, but more than once. They talked of hundreds of crores and Rs.5-6 crores here and there are not going to make the difference and thereafter the Vice-Chancellor had started telling the history of Panjab University, legacy and heritage of the University which they have heard so many times. The Vice-Chancellor used to take pride again and again that are they really part of this University which the Vice-Chancellor is talking about. Thereafter, slowly the year 2014-15 came when the same Vice-Chancellor was under tremendous pressure to increase the fee and at that time also when the proposal to increase the fee had come, when the slab was reduced from Rs.500-1200 which the Vice-Chancellor has mentioned. At that time also, the Vice-Chancellor had said that it is only to satisfy the UGC and the Government and other funding agencies, that the University is also doing something, but do not think that this in any way is going to affect the financial functioning of the University, though that could not be done. They really stated facing the financial constraints contrary to the picture which was there in the mind of the Vice-Chancellor when he had joined, contrary to the hopes which he had given to the Senate and the Syndicate, they started feeling the pinch especially in the beginning of the year 2015. He remembered that in the meeting of the Board of Finance in February 2015, when there were representatives of all including the UGC, he had told at that time that they should be ready with plan B that the hopes that they have from UGC, MHRD and Government of India, if those hopes did not come true, how are they going to face the situation. He remembered that probably it was 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2015 or this way or that way, the Vice-Chancellor had said that by 28<sup>th</sup> February, the pending instalment would be received. The attitude which they have seen, he did not have any hope and had said that it would be very good if that happens but where was the problem if they have plan B that what is to be done in case they did not receive the instalment. Let them try to read the writing on the wall and in the presence of both the members of the Board of Finance, two of them are present in the House, he remembered that the Vice-Chancellor had said "no", they did not want to have any such discussion here. The next meeting of the Board of Finance was held in July and the expected grant, which was expected to be received in February, was not received even up to July. At that time also, it was suggested that at least for the time being, let them try to curtail the expenditure so that they did not have to face a day when they are not able to pay the salaries to the existing staff whether teaching or non-teaching. Somehow, the



impression was taken, not only taken but expressed outside before so many agencies that as if people like Shri Ashok Goyal who are trying to give that suggestion, they themselves are the villains of the University. They are the one, in fact, who are creating hurdles in the functioning of the University. At that time also he had said that he would always like to be corrected wherever he has gone wrong. But his difference of opinion with A or B should never be taken as if he is rival of somebody. He may be having difference of opinion with the Vice-Chancellor, with so many other colleagues but one thing he could tell that as far as Panjab University is concerned, this would always remain his first priority and interest of the Panjab University would always be there in his mind and whatever he could do for this University, he would always be willing to do. As Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal he could afford, he in fact has shown his grace by showing how much love he has for this University, his alma mater. He knew so many people who are giving lectures and who are expecting from the alumni of Panjab University that after they have got so much from the University, after they settle, after they excel in their field, let them come and contribute and pay back to the University. Those who are giving the lectures, he found that they have not contributed even a single penny for the University though they themselves are the alumni of the University. So he congratulated Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal for at least doing something practically only to encourage and inspire others also to follow the suit. He is not happy that what he could read in 2015 has come true in 2017. He is not happy about it. It is his misfortune that he was calculating that the things would be coming. But he is happy at least that if the Vice-Chancellor was not agreeing to him in 2014 or 2015, and even not agreeing with him today, at least internally he (Vice-Chancellor) would agree that what he was saying 2-3 years earlier, was a fact, a truth. Secondly, on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2015, when they met in the Syndicate, it was a Sunday. On 30<sup>th</sup> July, there was a delegation of the students who met the Vice-Chancellor where by chance he was also present and the then DSW was also present. The agenda in the next day meeting was examination fee hike and tuition fee hike, of course for the year 2017-18, not 2016-17. So, in two hours discussion, though they had planned already that since the fee hike is to be implemented only from the next year, even if they did not take the decision tomorrow, it would not make any difference. But examination fee is to be charged right now, let they take the decision on the examination fee. The students were conveyed that they need not worry, they would withdraw the agenda of tuition fee from tomorrow's Syndicate. As far as examination fee was concerned, they could not do anything, this has to be done and the students were also told that to use their resources, different channels and try to approach the Ministry concerned. They, in fact, are not happy while hiking the tuition fee or examination fee or for that matter any kind of charges. But what they are doing, are doing unwillingly. If all the stakeholders including the students are able to help the University by getting the requisite grants, even if hike has been made, they are willing to roll back. That was the assurance given to the students' delegation. The next day when they met in the Syndicate, he specifically asked the Vice-Chancellor that the item has been brought before the Syndicate for consideration, are they free to consider the item or it is straight implied that it has to be said 'yes' because otherwise also even if they did not agree, the Vice-Chancellor would say to put the matter to vote, and by voting he would get done but they were under the impression and said that whatever decision has to be taken in the best interest of the University, better it would be if it is taken unanimously. The Vice-Chancellor at that time said that they have no option but to accept this recommendation of examination fee hike. As far as tuition fee is concerned, they refer the matter and let take up the matter with the UGC and see how far they succeed and of course, they had got enough time up to March, 2017 and see what happens by that time. It was discussed threadbare in the Syndicate that if this is the situation, then let they not discuss in the Syndicate, whether the hike in examination fee is justified or not, whether there is any rationale or not. Even after having discussed and finally concluded that even a single pie does not deserve to be hiked, the decision has to be, the hike has been approved. Then what for was the discussion. After having threadbare discussion on these lines, it was resolved that they have to evaluate the pros and cons keeping in view the pressure of the UGC and MHRD and also the onslaught of the students which they are going to face.

Only after evaluating, they must take such a decision and it was decided that while talking to the students, they, in no way, have to justify the examination fee hike. They have only to tell them (students) that unwillingly, hesitatingly, the Syndicate had to recommend it to the Senate under the tremendous pressure and unprecedented situation which has been created for the University that this hike has been caused. This was specifically told to the Vice-Chancellor that let them be one and take the students into confidence that in spite of the fact they are one with them, they are forced to take a decision which probably is not to their liking. Let them be transparent. But the agitation was there at that time also. He has no hesitation in saying that Vice-Chancellor and the office of the Vice-Chancellor at that time also said it is not me (Vice-Chancellor) who has hiked the examination fee, it is the Syndicate and Senate, the Governing Bodies, who have hiked the fee and it is the Government of India who is not releasing the grant, thus, completely disowning the responsibility of the hike which was caused under undue pressure which he (Vice-Chancellor) shared with the members of the Syndicate and the Senate in the hall. He is not sure what were the recommendations of the fee hike, on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2016 the item which was deferred. From the statement of the Vice-Chancellor, it looks that after the meeting took place in Delhi in December 2016, it seems that another Committee was constituted as he could not gather because the recommendations which were placed before the Syndicate in July 2016 were probably not from this Committee. But he might be wrong as he is not sure whether these were the same recommendations.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that these were the same recommendations.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether those recommendations from the same Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that these were the same recommendations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that should he take that these recommendations which were approved by the Senate on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2017 were the recommendations made before 31<sup>st</sup> July. He enquired whether Professor Navdeep Goyal is sure.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was deferred.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that these were the same recommendations. Now, he wanted to tell the background wherefrom these figures they reached. He would like to draw the attention of Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and he would like the members of the House to know that the percentage was calculated later on as Shri Bansal has calculated from the chart. The Vice-Chancellor had given that figure in the Syndicate also that unless and until they generate this much amount, the matching amount which they want to demand from the UGC, they (UGC) are not going to come to terms. So, the amount was given first and thereafter it was decided how this amount could be brought by having amounts from here and there. A decision which was being taken painfully by the Vice-Chancellor and his team was ultimately converted into a decision of the commercial organization, not of a public institution, not an institution like Panjab University. He had all the respect for the members of the Committee which has recommended this, but he has no hesitation in saying that the Committee seems to have worked on commercial lines with a view to garner that amount which was given to them to be garnered by the Vice-Chancellor. As any fruit seller does, as any trader does that he picks up the best quality from the same lot, he distributes those items in different rates. So, they distributed different lots from the same lot and starting evaluating that a particular course in the University is very popular, this is the best saleable item, let them increase the rate. The MBA course of Panjab University which is very much in demand, which has a fee of only Rs.8-10,000/-, this is saleable, let them increase it to Rs.1 lac which is causing 1100% increase. He told that even with this 1100% increase, no seat is going to be vacant in the University Business School. All of those seats are going to be

filled, but at whose cost, at the cost of those who would not be able to afford. And who would be benefitting, those who are capable of purchasing the education from a commercial organization. Similarly, as the Vice-Chancellor very rightly said that they were compelled to start the self-financing courses only to meet their requirement to substantiate traditional courses. The UGC came with heavy hands, before the Vice-Chancellor had joined, that as far as the self-financing courses are concerned, they (UGC) are not going to give any grants against this. The University could generate its own funds and pay from those funds to the teachers or non-teaching staff and not taking into consideration in the budget because these are self-financing courses. Otherwise, if they go into the history and the Finance and Development Officer would be able to tell how the nomenclature of self-financing courses was changed to partially self-financing. Those self-financing courses also which were started with a view to support the other traditional courses, according to him, more or less all of those self-financing courses have also started going into losses because probably, their projections were not right. If any such Department is still in profit, in one or two years, that is also going to be in losses. At that time also he had said that the cost benefit analysis of everything has to be done in advance before taking further steps. But in the University they have been taking the steps first and thereafter doing the cost benefit analysis. If he says, of course, it is felt that he says as per his wish. Thereafter, the issue of increasing the fee came. Unfortunately, whenever the fee was hiked, did they know as to which were the soft target, the traditional courses were the soft target and in self-financing courses in the name of already charging higher fee, there was no hike on the plea that they were already charging higher fee. The courses which were started for supporting the traditional courses, in fact, started getting the support from the traditional courses, in reverse, which is shown in the figures. As has been said that in those self-financing courses also, he is not against it as he is also part of the decision which was taken in the interest of the teachers of the University, non-teaching staff and the Colleges that the wards of staff working in the University and the affiliated Colleges would be entitled to 50% concession in all the courses. At that time also, they did not think that is there any way on their part that they could sacrifice something in the interest of the University. No, because they have one very good channel in the form of students and the society to grab funds from, why should one spend from his pocket. Slowly, the item came for approval of fee hike on 26<sup>th</sup> March. Unfortunately, because of the circumstances beyond his control, he could not attend that meeting. Otherwise, he could have shared these things on day also. Somehow, as he has been told as somebody in the morning was touching or maybe Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal was touching that he has gone, that most of the members in the House had opposed the fee hike in 26<sup>th</sup> March meeting. But the unanimous resolution barring, dissent of probably 6 persons, the decision was to effect the hike.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that rest of the members, in spite of the fact that they have spoken against the hike, he did not know how they agreed to that, probably again under the same compulsion as the Vice-Chancellor must have explained to them. In the meantime, they were already in the High Court, may be because of *suo moto* notice and they presented their case very well. The same High Court, he appreciated the High Court and the Hon'ble Judge who took *suo moto* notice of the happening in the University that on a statement given by the Vice-Chancellor in the Senate that the University would be closing on 1<sup>st</sup> January if they did not get the grants and the warning which he gave to the Senate, the warning probably the Senators did not receive in that spirit or not. He is happy that the voice reached the High Court and they took *suo moto* notice only to ensure that this heritage University is not allowed to close and took *suo moto* notice. It is very good that he understands that the Vice-Chancellor presented the case of Panjab University himself in the High Court and legally fought in an efficient manner though he had requested the Vice-Chancellor that as and when there would be next hearing in the Court, to please give him a message and he would also like to attend the Court. The Vice-Chancellor had assured that he would send a sms and he should come. That sms is yet to come to him. But still he has heard from the public and the media that the Vice-Chancellor excelled while presenting the case in the Court. Unfortunately, though they

were expecting that the grants would be released as per the directions of the High Court by 20<sup>th</sup> or 21<sup>st</sup> from the UGC, but they (UGC) preferred to file the SLP. He also remembered that when the Vice-Chancellor explained the compulsion of hiking the examination and tuition fee, what Shri Varinder Singh has said, that after having done so much and after having drawn so much criticism from the society also, if the situation is the same as it was on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2015, what have they gained. The Vice-Chancellor had given the assurance that let they do it provided the UGC also comes down to the terms that since the University has increased 12% and it is also willing to give 12%. But there is no such stand of the UGC as of today. He came to know yesterday only when he got a copy of the short affidavit filed by the Registrar wherein he came across the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and he came to know that the direction given by the High Court to release Rs.30.5 crores has been stayed by the Supreme Court which has neither been reported in the media anywhere, which has neither been shared by the Vice-Chancellor anywhere who was there on that day, which has neither been shared by the Registrar though he has been sending so many messages, though only a set of people which is named as University administration, he wondered the members of the Senate are considered to be the part of the University or not, he has never received any such information. He also shared this with 15 members of the Senate also who are not from the University, they have also not got any such information. Thus, giving an impression as if they are not at all in any way the stakeholders of Panjab University in spite of the fact they are not only the alumni but are also part of the society which, in fact, is to be served by Panjab University. The students, which were apprehended on that such a big hike, would be protesting in a bigger way, because after all it has happened for the first time that such a big hike in one stroke has been caused by Panjab University and if they thought that there would be no protest and if they thought the students would not go out of control, that is a miscalculation on their part and not on anybody's part. If the Dean of University Instruction has explained that on 11<sup>th</sup> April, he was not a fool that he would go out and meet the students specially after having faced the situation on 8<sup>th</sup>, he wondered, if in a University like this if the DUI is also not safe, he does not know till 7<sup>th</sup> May who were those people who were surrounding him on 7<sup>th</sup> May, whether they were policemen or musclemen or University security or some goonda elements, who were they. Has the University bothered to find out who were they? If a DUI finds himself to be unsafe, he wondered, is there anybody who is safe, what to talk of students. It is really very surprising and he demanded that an enquiry be instituted to find out as to who were those persons and how and under what circumstances, the SHO who had requested the DUI to come out and talk to the students, where was he (SHO), when he (DUI) was talking to the students. Why he (Dean of University Instruction) had to hide and run back to his office because he could sense some mischief which could be there. That is why, he (DUI) took a decision on 11<sup>th</sup> April that he would not go out in such a situation. That is the story which has been shared by the DUI. He was immediately provoked to share because 2-3 Hon'ble members took his name to convey as if the situation was not handled by him in an appropriate manner. So, he wanted to clarify and that is he clarified very well. But the same 2-3 members have asked time and again that in such a situation where was the Vice-Chancellor on that day. The Vice-Chancellor has been clarifying the things in-between. But the Vice-Chancellor has preferred not to reply to it at all that what was the emergent situation which made the Vice-Chancellor to be absent from the scene knowing fully well that what could be happening on 11<sup>th</sup> April. If the DUI knew that something wrong had happened on that day, he is sure between 8<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>, the Vice-Chancellor also must have been conveyed by him (DUI) that this is what happened on that day. If the Vice-Chancellor did not know, if the DUI did not know even then that what could be happening on 11<sup>th</sup> April, then again it is a miscalculation. If the Chandigarh Police which was called at the behest of Panjab University, which has already come to the University with tear gas, if they could come here well prepared, he says that he did not know what could happen. The University knew it very well that an unprecedented hike is going to be replied with an unprecedented agitation. He remembered, he wanted to share it with the House, that there was a strike once, generally the strike used to take place or start from the Department of Laws and it was

always thought that the students of the Department of Laws have come to the University only for this work. There was a strike, lot of sloganeering, lot of violence was expected, the Vice-Chancellor got from his office, went to the Department of Laws on foot all alone. There were lathis in the hands of the students. He went and got lathi from one student's hands and said that what a student has to do with lathi, it should be handed over to him as he is an old man. All the students were so much emotional and highly sensitive that the Vice-Chancellor himself has come to them and the Vice-Chancellor asked the students to go and held discussions later one, the agitation was called off. He could not say that the situation could be held the same way on 11<sup>th</sup> April also. But, nobody stops from introspection that somewhere they have gone wrong that head of the family is missing from the scene. He is sure that there must be some very emergent and compelling circumstances definitely more compelling than meeting the MHRD Minister in the same connection because he happened to read the statement given by the Vice-Chancellor that he was supposed to go to MHRD Minister or the officials on that particular day. But, because of the situation here, he could not go because the situation was very emergent. Then again it is not only on 11<sup>th</sup> April, again on 21<sup>st</sup> April there was a scheduled rally of the students or some bandh, again the Vice-Chancellor was not there. He is not accusing anybody, again on 21<sup>st</sup> April, the DUI was not there and they could see the transparency of the University, he read it from the newspaper that such and such person who was officiating as DUI met such and such person. He wondered where is the hierarchy fixed into the seniority to be officiating DUI. He tried to find out from his sources which say that there are 30-40 Professors in the seniority between the seniority of DUI and the one who has been handed over the charge of officiating DUI. This is the transparency. Then he tried to find it from the other channel which said that the Vice-Chancellor has fixed the hierarchy in such a way that after the DUI, it is Director, Research and after that some Associate Director Research or Coordinator or member or so and so. He wondered when such a decision had been taken. He knew that the Dean Research used to be the next senior person to DUI when the Dean Research was also appointed on the basis of seniority. Obviously, that person was next senior person to DUI and was the next person to be handed over the charge of the officiating DUI. But they should see how the things are going. He has no hesitation in saying that he (Vice-Chancellor) should see it in the right perspective that there are only a handful of people who are Senators and non-Senators who are running the University. All the selections which are being made in the Colleges, all the inspections which are being made in the Colleges, all the Committees which are taking the significant decision, they could find the same very people, the same set of people, at the cost of one set of people which is totally being ousted from any decision making in the University. Why is he saying so, that this Vice-Chancellor has best of the intention to serve the interest of the University. But, unfortunately, he thinks that only his yes men would be allowed to come near him and those who have very different ideas would be completely shut. Those people are not only giving him (Vice-Chancellor) right feedback, they might be given wrong feedback also, may be intentionally or unintentionally.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma requested the Vice-Chancellor to ask Shri Ashok Goyal to conclude.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is sitting since morning.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everybody is sitting since morning.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice-Chancellor not to loose temper.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to conclude.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is concluding.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that others have also to speak.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to conclude.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that nobody has right to interrupt except the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is asking him to conclude.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is concluding within 10 minutes.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would not give him 10 minutes and has given him time to speak out of turn.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there must be some limit.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked the Vice-Chancellor why he is losing temper.

Professor Keshav Malhotra got up to intervene to say that why he (Vice-Chancellor) is reacting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would conclude the meeting if he behaves like this.

Shri Ashok Goyal proposed that irrespective of the fact what the pressures are, they are also answerable to the society, he said that there should be an enquiry to find out wherever the excesses have been committed by the police vis-à-vis the staff of the University, the office of the Vice-Chancellor, the office of the DUI and the students also. They have already taken a decision that the criminal complaint filed by the Chief of University Security stands withdrawn and to that effect the Vice-Chancellor is going to write a letter to the concerned authority. He simply wanted to know wherefrom this has come the Chief of University Security has to file the complaint on behalf of the University. Where this decision has been taken? It is only and only the Registrar who is competent to initiate legal proceedings. He remembered that any complaint to the police used to go from the table of the Registrar and under his signatures except when it started in 2013 or 2014 that even in the case of staff working under the Registrar, the Registrar requested the Chief of University Security to file a complaint that such and such person has committed a fraud against the University and there from everything has been passed on to the Chief of University Security. In fact, the representative of the University in this regard is only the Registrar. When somebody said that probably the Registrar also did not know what was the meaning of the sedition, the Registrar immediate said 'no' because probably he knows had the complaint been filed as per the regulation of the University, this chaos would not have been created. It is good that the sedition charge has been withdrawn by the Administration and he is sure that if the complaint is withdrawn by the University, the FIR would also be ultimately cancelled by the Court or as per the other legal options.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to conclude.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just wanted to make the proposal that the fee hike be completely rolled back, but in view of the sentiments of the House, irrespective of the pressure that they have, there should not be 10% increase across the board irrespective of the fact whether it is Rs.2 or Rs.20 or Rs.200.

Professor Shelley Walia said that all is not right with the State of Denmark. When he looks at the people around the Vice-Chancellor, he is, in fact, overcome by a sense of

despair. He is overcome by a sense of despair because it symbolizes what is happening in the world right across from West to Europe to India. It symbolizes the politics of fear, the politics of surveillance. He thought that what it symbolizes is also the whole idea of world being constructed and borders being carved out to keep the people away. Here in this particular Senate, he is thinking only in terms of breaking those walls which have actually come in between the academic and the students, between the State and the public. He is not going to pull any punches and he thought that he needs to be very frank here. He is saying that he would be frank here because he is not ready to **hover** any kind of institutional authoritarianism which seems to be taking over the world. When he talks of institutional authoritarianism, what he really means is corporate control sham democracy that seems to be working around the world and taking shape. They academics and intellectuals who believe in the whole idea of indispensability of dissent remain slight inadequate. They do not speak up really. Today, according to him, they need to speak up because there is certain kind of lacking of that energy with which they could face tough debate and the tough debate realizes the fact to ask themselves a question why is it that nothing is really right with Denmark. When he talks of the authoritarianism that they have derived who like to speak against not power under, he would like to ask the House that how many of them do realize that they are actually going through a stage where the Government is trying to change the University. In modern times, according to him, this is unprecedented that the University is coming under such control by the Government that they, as academics, are not educated enough, are not using the appropriate language or lacks in one to hit out at the Government in order to show to it that there are certain responsibilities that it has towards the students, University and to the public as such. When he is talking of this, he is talking in terms of asking himself a question really that are they really complicit with the Government, with the authoritarian agencies in totally dismantling the values that go with the education, the University and those values which they need to preserve as such and if that is the case, they need to look within themselves. There is a State which according to him, for the academic, the political leader is bereft of all energies to face up a debate which is very essential and necessary today. According to him, this kind of a debate brings in a sense of outrage, it brings in a sense of offence to him. He is offended because this debate takes them nowhere because they do remain quiet and do not raise question to the Government, do not question the State because the State also lacks the energy to really come out and go into a debate with them. If that is the case that what they need really to grasp, what they really need to look at is that they are being governed by a very new liberal State where scaling down of all kind of public funding, scaling down of public investment, scaling down of social welfare schemes and they are not making the people alert to what really is happening around them. They are really talking in terms of whether the fee is to be increased or not. But he is actually facing a larger issue which seems to be taking over the world as such. There are larger issues which are concerning him and therefore he would like to be heard because what he really emphasizing is that he sees a kind of end to the very reason what Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said. The very reason and the very idea of democracy that they are talking of, he is saying that the very idea, the very reason of the University is being demolished with this kind of attitude that they have. Why he is saying so is because he is against the idea of outrage, because he did not think that the State has really done its work what, in fact, it is supposed to do to fund the education all over the world. Demonstrations are taking place all over the world. People are demonstrating saying why they should not do it. The solution to it would be that jointly the students and the teachers get together and put pressure on the State. He did not know whether Professor Ronki Ram would corroborate what he is saying that Mr. Alagh, the then Vice-Chancellor of Jawaharlal Nehru, when a strike was going on in JNU, he joined the students and said they would demonstrate together against the State and then they won that demand because the students, teachers and the administration were together. But here, he feels that the wall, the idea of surveillance, the idea of fear, the idea of barricades that seem to be coming up which make a difference to him when he sees the barricades all around. It seems something like hiding behind the barricades, slowly, slightly being led into the Senate Hall. Why should there be police

present on the campus, if there is enough dialogue as such. Therefore, when they do arrive at the idea of 10% hike or roll back or anything of that sort, let them pause for a second and see that if 10% or roll back is going to silence the Government. Would the Government say that now the matter is solved, the students' agitation is over and therefore its role is again finished. Do they think that with this little agitation, which was essential, which was necessary, though it went awry, though according to him they were caught on back foot, otherwise, if there had been a dialogue, they would have talked to the students, brought about the solution in which they had failed. But, let them say that if they roll back and peace descends on the University, then the Government is also going to wind it up. But it is not so, they together ought to exert enough pressure on the Government and exert pressure so that the political economic doctrine of neo liberalism that he is talking of, which is taking over the University, is brought to an end. That neo-liberalism is one which actually is turning universities into business houses, to take control of the universities as such. Therefore, if that is the case, let them put pressure on the Government. What happens in Chile is the fact that in the last 3 months, and the people know about it that the students have actually succeeded along with the teachers to have absolutely free education and he does not know how many people are aware of it. It is very essential that finally education is the subject for public, it is for the Government to look after and they could have free education for all, that would be an ideal State. But then it becomes very essential that they jointly put pressure on it. His idea is that they roll back but roll back after the Government reaction and response is visible that yes it is going to help. But till then let them roll back the present fee. Lastly, he complimented Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal on his gesture. What he has done should be really across the country, across the world that there is an alumnus who is present here, who took this innovative action and this inspires other people to take equal action. The last point he made was that many years ago when he became a member of the Senate and was put on a Committee and sent on a couple of Inspection Committees with Shri Ashok Goyal. According to him, that is the reason his name is clubbed with Shri Ashok Goyal often and sent with him and what he saw something there which is very important. He has been saying it so many times that when the College paid him an honorarium of Rs.800/- for the inspection, he accepted it. But when the College paid this honorarium to Shri Ashok Goyal, he (Professor Shelley Walia) was taken aback when he said that he goes for inspection all over Punjab but does not accept any honorarium. He is pointing out this because there are people who are ready to sacrifice, there are people who are ready that the pressure should be put on the teaching community. He is again saying that let them put some pressure on themselves and look within themselves whether they deserve the remuneration for checking of papers, do they deserve the remuneration for scripts checking.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is a very good suggestion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everything has been recorded.

Continuing, Professor Shelley Walia said that these suggestions should be implemented immediately. According to him, since morning it has only been tearing and they have not been practical enough. Let them be practical enough, let them look at the examination system and see the duties of the teachers all around. What are the duties of the teachers, he accepts the papers for checking but does not accept the remuneration. If all decide that if one person goes on flying squad or inspection, one would not accept the remuneration because he/she is getting a good salary of around Rs. 2 lacs. The people all around the world do not accept the money for paper checking or remuneration at all. Let them also take a unanimous decision. He knows it because he has been saying this for the last 6 years. He has said something and it is going to be swept under the carpet, no action is going to be taken. Therefore, at the end of the day, decisions are not made, they keep quiet. They just speak and go away and the discussions, according to him, come to them as cipher. Therefore, let them really move into the matter, let them be



more pragmatic and practical and not theoretical that these discussions just end up in academic discussions.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the fee hike has been the epicenter of the whole of the situation and of this episode. When they talk about the fee, it also brings into discussion the role of the State. Within the State, two organizations are the most important while dealing with the University, the MHRD and the UGC. It is said that the State has become really very harsh on the universities. But the question is that when was the State not really harsh. Is it today or was it also yesterday. There was Government before this. That Government had a Minister of HRD, that Government had a Prime Minister, an alumnus of PU. But what did that Government do to make a permanent solution to the problem. It is very easy to accuse somebody because they know it, they got the grant. But the grant was not made into a permanent solution to the problem. They knew that even their own Shri Ashok Thakur was there, but it was not done. Now another Minister comes, another Government comes. But it is the nature of the State. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has shown a good gesture, not today but earlier also he gave a lot of money to Panjab University from the MPLAD fund, like for the Gandhi Bhawan, Ambedkar Centre. He had also given crores of rupees for the Dental Institute. His gestures are well received. The question is that before this Government, the earlier Government also did not come up to the expectations which should have come. They know very well that the police has done excesses. They knew that the police have dealt with the students of this University. He also appreciated and shared the concerns of the other colleagues. One thing is very important that they should be unanimous in this House to condemn any sort of violence by anybody. If the students indulge in violence, they should not hesitate to say, but say clearly because they should not play here a game. They should speak truth. They should not come for the students of the University at the fag end of their retirement or after superannuation, but they should do it when they are Lecturers. Then they could say that they have done it. When one is phasing out then everybody says that he should remember the society but one should remember the society at the initial stage. Shri Ashok Goyal has rightly said that the Dean of University Instruction is not safe. If the DUI is not safe in the campus, he is not safe on the campus from the Senate, from the Syndicate, from the authorities, from the teachers, then who would feel safe on the campus. There might be some elements. They did not know who are those elements and they must condemn those elements in this House. They must say that from those elements, the Dean of University Instruction is not safe, then they have to save him and an enquiry has to be conducted and here they condemn all sort of violence whosoever he/she may be. They know that their students would not indulge in that violence but their students who were present there, should also be consulted as to who were those who indulged in violence and pelted the stones. Those students could tell very clearly because they were there because they are also the stakeholders. One should not simply say that since the students have been beaten up, they are with the students. They are also with the students but if the students were beaten up with some wrong reason and if they are their own students, they should not be spared. They should have the guts to say this. Since they have to live in the society and not for it that they have to give something to the society but they have to live in the society because they are the integral part of the society. If one is alive, society is there and if one dies, the society would also die. So, one should share the knowledge with the society very efficiently. The next thing is the Central University. They always talk about Central University. He fought for Central University and resigned from the PUTA Presidentship on this issue. He knew that he had taken the struggle on his shoulders. The struggle for Central University was made on 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2008 when the letter came to Panjab University and there was a dharna which was also lifted. There was a celebration that the letter has been received and he is having a copy of that letter even now. On 4<sup>th</sup> September, the letter was withdrawn and the reason told behind this was that the Chief Minister had been conveyed strongly from Punjab that whatever he had done, he would have to face the consequences of it. One of the senior Senators had told this that if the letter was not withdrawn up to the evening, then about 10 lac persons

would be sent to the capital. At that time, the Akali Government was in power and there were 21 MLAs in opposition. Even those MLAs had also written that it would not be allowed. So, the letter was withdrawn. On 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2008, then it was discussed that if the Punjab Government had withdrawn the letter, then they could ask for the central funding. The then Senators told that when they visit the villages, the people sarcastically remark that they have been sent to the Senate only to sell the University. At that time, he had suggested that if the Punjab Government had withdrawn the letter, and to come out of the crisis, it would be in the interest of Panjab University should be declared a central funded University. People asked him to submit the resignation as he was the President of Panjab University Teachers Association. Some people at that time also used to talk about yes-man. Even today, someone could also talk about it that whenever a new Vice-Chancellor joins, some of the people become yes-man while others go in opposition. At that time, he had said that they would not allow the University to be locked and he resigned from the Presidentship of PUTA. Again the issue has come that the fee would not be hiked and Panjab University should be made a Central University and have discussion with the Central Government. If the MHRD and the UGC are not ready even to provide a grant of Rs.9 crores, would the MHRD and UGC bear all the expenses of Panjab University if it is declared a Central University. If Panjab University could be declared a Central University, then it would be better and he is with the members. He is not opposing the status of Central University but is in favor of this University to be stable. There should be coordination of all including the teachers, students, authorities and the people of Punjab. If there is no coordination, then nothing could be done. They would have to think over it. They have not hiked the fee. As there was a pressure to hike the fee during the period from the year 2010 to 2016 and many of the members had opposed it. They all are responsible, if the fee has been hiked by 1100% percent. He had circulated a letter which some of the members must have read that this hike of 1100% in fee has been effected only in two courses, namely Chemical Engineering and Business Administration. The Committee headed by the Dean of University Instruction had taken a decision that the fee should be in such a way that the fee of a course running in two departments should be parallel. In traditional courses, the fee has been hiked up to 300%. The Senate had taken a decision to hike the fee and the Senate has the representatives from all walks of life. If the students of Colleges of Punjab and Chandigarh are paying a fee of Rs.10,000/- for a particular course, the fee of which in the University is Rs.2,400/-, he suggested that the students of the College should also be charged the fee of Rs.2,400/-. Do not they think about the students studying in the Colleges? He agrees with the members that whatever fee has been hiked, keeping in view the interest of the students, the Centre should be asked to release the grants so that they are not forced to hike the fee. He is not ready to agree to it that there is a pressure. He agrees with the House that a solution could be found out with having discussions with the students.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that how such a situation has been created. How much sources of income have been generated and how much expenditure has been incurred? As per the details shown, an expenditure of Rs.515 crores has been incurred during the year 2016-17 and the sources of income are very less due to which such a situation has been created. Secondly, as they have to get the grants from the UGC and have to follow the rules and regulations of the UGC, there has been a mistake in it. For example, the capping under CAS promotions which was to be imposed in July 2013, they extended it up to October 2014. Ultimately, they had to withdraw that. This was an objection and it became a matter of discussion in the newspapers. There were news about the purchases and transparency due to which they faced the problems. The UGC in its SLP in the Supreme Court has also mentioned such things as also the audit objection, etc. On the asking of the Government to generate resources, the University hiked the fee. It was a compulsion and they could do nothing as the UGC, MHRD and the Punjab Government have backtracked and no enhancement of 15% was given. Since, ultimately, they have to hike the fee, it could be hiked in a systematic manner. The fee presently being charged from the students of University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET) is

Rs.70,000/- and if they hike it by 10% for the existing students, and take them into confidence that the University has no other alternative. They have lost a lot of time since 26<sup>th</sup> March when they had hiked the fee even it was opposed by most of the members. Ultimately, there was a clash on 11<sup>th</sup> April and today they have to roll back the fee hike. In the case of Chemical Engineering, the fee could be placed equivalent to UIET fee and the fee of MBA could be equivalent to integrated MBA course. All the students are convinced on this issue. He assured that in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology, no student missed the class on 11<sup>th</sup> April. As was being said that University is closed on 11<sup>th</sup> April, nothing such happened. There are only a few anti-social elements who spread rumours which spreads like a viral. While rolling back the fee, they should do it in a systematic way. There is no issue on an increase of 10% fee in the case of UIET which at present is Rs.70,000/-, but it should not be hiked to Rs.90,000/-. Similarly, in the case of courses in Chemical Engineering if the present fee is of Rs.9,000/- is increased to Rs.70,000/-, no student would have any objection. There could be some possibility where they could enhance the fee. In the courses like B.A. and University School of Open Learning, not much expenditure is incurred there and if they enhance the fee, how the students would be able to get the education. They should also think over it. There should be transparency in matters like finances and CAS promotions so that the students or the public do not have any doubt in their mind. The teachers and the students have a thinking that the University should be fully funded by the Central Government and it should be declared as institution of national importance. They should take some initiative steps to get the central status and it should be made a centrally funded institute. The ratio of the students and the teaching-non teaching should also be maintained to some extent. Wherever they could do with the guest faculty, guest faculty should be appointed there and wherever regular faculty is required, regular faculty should be appointed. When the Vice-Chancellor joined on 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2012, at that time some regular faculty was teaching as guest faculty in some departments, they could do with that also.

Shri Deepak Kaushik first of all thanked the Vice-Chancellor and the Senate members that they have on their own decided to withdraw the cases registered against 68 students. It is a very good step and decision. As said by many members including Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa who has been a student leader, he (Shri Deepak Kaushik) was born, educated, lived in the campus and during the 1981-82, while doing graduation, had also been a student leader. But till date in the history of Panjab University, nothing such happened what had happened on 11<sup>th</sup> April which should not have occurred, but it occurred and was wrong. Why it happened and what were the reasons behind it, they could not know it. There must have been some powers which had provoked this. The students were provoked to indulge in violence due to which the violence did occur. Somewhere they are forgetting something. On behalf of the employees association, he had submitted in writing to the Vice-Chancellor that the employees were also beaten and their arms and legs swelled, but neither anybody talked about them till date nor gave any consolation as those employees had gone for office work. But, thereafter the Registrar had taken some steps and he would like to thank him that the employees have been issued identity card tag with strip. If such a step had been taken earlier, the employees could have been identified. On that day, the University employees had even shown their identify cards and told to the police that they are University employees and they are on duty to deliver letters and some other official work. Even then, as the police had entered the Gurudwara and also after dragging the students from the laboratories had beaten up the students, the employees were also beaten up even on informing the police about it. As by now, all the video recordings must have been seen, if some policeman is at fault and there could be some elements in the police also who must have provoked, he requested that if it so, an enquiry should be ordered and it should be seen if any policeman is involved in it, at least they should file a complaint against such policemen. It is for the police to register FIR or not as the police could do so many things. He again thanked the Vice-Chancellor that they have agreed on withdrawing the complaint against the 68 students. Secondly, he is the only one who

represents about 4000 non-teaching employees and has to discuss about their welfare. All others sitting have talked about the Central University status. As it was being said that the ratio is to be maintained, he would like to inform the House that after the year 2015, no daily wages employee has been appointed in Panjab University and after the year 2012, no regular employee has been appointed in Panjab University. In the year 2012, only 308 Clerks were appointed which is 50% of the total sanctioned strength of 755 posts of clerical cadre which had been sanctioned by the Board of Finance, Syndicate, Senate and various other bodies including the Finance Secretaries and Finance Ministers through whom the Panjab University Act had been enacted and approved by Government of India. When out of those 755 posts of Clerks, only 35 Clerks remained in the University, only then 308 Clerks were recruited. In the year 2012 also, only 50% of the posts were filled while about 350 posts again were kept vacant. After the year 2012, the employees are continuously retiring but no recruitment has been made. After the year 2015, no daily wage employee has been appointed because there is a financial crunch which is continuing. Then it was said that no appointment would be made and they are following the directives of the UGC. But if the UGC puts the condition of ratio of 1:1.1 as per Central University rules/norms, as they all accept Panjab University being a heritage University and the Government also says that if anything is about 100 years old that could be granted the heritage status. As the Vice-Chancellor had spoken about the history of Panjab University, which he (Shri Deepak Kaushik) did not have the knowledge, that since 1904, the University was being run only by the non-teaching staff and there were no teachers. If the non-teaching staff was running the University, the Finance Secretaries of the Government also used to approve the budget. The UGC had formed a Committee in the year around 2012 and at that time the number of teachers was 1510 and non-teaching staff was around 2600. He would like to inform the UGC through the Vice-Chancellor that whatever ratio the UGC Committee had fixed, that ratio was of the non-teaching staff to the teachers of the teaching departments only. That ratio has been fixed as to what supporting staff is required for the teachers of the teaching departments. In the University, there are about 1.25 lac private students, about 2.5 lac students in about 190-192 Colleges and about 60,000 students are studying through University School of Open Learning, who would look after the administrative work of those students. If the UGC wanted to fix the ratio of 1:1.1, then all the teachers of the Colleges should also be taken into account in the teaching staff and then the ratio could be arrived at. It also needs to be looked into whether the UGC or any other agency is not indulging in blackmailing Panjab University so that the University closes down. They could see around Panjab University in the areas like Kharar, Ropar, there are so many small private universities and the students are taking admission in these private universities. He feels unhappy that when one of the retired employees wanted to have guidance for the studies of his son who has just passed out 10+2. He told that colleague to take the entrance test of Hotel Management which is going to be held on 30<sup>th</sup> May, but that colleague said that the condition of Panjab University is very bad. He had heard about this bad condition of Panjab University from a retired employee and could see the tears in his eyes. So, the ratio of 1:1.1 given by the UGC is totally wrong and he requested the authorities to supply the documents on the basis of which the UGC has fixed this ratio. There is an issue of Central University status to Panjab University. Professor Ronki Ram has also talked about it. He is associated with the Association for the last 21 years and also worked with Professor Ronki Ram who at one time was the President, PUTA on the pension issue. All the non-teaching employees were with the teachers on the common issues and this cooperation would continue in future also. When the issue of Central University came up, the first attack is in the form of ratio which has been provided in the documents even though Panjab University still has not become a Central University. He is not saying that they would not allow Panjab University to become a Central University. If there is some (2-4%) reduction of non-teaching employees and if there is any deficit, he would not be against it, but at least on a common platform, the Government sit together with the University and whether the University would be benefited by 50% or 80%. Could the Government take up the responsibility that after Panjab University becoming a Central University, there would be

no capping on the grants? Then, everything would be under the control of the Government, whims and fancies and whatever it wanted to do, could do. Therefore, they would have to struggle against this. If once a capping is forced, then it would become permanent like the capping by Punjab Government. As the Vice-Chancellor had suggested for creation of a reserved fund and getting inspired by Hon'ble Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, former Member of Parliament who has announced that he would contribute to the University out of his sincere earnings, the Senators and the teachers are present in the House, why do they not take an initiative and make such an announcement, he announced that being the President of the non-teaching employees and according to his paying capacity, he would contribute an amount of Rs.11,000/- per year towards the reserve fund of the University and would continue to do so till he is alive. If in between due to some circumstances, he would no longer be able to contribute, getting the motivation from Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, he would also pay some lump sum amount. He requested the members that they should take an initiative as has been done by the non-teaching employees that they had called all the non-teaching employees even those who had retired before 1947 to a convention in the year 2013. Such conventions have some meaning. He would also convey it to all the non-teaching employees that according to their paying capacity, they should contribute to the reserve fund out of which the University wanted to help the poor students who could not afford to pay the fee. It would be a good gesture. He said that there are only 10% of the students belonging to rich families while the rest belong to the middle class. This increase in fee would mostly affect the middleclass. As the Vice-Chancellor said that a Core Committee has been constituted, he requested the Vice-Chancellor to invite the students also in the meeting of this Committee conversation and reach to a mutual understanding and the fee should be hiked only to the extent that the middleclass persons could educate their wards in Panjab University and it has been a tradition of Panjab University that no poor child is deprived of the education. He said that there is a general feeling that the non-teaching staff does not work, but he would like to clarify that one employee is handling the work of two seats. There is a shortage of staff and the number of staff which earlier used to retire in three months, that number is retiring in a single month nowadays. He requested the Hon'ble members that whenever they have any work in the University, they could contact him or the heads of the branches as sometimes the employees, being under stress of work and irritated and not recognizing some of the members, might not be able to attend to them properly. To avoid all such things, all the Senate/Syndicate members and employees respecting each other's dignity should work in a congenial atmosphere.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that he had appreciation and sympathy with the Vice-Chancellor because he has put in so much efforts in pursuing the financial problems which are causing so many difficulties. He has sympathy with him (Vice-Chancellor) because whatever they do in a situation like this, it is always inadequate. The Vice-Chancellor is trying very hard to get out of the obstacles with a proper process, he is not as successful as he should be and therefore there are only wild thoughts. In the situations that emerged, unexpected or expected ones, certain decisions are taken on the spot and whatever decision a person takes, he/she is a human. His experience is that, as most of the members are experienced people, when one takes a decision, the people have different perspective. When the Vice-Chancellor is sitting amongst the members, some of them might agree with him while others might not. But at the same time, when they blame him, that is not fair. What the members could do is that they could say that alright, but in future they could give some suggestions. But eventually, the responsibility is his, the decisions are his, he has made the decisions and the decisions are made on the basis of whatever information at that moment is available with him and whatever are the compulsions. Professor Shelley Walia and Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal have raised very pertinent question of the relationship between the State and the University and the use of money to compel the University to do something which in this case the University had to raise some money but sometimes it could be certain philosophy, it could be putting things which the State wants to do which might not be intellectually acceptable

and the State could use its compulsive power. The answer to that is that the bodies like Syndicate and Senate, the executive bodies, could not really take decisions on the things, but if the University has enough intellectual capital, those intellectuals get together and build up a case and enlighten the public about the dangers of what is happening, about what are the limitations within which the State would act, what are the freedoms that are necessary for the University to provide its leadership role that is something that Think Tanks of the University approve it. The Senate would not do it. The Senate could not go into conflict with the Government. But the intellectuals could always build up an opinion, enlighten and educate the people about what is at stake. So, these are things that, he hoped so, may be Panjab University has enough intellectual capital might be able to go into such a course. Coming to the nitty-gritty of these things, first of all, he said that he did not find faults but if he had been there, he would not have sent the names of the students to the police. According to him, that is something where they were misled. They have a disciplinary machinery and could suspend the students, rusticate but should not send the names to the police. He hoped that in future if the problem arises and the violence takes place, there could be stone throwing or so, there is a reaction that they must take a lesson. Could they do it for their own children? If the son of a person is involved, would he send his name to the police that he has committed a mistake in the House. He requested that they forget the past and in future it be made sure that the police is not involved against the students. Sometimes, the help of the police could be taken. They should make sure that the students are their own children, they are a responsibility of the University and they have to safeguard them. They should have the same attitude for the students as they have for their own children who can commit mistake. As said by Professor Ronki Ram, they did not endorse the violence that the students indulged in. They condemn the violence and at the same time make sure that they did not put to the students in such a situation like jail, etc. They have enough disciplinary machinery to take care of such things, they could rusticate the students. On the matter of fee, he confessed that when the matter came up for the hike in fee, he felt that the Committee must have given full thought to it as the Vice-Chancellor is convinced with the suggestions of the Committee. When some of the information, which he had asked from the Finance and Development Officer, came to him, he found that there has not been increase in the fee for a number of years. He looked at the consumer price index of the year 2001, i.e., the base year and various stages after that. From the year 2001 to 2016, the CPI has gone up by 2.8 and the fee by more than 3. Therefore, the fee has not increased. Again, the Committee obviously had reasons and rationale and the Vice-Chancellor was convinced but they are not realistic. When somebody looks at these 10 times or more fee hike, then the feeling is that it is too much. Even if they want to raise it to a certain level, they could go gradually. Even in ordinary B.Sc. courses, the fee is increased by 7 times, which is too much. There are two ways, one is that there should be a Core Committee. The increase in the fee should be such that it looks reasonable and it should not look like 7 or 10 times. If they look at the traditional courses, in one case the fee has been hiked from Rs.750 to Rs.2260/- which is 3 times whereas the CPI during that period is 2.8.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not in the traditional courses. They have not increased the fee in the self-sustaining courses.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that these courses were started in 2005.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University Institute of Engineering & Technology started in the year 2002.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that the main function of the University in the traditional courses is to prepare thinking people, people who could think, people who could question, people who could analyze and look at the things. These are basic subjects like History, Philosophy, Mathematics, Chemistry and Physics where these skills

are developed. Therefore, these were the traditional courses which were really the core when the University was started. Thereafter, the Polytechnics, Engineering, Management, Hotel Management, Fashion Design and so on were started because of the compulsion of demand. But the real core of the University is sciences, humanities and social sciences. Therefore, to discourage people coming here is something against the very philosophy of the University and his feeling is that these are the courses where the fee increase is too much. If they look at the things, an increase of Rs.500/- per month looks quite reasonable and Rs.50,000/- looks very bad. Therefore, he suggested that to rationalize these things, they should take a view of the rise in the fee structure.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is the reason that the Committee has recommended that up to an income of Rs.7.5 lacs, this much fee concession could be given.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that they should not give the charity. They should give aid but not charity. He suggested that they have a system of easy loans that could be used to give loan to the students which they could repay after passing out of the course. Maybe the teachers could contribute something to that fund and even as a fixed deposit which could be withdrawn at the time of retirement. There are so many ways to create a fund from which they could help the students. But the students do not need charity but loans and hopefully the same could be given back. These are some of the ideas that they could work on. But at the moment, the thing is that the change in the fee structure be made such that it does not look a burden on the students and satisfy the students who are sitting out. The demands of the students are that the cases be withdrawn for which they have taken a decision. The other demand is roll back of the fee. The fee is not going to contribute very much to the University but it is only to satisfy the Government that the University is doing something. The third issue is of police. The police may be necessary sometimes but not always as the students are their own children and should treat them like their children.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they are meeting to reconsider the decision that they had taken on 27<sup>th</sup> March. This matter had also come up before the Syndicate in the month of July when he was a member of the Syndicate. At that time also he had pointed out that it should not be highlighted and such a rise in the fee be not effected. Most of the members present in the House are in favour of roll back. Did they know about what is happening today or what the students had done? They had increased the fee too much that again they are meeting to discuss the same. In the Syndicate at that time also, members had recorded their dissent that the examination fee should not be hiked so much. If they have been able to generate an amount of Rs.35 crores from the hike in examination fee and with the hike in tuition fee, they would be able to generate more money.

The Vice-Chancellor said that enhancing the internal income of the University is a compulsion for the sustenance of this University. This University has never been fully supported by the State. They should put in their all efforts. These decisions are of the members and not his. The proposals are coming again from the Committees which are made up of University teachers and this is for the sustenance of the University. Where does the money of the University go? The money of the University goes towards paying the salary and pension of the staff. If the University would not raise its internal resources, they would not be eligible for external aid. The new Finance Minister of Punjab Government categorically told him in the presence of the Registrar that the roll-back of tuition fee of the University is not an answer, fee must not be rolled back. They could come up with a new proposal but the non-enhancement of the income is not an option that the Panjab University has. This has also been categorically told by the Centre that the enhancement of the internal income is a compulsion of this University. So, roll-back of the income proposal, they could modify or come out with a different formula, but

it is compulsive that they have to enhance the internal income. It is the thought of the Think Tank that given the year 2013-14 as the base year, they were to increase the income by 20% in one year, 25% in the next year and another 25% in the next year. Then they have to work back. This is that compulsion. Since they managed to get a little bit extra money when they raised the examination fee, that is why the Committee came up with a proposal that whatever enhancement they did last year, they are supposed to generate more money this year. But, they are not generating more money this year. The proposal is to generate not less money this year that they generated last year. So it is a very difficult and complicated thing. Announcement of roll-back is an answer to satisfy the students but they have had a Core Committee of the Senators, had a meeting with the Senators and it was explained to them. The proposal that came in that the relief should be granted to those deserving students in the form that the slab of income of Rs.2.5 lacs to Rs.5 lacs be enhanced to Rs.7.5 lacs. That proposal has come from the students and they have also proposed another income slab of Rs.7.5 lacs to Rs.10 lacs. So, any new proposal that they come up with, eventually they would have to discuss with the community at large. Just saying that increase the fee by 10% all across the board, this has also again to be talked to the students. If they want that there has not to be an enhancement in the internal income of the University, they have to come out with a solution as to how this University has to be sustained. Maybe, in one day this decision could not be built. They could end up today and could form a Sub-Committee of the members which could come out with a proposal and they come back in another week from now and could discuss the proposal. But they have to have a game-plan in place before 4<sup>th</sup> July 2017. They just could not escape that by 4<sup>th</sup> July 2017 when the matter goes to the Supreme Court that the University has no game-plan. If the University has no game-plan then do they realise that the onus of that would come on the governing body of the University. If people who created this University and have sustained this University by virtue of finding some innovative ways of having an enhanced income all through, it is all of the members who must have approved like creation of UIET, it is all of the members who must have said that create all these things which was objected to as partially self-financing courses. All these approvals have gone through this body exactly in the same way as the decision of 26<sup>th</sup> March went through this body. It is their decision. They could not just look at some who is presiding over the meeting, someone who is presiding over the meeting is only facilitating that decision, he is not forcing that decision down the throat of anybody. So, it is a very heavy responsibility. Whether the University would get sustained or not, unfortunately that onus, that burden is on the present members of the Senate. They could conclude the discussion and discuss as much as they could do today, but while they disburse today, they have to go back that there is a homework that they have to do. Otherwise, he has sought a meeting of the Core Committee, on behalf of the Senate, with the Chief Minister of the State. He has also sought a meeting with the MHRD Minister. Neither the Chief Minister nor the MHRD Minister has given the time so far. Whenever the time is given, a Core Committee is there and if more people wanted to go, he would tell about the time. They could put a request on behalf of the Senate to the Chief Minister who is also an ex-officio member of the Senate. They could pass a resolution that the State Chief Minister, the Education Minister and the Advisor to the Administrator, U.T., all being the ex-officio members of the Senate, that they must come to this meeting. When the Chief Minister, the Education Minister, are present as also both the DPI (Colleges), Chandigarh and Punjab, who are IAS officers and are also members of the Board of Finance. They must also come to the House well prepared so that they are made aware of the sentiments of the House, they are made aware of the voice of the people in the form of whatever the students want to say. So, there are many options that are available for the members to explore a solution for the sustenance of the University. But, unfortunately the burden is on all of them, on the entire Senate. Just walking up with saying something is not going to solve the problem of the University.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that Goyal Sahib and others had given dissent in that. The students whom he (Vice Chancellor) met, listens heard and held meetings or



not from 27<sup>th</sup> March to 11<sup>th</sup> April, but that as per his knowledge & experience whenever the opposition parties had to go to CM Bhavan, he (CM) came outside and sat on a chair and offered tea to them. If they (Panjab University authority) had known that the students were holding a mass rally there, perhaps he (Vice Chancellor) would have been in the Office there; perhaps that incident would have been avoided. . All the members in the meeting had spoken repeatedly that the college teachers and University teachers whose wards were taking 50% fee discount, if he thinks about himself, his instant reaction is that he will not take that benefit, but he asked the members that the 2200-2300 teachers who were working in the colleges, were they taking full salaries. There were at least 1500 teachers who had been drawing salary less than basic pay. He has been saying one thing repeatedly, he was not making allegations, that all the Senate members and all the Professor of the University were party to it because they all go on inspections and they keep their eyes closed, they encourage brotherhood. As others had said there, they had been asking record for the four years from him (Vice Chancellor) that which person had gone for inspection at which place. They brought some persons with the letter of inspection saying those were names of persons for inspection. He asked the Vice Chancellor, whether he (Vice Chancellor) forms the Inspection Committee himself or not, or just tell that to the council. He (Vice Chancellor) had a lot of work load, but if he had deployed two persons for forming Inspection Committee, what type of committee those persons form, that type of affiliation committee was formed, he was not making any allegations on Vice-Chancellor. He (Vice Chancellor) can find out from the record, for the Selection Committees and Inspection Committees the persons who were nominated for the particular college. They were told to go there and if they felt somewhat discrepancies, overlook that. The result of that was their cadre, teachers cadre was suffering, teachers have no value. Out of 2500, they were 1500-1600 persons having paid Rs. 15000 p.m. and the position was that they were taking salary with one hand from the Management and they (Management) get back money by withdrawing through ATM. He had tried to speak in the Syndicate. He had requested the Registrar fifteen times and the Registrar had also made a Committee for the rollback of money that colleges take, but he (Registrar) had not issued that letter. Despite requesting again and again, what the position of the persons of colleges had been done, the issue of permanently affiliated colleges was different and the colleges which were temporary affiliated, the officers of their University were invited deliberately for prize distribution and for holding convocation. They (colleges) call them knowingly, despite knowing all that decisions had been taken. If any college, aided college had discrepancy in record, every year reports of the colleges had been coming, knowingly, when it was decided in the meeting of the Senate held in December that the decision was taken that inspections will be done before 31<sup>st</sup> of March. All the reports of Inspection Committee will be produced in the Senate meeting of March. Despite taking that decision, it was not implemented. The special meeting and the meeting of the March had gone. When September will come, it will happen that temporary extension of affiliation will be granted for the session and what they will be able to speak in September Senate meeting! Every year, they know, non-attendance of students was going on, teachers were also not attending and nothing had been done to those colleges whose reports had been given by them (Committees). That was not the matter of a Management, but how they were running that system. The decision was taken in meeting of the Syndicate on March, 2016, if they were talking about the issue of funds and money and Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and Shri Deepak Kaushik willingly decided to give money from their pocket. He also knows what type of construction had been done in the College Bhavan. He (Vice Chancellor) had also formed a committee for that. He had said again and again that the tender of that construction and other documents of College Bhvan should be given to the members of the Senate. The College Bhavan was constructed in 2015-16, open wires were there, all the face work has fallen and the screw had been tightened on outside face work. Were they (Panjab University) not looking at those things? Was that not the right of the members of the Senate to know that how the order of construction of College Bhavan was given? Was there (in construction order) condition for underground wiring exposed or fittings? The case against students was filed and lathi (cane) charge done. You (Panjab University) had

collected Rs. 10 crores and the budget of the University was Rs. 515 crores. So, that needs only 1% saving will give Rs. 5 crores and 2% saving Rs. 10 crores. To save that much of money was no problem. But, that was not happening. He cannot explain how to relate that, but the things were attached with each other. He (Vice Chancellor) asks them (members) not to speak and meeting is conducted after 3 months or 4 months, everything was seen, but they were not able to report that, what should they write to MHRD that the funds they were sending was being used like that and should they (members) complaint against themselves to the MHRD. It was not that these things were brought in the knowledge at one time, two times or three times rather that was brought to the knowledge in the seven continuous meetings of Syndicate. The issue was also raised in the last Senate meeting. He told to circulate the details of tender/construction work of College Bhavan to all the Senate members, why Panjab University were not able to address that, why the meeting for that not being conducted. Why the data of inspection and selection they were demanding from him (Vice Chancellor) was not provided, nothing was being done. Students had protested, they were lathi (cane) charged. They should plug all those points. He had thought to talk on two-three points. Regarding the extension of Library in Ludhiana, the students were sitting on dharna for about one month. Whether the Director had got time or not, but no one had gone there to address them. No one had gone there to ask why they were sitting on Dharna. If no one had gone there to listen to them for a month, then what was the option with them to raise their voice? He was not justifying their violence, but if they don't listen to the voice of any one, that thing hurts them, at least they must be listened. The Committee had hiked that fee, he does not know how many representatives were there from the colleges, they can see that when the issue of fee hike is raised, why he was telling him (Vice Chancellor) again and again, because the committee was formed by him (Vice Chancellor), at least suggestion of others must be taken. He was not asking him (Vice-Chancellor) to make him the member of the Committee. They had come for the meeting since 10.00 a.m. in the morning and it is 5.00 p.m. now, but not a single penny worth discussion has been done on the colleges. They had 12,000, 13,000 or 15,000 students, but they (colleges) had 1, 75,000 students. Would not they be able to speak any time? When they come there and see the agenda, everyone knew that the fee hike will be made, there will be strike and everyone knew that there will be roll back. If everyone knows that, then why that hike was done. If that fee hike by the Committee formed by him (Vice Chancellor), hiked 10% at that time, was that necessary that students be beaten up. Rs. 20 was hiked to Rs. 200 and the same was regarding examination fee which was hiked manifold. All the Senate members had lessened their value to come there again and again. The vehicle of only Vice Chancellor, Registrar and Controller can be parked in the parking in front of Administrative Block; Senators cannot park their vehicle there. That was their (Senators) respect there (in Panjab University). Last time it was quoted that they cannot eat in the dining hall; two fellows were removed from there. They were their (Panjab University's) employer, they enter in the University not as a student, but as a Senator of Panjab University. He had not even pasted a sticker on his car. But, the value of Senators was that he was asked not to park in front of Administrative Block as that parking was for the Registrar and other officers of University. Had that happened ever? This situation has been created with them (Fellows) by themselves (Fellows) only. Nothing needs to be corrected but Management should be strong and made accountable. Being a Senator, he had given some suggestion, it was not necessary to accept it, but at least what was right, that must be heard and see whether it had sense or not. He had been demanding for the document of College Bhavan for about one and half years. He can name the colleges which took money back before paying the salary to the teachers. They can form a Committee to address these issues. For all that mismanagement, he (Vice Chancellor) becomes responsible, because the affiliation committees were formed from his (Vice Chancellor) office. If the affiliation committee had been formed and he had given wrong affiliation to a college, he should be accountable for that. That affiliation committee should tell that the college was not paying full salary or the teacher to student ratio was not proper, then how the affiliation has been given to that college. Those things need to be set right, nothing required more.

In every meeting nothing comes satisfactory. Some people speak in anger and some speak softly, his time will also come to stop speaking. He just wants to know that why he (Vice Chancellor) was not providing the document of that (College Bhavan) and whether that was not the place of corruption. Why the special meeting was not being conducted for that (College Bhavan construction)? How much crores investment had been done there? He was asking for documents for one and half years from different channels. Why he was not able to get those documents? He will not talk about other cases regarding not providing documents in the Syndicate for costly purchasing. He knows that when the affiliation committee was formed, and problem comes on a person that he was strict for colleges, that person was not responsible for that, but they (authority) was responsible for that. They (authority) told some person about what was right and what was wrong. If some people try to do that thing right, it results that those people irritate the college. The total administration had no control on the colleges. Everything was told to be done, but the name of a Senate member comes, but they do nothing. The issues of finance and administration should be considered favourably and please, give one date when the documents of College Bhavan will be provided.

On a point of order, Dr. Keshav Malhotra said that the Affiliation Committee of which he (Sh. Harpreet Singh Dua) was talking and he had some doubts, grant of affiliation should be given by the Senate and some members of the Senate should also be included in the affiliation committee and he proposes the name of Sh. Harpreet Singh Dua. That will give a complete view that only deserving college be given affiliation. He (Sh. Harpreet Singh Dua) was very hardworking and a senior teacher.

Sh. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if they look to the senior teacher fellows, he was the senior most of them, but he belongs to some other side. Date sheet was formed, but he was not a member in that committee, implementation of semester system, he was not member in that Committee, if choice based credit system was made, he was not the member of that Committee, if academic calendar was formed he was not member of that Committee, affiliation committee, he was not a member in selection Committee he was not a member, that's why he was saying that all was done by him (Vice Chancellor).

That's why he says politics starts from there (Vice Chancellor's side) not here (Senator's side).

The Vice Chancellor asked Shri Harpreet Singh Dua to conclude.

Dr. Keshav Malhotra said that his request was that the members of the Senate should be included in affiliation committee. Equal number of members should be there.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that he thanked him (Vice Chancellor) very much for giving a chance to speak to a person from a college. First of all, he wants to make an observation, what he feels, on the draw back of previous Senate meeting and that Senate meeting which was being conducted today. The agenda which was in the previous meeting and that meeting which being conducted, the drawback which he feels, was that objectivity and time management was not looked into in the agenda items, due to which they (members) waste the whole day. He wants to give an example, suppose today's meeting which was being held, 10-15 students had got signed from them (fellows) as he (Vice Chancellor) informed the students that the fee was hiked by the Senate. When they (students) asked to call the meeting of the Senate, he (Vice Chancellor) said that unless Senators do not give it in writing, he cannot call for the Senate meeting. Although, the students had given in writing to convene the Senate meeting, but the agenda of that was fee hike and the crisis of 11<sup>th</sup> April. That demand they (Senators) gave it in writing, but in the agenda item, that issue has not been included. That he was talking the objectivity of the agenda, with that he would talk about the time management. If that had been included, the time in the morning which took one hour to convert that meeting general

meeting or special meeting, they could have saved that one hour. Similarly, he also wanted to give an example of the previous meeting, there were two inter-related agenda items. In the morning, financial crisis was discussed and again in the afternoon some consideration item about fee hike was discussed. He wanted to say that the honourable members who had given their views regarding fee hike, mostly they were the similar to that were discussed in the morning. Had he (Vice Chancellor) clubbed both the items, perhaps some time could have been saved and the Zero Hour that was not done in which they had to discuss a lot of important issues, that Zero Hour could have been done. He would request that in future, to look into the time management and objectivity of the agenda and the serial order should correspond in such a way that where the arguments can come similar, same discussion can be done, that time could be saved, so that at least time of Zero Hour cannot be missed as they had to discuss very important points. Second, he would like to talk about today's agenda item of fee hike and crisis of 11<sup>th</sup> April. These two issues involved three stakeholders, students, teachers and administration, even outside agencies say police, U.T. Administration or the Court. His first question was that could the incidence of 11<sup>th</sup> April have been averted. His second question was that, was not it their lack of vision of University Administration. Of course, he would include the Senate or all Fellows in that. It was the matter of common sense that when they increase fee or do anything like that, they increase that in a remarkable way, in place of 10% increase would be 100% to 1100%, they (Panjab University) did not think that there will be protest on this issue. There was a sociology concept – Social Impact Assessment, when any policy or project is implemented, they see that what will be their impact on society, people and beneficiaries. They had not talked about that at all. He thinks that was lack of administrative, lack of political, lack of policy makers' vision was very much involved. He thinks that all the Senate members and of course, the Institution should take the responsibility of that crisis, because lack of vision had remained a very important part. Any person can say that, if the fee be hiked in future in the colleges or in any private institution, suppose 100% fee hike is done, then protest and violent protest would be there. As Professor Ronki Ram had said that they condemn that violent incident, of course, there will be no person who will not condemn that violence. But again his question was, there was violation of multiplication of fees. If fees were increased 10%, 15% or 20%, no problem, if they were hiking fees thousands time, that was also a violent act and due to which the second violence happened, that was corresponding and response to that act. Secondly, he would say, as already discussed, tactless handling of the situation. In a District, if any serious situation happens, he (DC) cannot leave the District. As already discussed, there were two dates, 11<sup>th</sup> April and 21<sup>st</sup> April, even if important and emergency might be there on those two dates, he thinks that the Head of the Institution should not leave the University. Perhaps the Vice Chancellor would not have been there, the Dean of University Instruction had to respond that he cannot do anything, the Vice Chancellor will come and address the issue. Before that, the frustration and aggression of 11 days had come in the students. They (authority) were responsible for that because till the time they continued doing repression, there will be limit of repression. It was a kind of repression.

The Vice Chancellor said that what does he (Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta) mean by repression, what repression was there?

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that repression there means psychological because they (students) were not being heard. If any person is not heard in dialogue, automatically the behaviour of mob will become violent. They were all academicians, all can understand the situation like that how and when a child become violent. They were all responsible for that. He thinks that University administration and authorities should own the responsibility of that. The second thing regarding that what the Vice Chancellor had just conveyed outside, they (Senators) all speak in the Senate, Vice Chancellor gave enough time to them (Senators) to speak, but the response they get, response was that they take their time, speak and go, they (Vice Chancellor) will see later, what to do. He

will give an example that they were basically talking before lunch that the cases on students will be withdrawn, he (Vice Chancellor) will write. That was discussed in the morning and papers of FIR and other correspondence were demanded by members regarding withdrawal of cases or relaxation they were giving. From morning till that time, almost 8 hours have passed, but they had not got those papers. He will again request the Registrar, if he can provide the papers, because legal luminaries were sitting there already and according to that what he had talked to the students below. This was not the thing that he (Vice Chancellor) would meet the Governor or Home Secretary, he thinks that the Prime Minister or Governor or any other person cannot do anything in that legal matter. That was a legal procedure and till the time case is not file for quashing of FIR in the High Court, by that time the case cannot be withdrawn. He knows that even though he was a non-legal person. He demanded that to pass a resolution that right then it should be typed and presented there that they (Panjab University) were withdrawing the case and filing for the quashing of the F.I.R. petition. Because these are the examination days and the students have the burden of exam, they (members) can imagine how they will study with that burden. Parents were also feeling the tension and he demanded that in the resolution that right then, quashing of F.I.R. resolution be given and it would be quite better if the date on which quashing of F.I.R. will be filed in the High Court, can be given right then. The second issue was regarding finances, due to which the incident of 11<sup>th</sup> April happened. He will talk there about two resolutions, one that had already been proposed, regarding Central University status or University of National Importance or Heritage University. He thinks, once again it should be resolved and tried, either it gets success or not. He also deems that perhaps it may take long term plan and cannot be resolved soon because it was the political issue between the State and the Centre. He seconds that if they can take that issue at some level. One second resolution to which he will try to propose a name. Perhaps in the last Senate, someone had questioned that he (Vice Chancellor) had not spoken to the Chancellor that he (Chancellor) should intervene. His (Vice Chancellor's) response was that he (Chancellor) denied. That he would have tried at personal level that he (Chancellor) may involve himself. Some news had appeared in H.T., along with two other things that the grant they were seeking from MHRD or Centre or State, why they were imposing conditions on University on their own or they were trying to follow things which suit them. Never before they had an issue of the Universities Grant, when budget comes, he used to hear that such institution got such money, no conditions were imposed in that because the University had their own autonomy to start courses as per their financial management. University's purpose was to promote creativity and research and not to start small courses to generate income. They should demand for their grant without any condition. He was proposing resolution for the demand of grant. Earlier, the Vice Chancellor had conveyed that the Chancellor may be involved in that, but his (Chancellor's) response was negative. If they pass a resolution in the Senate and send it to the Chancellor either it was the issue of Central University or issue of National importance or issue of Heritage University or Centre State Corporate Body, which was already there. The Chancellor himself should intervene and form a committee of the representatives of state, Punjab or the representative of Ministry of MHRD or the University Grants Commission Chairman and the members of the Senate/Syndicate or Vice Chancellor or any other representatives, and should give directions, because the Chancellor was the most important, Head of the University. If they (University) request him (Chancellor) by passing a resolution, he hoped, perhaps he (Chancellor) will not deny, because the Senate members had been nominated by him (Chancellor). Perhaps this resolution of Senate, if discussed by the Chancellor with State, Centre, MHRD, University Grants Commission, and all nominees of University, he hopes that some solution will definitely come out. That was regarding financial crisis and the last issue he would talk about is regarding the fee hike. As the issue was of withdrawal of cases and he (Vice Chancellor) talked about referring the case to Governor. They make the issue complex. Last time, he had raised the issue of an accident. That was a simple issue and they made it complex and now that has become more complex. There were simple issues. These issues should remain simple. If they had to increase the fee, as Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has told and

that was in his mind also that how many new employees they will involve in accounts related, concessions related to be given to the students. Those had the complex implications. Simply what they could do was to increase the fee at the minimum level, but he was proposing for the withdrawal of total fee hike, as earlier discussed. These were the sentiments. Maximum 5, 7 or 10 percent hike that too particularly and categorically of the tuition fees, not all kinds of fees, as examination fee had already been increased too much. Only 10 per cent fee should be hiked and that also on simple level and in that bracket should also be seen to giving concession/scholarship to 3 or 4 lakhs income groups.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the case of bracket or income slabs to give concession was not practical.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that his last point was that, he also wants to tell Controller of Examinations that a lot of complaints were coming regarding delay of results. Sometime, re-evaluation results were declared after the result of next class and the careers of such students remain at stake. Last year also, the result of re-evaluation was not declared for about one year. They should do something to reform the results of examinations.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that as the illegal meeting would had been convened as earlier Shri Ashok Goyal had said and he (Vice Chancellor) converted that special meeting into ordinary meeting, thank you very much. Now the work of the meeting will be done legally, no one will go to the Court.

On the point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that nothing will be legal. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Shri Chaman Lal and some senior members told to continue the meeting that was not legal. Ordinary meeting of Senate, nothing can be discussed unless and until it comes as a recommendation of the Syndicate. That was not legal, since they had come together and that's why they were discussing.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that on the incident of 11<sup>th</sup> April, why the complaint had gone from Chief of University Security, rather it should have been gone through the Registrar. Secondly, if the Chief of University Security had sent the complaint, he thinks that that should had been at least got vetted either from the Vice Chancellor or from the Registrar, that he (CUS) is sending in writing. The complaint they read in the newspapers from which it seems that as the SHO had abducted him (CUS) and there he (CUS) had been asked to give that in writing. If the complaint had been written by asking from the Vice Chancellor or Registrar, at least in that complaint that should be written what the excess had done by the police. It looks that they (Panjab University) had complained on behalf of the police. There was not a single word of the excess done by the police. All Teachers, non-teachers, students and the Chairpersons, who were teaching in the classes, were telling that the students were beaten in front of them. They (police) misbehaved with ladies, misbehaved with girls. If not written about them, at least action should be there that why that had not been written. Why that had not been mentioned in the complaint and if that had been mentioned, perhaps the police might not have entered the F.I.R. Police was levying sedition charges and then taking back on the request of the University. They were hesitating whether the F.I.R. will be withdrawn or not. When the sedition charges were withdrawn on their (Panjab University) request, then why the F.I.R. will not be withdrawn. Who are they, not to withdraw the F.I.R.? Second thing, they were talking of grant, he personally appreciates that he (Vice Chancellor) was doing drafting, visiting the court, doing the arguments himself, they were with him (Vice Chancellor) on this issue, but if he (Vice Chancellor) thinks that by increasing the fees, the University get much benefit, there will be no benefit. In the morning, Shri Varinder Singh had also said that when they increase 9 crores, that will ultimately yield 28 crores. When the University's administration justify that Lovely

Professional University had that much (fees), Guru Nanak Dev University had that much, Punjabi University had that much, they should also compare the rent of shop-cum-flats in Sector-14 with the rent of shops cum-flats in Sector-15. They don't want to increase there. The showroom of Sector-14 had only 10% rent of their market value. When they compare the fees with other Universities, they say to increase the fees, but he was not in favour of increasing the fees. On 26<sup>th</sup> he did not give his dissent, but he had said that being an employee of Punjab Government, he receives a lot of complaints. The same thing happened in the next meeting, and the Punjab Cabinet forced the capping at 8% that no private school will increase the fees more than 8% including the unaided schools, whom Government did not give grant. They gave the directions to all the DCs that whosoever had increased greater than 8% fees, their managements be called. They (Punjab Government) had also given the direction to the Education Board that whosoever increases fees more than 8%, affiliation of that school be cancelled. So the fees should not be increased more than 8 or 10 per cent. As far as the grant was concerned, he appreciates him (Vice Chancellor). He (Vice Chancellor) had told that Punjab Government will present their view point there on 15<sup>th</sup> of May. Punjab Government will give their view point there through Higher Education Department. He (Vice Chancellor) will be shocked to know, because he (Vice Chancellor) remains busy, that Higher Education of Punjab would not be existing on that date. They had building-land dispute, all their belongings, chairs, furniture, Photostat machines, computer had been packed and their files have also been packed and don't know to which godown those things had been sent. They (Panjab University) will not get his (Panjab University) file by the 15<sup>th</sup> of May. Total employees of the DPI and Higher Education were on the road without tables and without any files and they were expecting what relief they (Panjab University) will get there by 15<sup>th</sup> of May. That was the position of the (Punjab) Government. There, with the direction of the Court, SLP had been dismissed and being the vacations, hundred persons of labour had come there and taken their files and other things in someone's godown and they don't know in which godown they had taken those things. They were helpless. They don't have files, chairs and computers and everything had vanished. Don't write any letter to Higher Education Department (of Punjab Government) by that date on their old address, they will not get that and their building was locked. The next issue that they talk about is the University Grants Commission. University Grants Commission is talking about the ratio of teaching and non-teaching. Neither that ratio was maintained nor that was possible. As Shri Deepak Kaushik, President, Non-teaching Employees Federation had said that one non-teacher had been given the work of 2-3 seats, he proposes to withdraw that immediately, why the work of 2-3 seats had been given to them. He works in a Government office and when they give work of 2, 3 or 4 seats to an employee or an officer or an IAS Officer, the standard of work goes down, there the corruption increases. That was natural. Why they were giving them additional work? On the one side, they (Panjab University) were saying to retrench 500 people, today if they (non-teaching employees) are being given work of 2-3 seats and when will they (Panjab University) retrench 500 employees. (Thereafter), they will give them (Panjab University employees) work of 4-7 seats and it would not be possible. How a given person will do the work? In the coming days, staff retrenchment should not be there. Big news had appeared in that day H.T. regarding staff retrenchment and if staff retrenchment was done, he being the member of Senate will sit on strike (dharna) with them (Non-Teaching Employees). As Shri Deepak Kaushik had told, no new person has been employed since 2015. There is a popular saying that a four year child was demanding a cycle from his parents and the parents tried to understand him and did not give him cycle and rather pick him to sit on an 8 feet wall. That child told that he will not demand cycle, but put him down. Now they (Panjab University) were doing with them (non-teaching employees) like that. They (non-teaching employees) were saying for regularization and promotions and they (Panjab University authority) were saying for their retrenchment. They (non-teaching employees) say don't regularise them, don't give them promotions, but do not do their retrenchment. That was the position. Why their promotions were not given in time, why their regularizations were not being done? They (non-teaching employees) were not regularized since 2015 and were waiting for regularization for 10 year, 12 years or 15

years and they (Panjab University authority) were saying for their retrenchment. He was not saying to regularize all of them, but the persons who were working against the existing budgeted posts, should be given their justified right. After that what the University Grants Commission was saying and showing them (Panjab University) the ratio. That was not the fault of Panjab University. That was the fault of University Grants Commission and MHRD that they were dividing the total budget with the students and telling him (Vice Chancellor), who had reiterated that in last 2-3 meetings. In last meeting also, it was reiterated that more than one lakh expenditure was incurred on one student. Everyone knows that the pay scale of 1.1.2016 revision was due, when the revision of pay scale is implemented, that expenditure would be from one lakh to two lakhs. Then how much they will increase the fee? It was not possible to see calculation of the ratio like that. That was a social sector and total responsibility comes on MHRD and the Punjab Government. They (University) should take the grant from them and the fees should not be increased more than 10%. One more thing was that they should see that how much burden was on the University in the cases of age of reemployment of 65 years. They discuss again and again and leave the issue. They (Senate) should form a Committee in which teacher should not be a member. They should come to know whether 65 years employment should be there or retirement age should be 65 years or not and how much burden comes on the University with this re-employment and if they (Panjab University) appoint new persons then how much difference of expenditure comes. Why that was restricted only to the University teachers, why not to the colleges. If the re-employment was to be given, then that should be uniform policy and it should be implemented in colleges also.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he understand that today's meeting to some extent was a damage control meeting. So much damage of the University had been done and he thinks that in the world what has been talked about the University, they were all very sad for that. He thinks that in that damage control, one very positive thing had been done today and all were unanimous on the issue that the complaints against the students be taken back and that was a very good step. He feels that the entire mistake was of mishandling on 11<sup>th</sup> April. If mishandling would have not happened on 11<sup>th</sup> April, perhaps that would had not become national or international news. Small things happen there in the Universities and that will continue to remain there. But, he was surprised that the Vice-Chancellor could be out of station due to any reasons. He (Vice Chancellor) may have some other occupied meetings, he himself can tell in a better way, but they can't say that why he (Vice Chancellor) was not there. That was wrong. That happens in the world and one had to go. It was very sad that in the absence of Vice Chancellor, the person, the official who was availing the position of Vice Chancellor, availing the responsibility, mistake took place at that level. He thinks at that time as the Dean of University Instruction had himself told that he went away and gave the charge to the Dean Research. If there was fire outside, cane (lathi) charging being done, stone throwing being done, tear gas was being applied and there the Head of the Institution goes at home through the backdoor, no other act may be irresponsible than that act. He wants to say that as the word of sedition came to say about the state, which was made as news and that damage control was done after that and if acting Vice Chancellor would have been sitting there, his advise would had been taken how to handle the situation. The names of 66 persons (students) were given. He was surprised that the Committee was formed and the Chief of University Security was Head and the DSW was his Assistant, his Co-Chairman that had never been heard like that. He thinks the Chief of University Security was not in a position to do anything in that, but he says what that had been done and after that the person, who had given names of 66 persons, was saying 14 persons were good, remove them from list, 13 persons were good remove them from the list. He was surprised that the person (Chief of University Security) who had given complaint, he was saying who was right and who was not. That all happened due to mishandling or as all his friends says, which was very clear, how the students were tortured in police station and all that happened, no one talked on that. He want to say that the inquiry of the incident be got done and facts be looked into where the wrong has



been committed. He would say that when the inquiry will be done, many things will come out that various lapses had been done and mishandling had been done on that day. So, he would demand that the inquiry of that thing be got done, to see that why mishandling was done on that day. What were the reasons of that, so that truth be brought out and who had done all that provocation, that will also come out in inquiry. Second thing, he feels that first it has been seen, perhaps Professor R.P. Bambah was sitting there or Vice Chancellor would tell, perhaps happening for the first time, that Government of India, University Grants Commission, in the recommendations and direction of MHRD Ministry, filing SLP against the University of his own state. If there was any example, that will be news for him. That was new thing for him that the Government of India, filing SLP against his own University and he was reading that they had appointed a retired Judge as our Counsel and how much fees he (Counsel) would be charging to the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that Justice B.B. Parsoon was not charging anything.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that right, then that was good. But even then, his (Vice Chancellor's) time and everything was being going in that SLP, which was very unfortunate. There political issues rose every day, but were solved there, not that they involve in litigation or in court. The time that he would had given to the University in the Senate, was being spent in the court's case. Second thing was that to use the police so much there (at Campus) was to encourage the provocation. He remembers perhaps in 2003, there was a Vice Chancellor there (in Panjab University). He said that section 144 had been imposed in the University and no one can come around his (then Vice Chancellor's) residence. They had also protested at that time and he and Shri Anmol Rattan Sidhu had walked together to emphasise that the University should not be run with section 144. So that in rare case, when there is very much emergency, only then, police should be used. The issue regarding fees, they had earlier also given dissent by saying that if fees was hiked 10%, then they would not give dissent. He had also said the same thing in the Syndicate. So, he wants to say again that fee hike should not be more than 10%. Their concern should be to satisfy the students. The message should go in the world that they (Panjab University) had solved the issue.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he felt that being an Indian citizen, he is living in a poor country. Whenever he refers to the Preamble of the Constitution of India, there the country has been defined as a socialist State and the spirit should be a socialistic one. But in the present times, it is going towards commercialisation. As the commercialisation is being done, then according to him, the word 'socialist' from the Preamble of the Constitution should be removed. Under the present circumstances, the educational institutions are being commercialised and are going against the spirit of State universities. If such a situation continues in Panjab University and other universities and the fees are being increased, then there would not be much difference. According to him, they should not become a part of it. They have always been opposing the fee hike and the teachers are also opposing that the commercialisation of the education should not be done, otherwise the education would not reach to the grassroots level in this poor country, which earlier used to. If they enhance the fee at a high level, then the education would not reach to a level which they otherwise think that it would reach and the dream of providing education would not be fulfilled. The Government should also think over it. The enhancement in the fee is unjustified. The enhancement should not be more than 10%, so that all the children could get education. If the Government forces the University to enhance the fee, then the administration, governing body, teachers and the students should collectively fight with the Government, but not individually. The income slab for fee concession should not be made so that there is no further division in the society. Some of the members had proposed and he also talked about it that the alumni of Panjab University are very strong and they could think of generating some funds through them, especially from those who are settled abroad.

Some of the colleagues have also brought it to notice that whenever an alumni meet is organised, it is being organised at a very short notice of 4-5 days as recently happened in the case of Biophysics. Some of the alumni from abroad wanted to attend the same, but could not because they came to know about the same just 3 days before the meet. The dates of the alumni meet should be fixed in advanced and put on the website, so that if someone is interested, could attend the meet. In the last meeting also, it was discussed that the expenditure of the University is increasing, they should cut down the expenditure. Some of the colleagues think that the remuneration for examination duty and evaluation is a part of the expenditure. One of the members has just talked about it. He brought it to the notice of the House that under the present policy of the Government, about 400 teachers have been recruited and they would be paid a salary of Rs.21,600/- for a period of 3 years. Do they think that this amount is sufficient to maintain a family? If a teacher is working extra time after fulfilling the requirement of 40 working hours, should he/she be not given the payment for that. There are so many private Colleges which in actual are paying the salary of Rs.21600/- or Rs.15,600/- whereas they are showing the salary as Rs.42,000/- on record and the managements are taking back the money after immediate withdrawal through ATM or some other means, and this money is going directly into the pockets of the management. The Government says that the education is not a profitable profession and no earnings could be done through that. But Colleges are being opened rapidly and those all are personal Colleges. The management of such Colleges consists of the family members and relatives. Do they not have a need to think over it? Is it not an exploitation? If it is an exploitation, then why they do not take any action. This issue has been discussed time and again, but no action has been taken. He requested that it should be kept in mind that there is no exploitation of the teachers, students. It is the duty of the teachers to provide quality education to the students. When a student goes away for further studies, then he is under the care of the teacher. If they have to build up a nation, it could be done through providing quality education to the students which is their duty. The quality education should also be affordable so that the students could take the benefit. The fee structure should not be such that only 10-15% could get the education and 80% of the students are deprived of the education. He requested that the hike in fee should not be much.

On a point of order, Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that she has come to know that, about 2-3 years ago, students' bodies sent some paper that if the fee is increased @ 5% annually, then the students' bodies would stand with the University on annual increase of 5%.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could not be implemented.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that it could not be, but if they go with this 10% proposal, according to her, the students would not be objecting to it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when the 5% proposal was put in, 5% across the board for traditional as well as self sustaining courses. The 5% increase was for the self-sustaining courses and the students of these courses protested and the students go together. That is why this band of increase of a minimum of Rs.500/- and the maximum of Rs.1200/- was created. The students at the end of the day want that the burden of enhancement should be shared by all the students in some equitable way. It is not equal but somewhat in equitable way. When it becomes equitable way, then there are problems.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there was a solution to it but it was not implemented. If at the time of advertisement, they specify that this much is the fee and would be enhanced by 5% every year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could be for future only.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it was suggested last time also that when they give an advertisement for UILS, they should give the fee structure of entire 5-year course. It is in between the course that they are enhancing the fee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is where the problem is. The burden could not be put on the current students. Whatever is to be enhanced, it would be applicable for future students.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the enhanced fee should be mentioned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want to indulge in arguments at this stage because each other's compulsions would not be understood.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice-Chancellor to try to understand a simple proposal given by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa is saying that they should put it at the time of advertisement. The existing students had joined on the basis of the Handbook of Information.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Handbook of Information should have contained this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was not approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that is why it was not implemented.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the students should know about the estimated expenditure on fee for a particular course which should also include the enhancement of 5% or 10% every year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that such a practice is being followed in Maharashtra.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the Government of India had demonetized and introduced digitalisation. Due to that, the University made a provision for on-line payments to the Centre Superintendents and other staff also. But till today, whether it is due to financial crunch or other reasons, maximum of the College teachers have not received their evaluation payments. He had a discussion with the Finance and Development Officer, who has assured that the payments would be made before 12<sup>th</sup> May for which he is thankful to him. There were so many queries pouring from different quarters. He said that the demonetisation and digitalization of the Government of India has failed. For the evaluation going to start in the month of May, the online payment of evaluation should be stopped, because the teachers do not come to know about the payments. Firstly, the payments are not made by the University. Secondly, the teachers do not get sms for which there is no fault on the part of the University. He requested that the earlier mode of on-the-spot payment for evaluation be restored. There would be no problems in it.

While raising another point, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the University prepares a list of holidays. Most of the Colleges, especially the private un-aided ones, do not observe the holidays of the University. Therefore, directions in this regard be issued. Sometimes, the University has to declare holiday on-the-spot. Recently, such a decision was taken by the University as there was a holiday declared in Punjab. He requested that such a decision should be taken and be communicated to the Colleges before lunch

so that the Colleges could act accordingly and the staff and the students are made aware of it in time.

Raising another point, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that in the Senate meeting held in December, 2016, he had discussed an issue that in the fee structure being sent by the University to the Colleges, there is a column of retirement benefit charges which is about Rs.1940/- being charged by the Colleges. In that column, there is a condition that every College would create a separate budget head. He requested that information be sought from Colleges as to which of the Colleges have created a separate head and which not. If, some action has been taken in this matter, that may be known to him, if no action taken, then necessary action be taken.

Raising another point, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that he had earlier also discussed on the issue of a complaint of the SDP College for Women, Ludhiana. There are some other Colleges also. The Colleges are not only taking back the money from the salary which is being paid to the teachers, but the salary is also being deducted for the casual leave which is a fundamental right. If a teacher takes the casual leave, he/she is not marked on leave, but marked as absent and the salary is deducted. The teachers could be asked to take prior permission for the leave but not should be marked absent. SDP College, Ludhiana has deducted the salaries of the teachers for the month of July to August. Therefore, an explanation should be called for from the Colleges as to why such a thing is being done. Even the teachers are being compelled to avail the earned leave in place of casual leave which is an undemocratic system.

Raising another point, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that whenever a panel of experts for the appointment of Principals in the College is sent for which the Colleges gives the advertisement. As of today, a person having 405 points is eligible for the post of Principal as per the UGC guidelines.

Raising another point, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the Colleges are not deducting 10% EPF as per the rules of the University. It should be looked into.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that as pointed out by Dr. Gurmeet Singh and Dr. Ajay Ranga, the only way for the University is to ask for the central status. As the Vice-Chancellor has already formed a Committee of 4 members to discuss the financial position of the University, the Committee could also discuss with the Chief Minister as well as the MHRD Minister, if there is a possibility of extending Central University status. As Shri Deepak Kaushik has said that the ratio of teaching to non-teaching is a deterrent in declaring Panjab University as a Central University or granting central status. According to him, there are so many universities which already have ratio much more than or equal to what Panjab University has. So, this ratio should not stop Panjab University from getting what it deserves like the heritage status, institution of national importance, Central University or a centrally funded institute. The model could be worked out. There are universities like Allahabad University, Guru Ghasidas University, Bilaspur and Pondicherry University, which are already running with the similar model of having existing affiliated Colleges like Panjab University. As is being done by the Committee formed by the Syndicate, they all could be open to this and should work together, so that it can be taken up further. On the issue of agitation and the violence that happened on 11<sup>th</sup> April, he said that the violence is condemnable, the police action is also condemnable. As is being said that the teachers should have been there and they should have been controlling the mob, questions have been raised over the handling of the situation by the Dean of University Instruction and the Chief of University Security also. He had seen that some of the Wardens were there and helping in controlling the mob. According to him, there should not be belittling of the teachers of the campus. When it is said that the teachers should be role model, they should all define that they are role models here. Majority of the people sitting in the Senate are also teachers.

According to him, the teachers are being belittled in the Senate itself. About the fee hike whatever the Senate decides, consensus looks that since they are saying for 10% fee hike across the board, if that is acceptable, they have to increase the fee and that is also a compulsion for the administration of the University and the Senate should endorse the 10% fee hike all across.

Professor B.S. Ghuman, in the light of the discussion going on since morning, suggested that they should revisit the fee hike faculty-wise rather than across the board. There are certain faculties like Languages and Social Sciences where the employability is very low and the cost of services is too low. So, they should link it with the faculty, rather than across the board. Secondly, the tuition fee under first alternative which is previous one or under second alternative which is 10% bound to increase. If it is so, according to him, it is the responsibility of the State or of the University to improve quality of teaching, research and employability. They should not undermine that if they are increasing value of education, simultaneously they should make attempt to improve the quality of teaching, research and employability. Thirdly, this point has also been raised by Ambassador I.S. Chadha also, that the quality of teaching, research and employability could not take place when they are facing huge faculty crunch. Most of the Departments are operating at 20% or 30% or less than 50% strength. If a Department is operating at such ratio of the faculty strength, they could not ensure the students and the public that quality teaching, research and employability would improve in the background that MHRD itself has taken a decision that no contractual appointment of the teachers be made, but all positions should be regularly filled up. Therefore, he suggested that they should write to the MHRD and UGC to review its decision where a blanket ban on recruitment has been imposed. Need based recruitment should be allowed, only then the University could discharge its functions in the blanket ban. Otherwise, they would not be able to deliver the services which they promise to the public.

Professor Promila Pathak appreciated the continuous and untiring efforts being made by the Vice-Chancellor towards bringing out the Panjab University out of the financial crisis. The Panjab University Teachers Association (PUTA) being a party in the court cases has been witnessing his continuous efforts in this regard in the court cases for the last many months. Though the matter is sub-judice, however, they are hopeful of the success and for the regularisation of grants to the Panjab University, and the capping to be removed. In this regard, she endorsed working for proposal being discussed in the Committee constituted by the Syndicate. Regarding the Panjab University as a Centrally Funded University or heritage status or institute of national character, as in this case, the governance and academic structure is not going to change. There is no case regarding the ratio of 1:1.1 and all that. She requested all the members of this august House that they should condemn the violence on 11<sup>th</sup> April and the decision for withdrawal of the cases against the students is a positive step on the part of the administration in this regard. Further, Hon'ble Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal deserves appreciation as he has taken a very good initiative and shown his grace for offering a contribution for the reserve funds of Panjab University. This would not only motivate the alumni in the country but also across the globe. In this regard, she made an appeal to all the teachers to contribute an amount equal to one increment as contribution towards reserve fund of Panjab University. There seems to be a consensus among the Fellows who are the members of PUTA executive. As far as the fee hike is concerned, according to her, the proposal of fee hike with concessions in different slabs seems better. 10% fee hike for all the ongoing and the fresh students because as in the former case, there are at least provisions for concessions for economically weaker sections. Then, there is no fee hike for the ongoing students.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that all the Fellows and the people who have vast experience in the field have spoken everything. But there are few things which he will like to

mention. The first point is, he did not know how his fellow colleagues feel, but there was a term he heard for the first time Consumer Price Index (CPI). He felt and is reminded of few lines by the President, James A. Garfield who used to say that next in importance to freedom and justice is the access to higher education. For him, higher education in itself is a form of human rights. When they use such kind of words in such an august House, he did not know what they are going, what they are dealing with. There are students who are shouting. They are dealing with the lives of young children. They are dealing here with the quality and dignity of their lives, of the people who are vulnerable and when they enter into the campus, they are susceptible to exploitation. He is also a first-timer. He does feel though it is not right to say that they are taking baby steps. They look at the Vice-Chancellor as a father figure and also to the people who are representing the Senate for the last so many years. They do feel the exploitation. He would not discuss that. Many Senators have used the word exploitation, but exploitation happens at every level, at their level and at the level of the students also. But to deprive the students of their very basic right like Professor R.P. Bambah had said and noted down those words so that he should not be wrong. They all have trust in the Vice-Chancellor for whatever efforts he is making. Professor R.P. Bambah had said that “despite his best efforts, he is not as successful as he should be” and there is one thing that Professor Bambah said, he would like to salute him for that also, that “if I would have been the Vice-Chancellor, I would not have forwarded even a single name to police”. Professor Bambah has such kind of a resolve. What he meant to say here is that they have to take a decision here and like Professor Bambah said that some people would agree with the Vice-Chancellor, some would not. But what kind of a decision? This is a very august House, the decisions and the kind of discussions regarding the fee hike of 10% or 20%. In this Senate of Panjab University, are such kind of issues worth of discussion. He did not know whether such kind of issues should really be discussed here. What is the mandate of this Senate? There is a financial problem, that is one aspect. But still could not they convince the Ministry. They are having Senators from all walks of life. There are so many politicians, senior legal luminaries. Why could not they tell the Government that it is running away from its responsibility? Why could not they send a letter? Why should they involve the students? Why they are using the terms like Consumer Price Index? He suggested that, if everyone agrees, the wordings like this should not be a part of the Senate proceedings. They are not dealing with the products in a super market. There are students and they are dealing with their feelings, their future as they look towards them. They as Senators look up to the Vice-Chancellor. He did not know whether this is right or wrong, whether this discussion is even right or wrong, to what extent this is right. The future generations would sit on these chairs and would say as to what they were doing, what they were discussing. The issue of re-employment or enhancement of age from 60 years to 65 years as Shri Prabhjit Singh has talked about. They are the role models. There are young blood. The Supreme Court ruled that it is within the domain of the legislature to decide whether to give re-employment or not. He has a judgment related with it, he might be wrong. But the gist of that statement was that there is a need to infuse young blood into the system so that the freshness of ideas is maintained. Tomorrow those students could come and ask that they have taken away their responsibility and they as teachers would be failing in their duty when they would not be able to respond to the students. Yes, they took away the opportunities of the students. He did know the basic as to how to define the unemployment. But it is something like that a person wants to work but he is not provided an opportunity to work. So, for the last few times, he has attended 4-5 meetings and observed that, do not take it otherwise, many things are discussed, lot of people ask very relevant questions like today Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said and made certain suggestions. Also Professor Shelley Walia had said that there are people who would not accept the payment. There are so many ideas. But the decision, as he has attended the last 4-5 meetings, what he has found or what he has observed is that where is the decision, what is resolved. He did not understand as to what is resolved. What is the issue and what is resolved. One after another, everyone stands up, speaks and then sit down. Then another person stands and speaks something and also sits down. What is the issue, what is the outcome, what is the

resolved part? There is famous poem by Robert H. Schuller which goes like this “never cut a tree in the winter time; never take a negative decision in your low time; never take a bad decision when you are in worst of moods; wait, be patient, the spring will come”. His very simple question is that when that spring would come. When they would be able to know before leaving that these decisions have been taken? They are not able to go outside and tell anybody as to what decisions have been taken. They, as Senators, do not know anything, they do not know as to what is the resolved part. From 10.00 in the morning, these poor fellows (students), otherwise also given today’s economic scenario, their future is bleak. There is a kind of barricade which represents their mindset that the students are shouting but they (members) are not able to hear or they are not ready to hear. They have all the means, they have former and current MPs, but they could not do anything. If a 92-member House could not decide or could not reach to a decision as to what has to be done, then why they are sitting here.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that as there seems to be a consensus on 10% hike in fee, they could go ahead with it. She suggested that the police should be kept out of the campus. Whenever they feel any need of the help of the police, the police should wait outside the campus but should not enter the campus. Whatever proposal Professor Shelley Walia had proposed in the last meeting of the Senate, she has implemented it that the teachers of the campus should not take any remuneration for the paper setting and paper evaluation. Whenever discussions are held with the students, they say that the University is passing on all the burden to the students and what the teachers contribute towards it as they are drawing a good salary. Therefore, they as teachers should set an example and should also contribute. They could also take a decision not to accept the payment of TA/DA for local inspections. For outstation duties, a common taxi service should be availed by the members so that expenditure on separate TA/DA is not incurred. The teachers of campus have no issue regarding salary and even then are also availing the concession for their wards, they should stop taking the fee concession.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu appreciated the hard work being done by the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar during the last one month shuttling from Chandigarh to Delhi. He also appreciated the sacrifice being made by their families as they are spending most of their time for the University. Each and everything has been discussed in detail a number of times. There is some contradiction that the Vice-Chancellor had given a statement before the last meeting of the Senate or perhaps in the Senate that the fee of the Colleges would not be increased. He requested that a Committee of the Syndicate/Senate be formed to increase the fee of the self-financing courses running in the Colleges because the new pay-scales are due and with that it would be very difficult to pay the salaries. He requested to consider this point also. On the fee hike, he suggested that it should not be hiked by more than 10% and the cases filed against the students should be withdrawn.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he wanted to discuss the issues whether related to the re-employment or the fee or as Shri Deepak Kaushik has also talked about that due to semester system, there is a burden on the non-teaching staff. This should also be kept in mind. As all the members agree that the incident which happened on 11<sup>th</sup> April is an unfortunate and from the discussion he understands that it indicates that it is due to some fault on the part of the Vice-Chancellor. He has no hesitation in saying that every member of the House is responsible for that who is sitting today and was also present on 26<sup>th</sup> March. They had at that time told that this item should be again brought and discussed, but at that time nobody listened to them. Now after having messed up the issue and getting disrepute, when the people talk to them and ask as to what they are doing especially, he is under pressure being the first-timer. As earlier, they used to say that such and such work would be done, but what has been done. Whenever he says that he had got recorded his dissent, then the people say that what is the use of it. He is being questioned time and again. They are sitting here since morning. But for whom

(students), they are discussing the issue, they are waiting for the decision. As before lunch they had talked to the students that the cases would be withdrawn, the students are also puzzled whether the cases would be withdrawn or the same would be withdrawn only after having a discussion with the Governor. Therefore, they should resolve both the major issues otherwise there is no use of having discussions which they are doing since morning. He would like to be excused if his words pinch someone because whatever decision they have to take, they are not taking that. As requested by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, why the information is not being provided. Professor Rajesh Gill has also pointed out the issue of involvement of Rs.2 crores about which he is not aware, but why that matter is not being discussed. Dr. Amit Joshi has also said that they are discussing the issue but what is the impact. In the last meeting of the Senate he had also asked for the reasons as to why the Central Government and the Punjab Government are not giving the grants. They could try to manage that. As Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has made an announcement of contributing an amount of Rs.2 lacs every year, there are so many alumni who contribute funds if they approach such persons. Every time it is being discussed that the fee would be enhanced. They should think over it and it is not that all the Governments would be doing like this. Nobody wants to say it openly but undertone everyone says that all these problems are due to 1-2 persons. He did not know as to who those 2 persons are. Since all the persons are senior and experienced, they could have discussions with those two persons and solve the issues. It is because of those two persons that the students are being burdened and all the burden is being passed on to the students. If they would have put right the decision that they took on 26<sup>th</sup> March, then they would not have faced the unfortunate incident which happened on 11<sup>th</sup> April. Therefore, only the Vice-Chancellor should not be blamed for it, they all are responsible for it. Why the members on that day itself did not say that the fee should not be hiked by 1100%. The students approached each and every Senator to help them on this issue. Now, they are saying that the students are their own children and if their own children were there in place of these students, they would not have behaved like this. This could have been done on that day itself. He also pointed out an issue related with the Education Colleges that they are appointing the non-NET candidates and paying the salary between Rs.5000/- to Rs.10000/-. Whatever they are discussing should be put into practice. Since morning they are discussing that the cases should be withdrawn, a letter in this regard should have been finalised before going for the lunch. As they are discussing about 10% hike in fee, a resolution in this regard should have been passed before lunch itself so that the protesting students would not have to wait. If any of the members has any objection to what he is saying, he/she could object. Other discussions could have been continuing for which they are present. There might be only about 10% mischievous students, but why the other about 90% of the students are being punished for no fault. The Vice-Chancellor being an experienced person could find out a better solution to this problem as compared to the members and also listens to every person patiently. Such a person could find out a better solution. If there is any problem related with the House, they are ready to request anyone to facilitate the Vice-Chancellor in the matter. They come, discuss the issues, but what they resolve. In the first meeting, he had requested that the results of re-evaluation and reappear should be declared in a time bound manner. If they approach the clerical staff regarding this, they say that the teachers do not evaluate the papers, take the answer sheets to their residence and keep pending. Are the answer sheets their personal property? Why the evaluators are not directed to evaluate the answer sheets within a timeframe? If one is not able to evaluate, the duty could be assigned to other teachers. There are so many teachers in the University who could evaluate the answer sheets. These are minor issues which develop into major ones. He requested to pay attention to these problems. First of all, leaving other issues aside, the decision of hike in tuition fee by 10% be taken and not for other fee as they have already taken a decision to hike the examination fee by 100%. He knows the ground realities, which some of the members might not be knowing, that he has seen the students crying as they are not able to even pay a fee of Rs.5000/-. Unfortunately, at one point of time he was sitting in the office of the Principal, Government College, Hoshiarpur and found that two cousin sisters borrowed an amount of Rs.10,000/- on



interest to pay the fee. Shri Varinder Singh had said that Abohar is a border area. The Hoshiarpur has always been a topper in education except one time one Sangrur was the topper, the students of Hoshiarpur area are not aware of it that the facility of fee concession is also available. He would like to apologise if his words have hurt anyone. He requested that these suggestions should be noted and implemented but should not remain on papers only. He had earlier also raised an issue that the general category students should also be allowed to appear as private candidates. But till date, he did not know whether this has been recorded or not.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that they are in a very awkward situation because they have converted a special meeting into an ordinary meeting and the Act also provides certain ways in which ordinary meetings are held. It stipulates that because this is a very large body and it needs a smaller body to look into the details of the recommendations and they are debarred from looking into anything without the recommendations of the Syndicate. The University has been accused of violating the Calendar as pointed out in the morning. He hoped that this would not create an awkward situation for elements to say that this meeting of the Senate was also a violation of the Calendar. This has become more like a zero hour and everybody has said something. They have no agenda or a written agenda, it is just like a recommendation and therefore, they are handicapped in coming to a rational decision. Secondly, regarding the fee hike, he said that let them look into the nature. The last time that they met, the Senate considered the recommendations of the Committee which had gone into the depth of the issue and came up with certain recommendations which were approved. Though there were 6 dissents which he has seen, but the majority felt it to be correct. Even if they want to reconsider it and whatever they want to increase like 5% or 10% or 20%, it has to be analysed in the context in which the fee hike has been considered, in the context of the difficulties which the University is facing, the financial crisis that they are facing. They have to see the result of what is proposed or what is done, how does it fit in the situation that they are facing in the Court, with the UGC and the MHRD. So, that is something which he said that it would not be proper to take a decision on the basis of just a general proposition. Regarding the withdrawal of FIR, there is no difficulty in writing to the police, but the thing which they have to keep in mind is that on this issue, the police has to go to the court to cancel the FIR. The Court would look into the reasons again and if it is satisfied to cancel the FIR and if not satisfied, the court would give the directions. Let them hope that this strengthens the hands of the police in going to the court.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that why they have reached a situation where they are, there are many reasons, multiple reasons. Whenever there is a crisis, one should listen to people who may be harsh but the reality whatever they say one might not like but it is very fruitful to listen to such people rather than only talking with people who pat one. She has seen that in this Senate also there is a hierarchy and she has seen the hostile environment especially in relation to her. It is very unfortunate because, according to her, she has never spoken anything irrelevant. Throughout her life, she has not done that just to grab attention. So, she feels bad, very sorry to see the state of affairs. She has put in here more than 30 years here as a teacher. Prior to that, she was a student here. For her more is at stake on her behalf. She belongs to this University. It gives her some solace to listen to Dr. Amit Joshi, Shri Sandeep Singh and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, the younger people in the Senate, who were talking with greater sense and even after more than one term, she also goes home and when someone asks her as to what was resolved, she never knows as to what was resolved because there had been times that whatever they decided, when they go home and the next day when open the paper, the thing is opposite to what actually they had resolved. It is very unfortunate. Coming to what Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal did today, it is commendable. Everybody should do it. She has also been sitting here and thinking that being emotional everybody feels like doing something for the alma mater. She has been talking about this to her friends also and did they know what most of them say that they could contribute money to the

University but what is the surety that the University would spend this money in a better way, there would be no misuse. Have they ever talked about the corruption in the University? Why do they avoid talking about this? This is the crux of the matter, they have to hit the nail at the head. This is the reason and they try to brush it aside that if she speaks, she would talk about it only and she would not be allowed to talk. But she would talk about it as she is sitting in the House since ten o'clock in the morning. She also has a family, she is also a woman. But this is an institution to which she owes her life. Whatever respect she commands in the society, whatever status she has, she owes to this institution. But her respect and insult does not matter here. She has that conviction. She was reading about the proposal of reserve fund about which a discussion has also taken place here. She was thinking that if they create a reserve fund what is the guarantee that this fund would not be misappropriated. Did they know how the people talk? This is a public forum where formal discussions take place and they talk in clear terms. But how do they talk in private life where it is said that the provident fund should be withdrawn because it is not known whether they would be able to get it in future. When she was sitting in the meeting of the Faculty, one of the colleagues said that she has already withdrawn the maximum of the fund and only the minimum amount is in the account. First, they need to build up the credibility of this institution and the other things could be done later on. What is the credibility? What is the national importance? Where is the credibility of this institution and why the credibility is at stake? She told why it is so. In the last meeting as well as in other meetings of the Senate, discussion took place on some cases of corruption. What they have done in that matter. It is being talked about in the society. If they do not discuss about it here, could it not be discussed in public. Everybody is talking about this outside, in the classrooms, in the staff rooms. Even the students, non-teaching staff, laypersons and the society, all are also talking about it and ask them as to what they have done. What they have done? In the last meeting of the Senate, the reports submitted by the CVO were very methodically placed in the last at Sr. No.I-33. It was done deliberately, it is not without design. Nobody cared about it. When it was the time for the national anthem, she had talked about it that there is an item I-33. Otherwise also, nobody bothers as to what is being placed before them as table agenda item because it is convenient. There is a politics of meeting. Those reports would have been approved as such in the items for information. But she had said that she wanted the reports. It was very nice of the Vice-Chancellor who had asked her about which reports she wanted to which she had asked for all the reports. At this, the Vice-Chancellor had directed to provide all the reports and said that she would get all the reports immediately after this meeting. She kept on writing for those reports and she got a letter, which all the Senators must have got, saying that the reports are available with the DR (Estate) and whoever is willing, could go and check the reports. If the Chair, the Vice-Chancellor in this meeting, which is so-called supreme governing body, makes a statement which is an assurance, which is almost a promise that she would get the reports as also those who wanted those reports, would be given to them. Who would honour that statement, it is the administration who has to honour it. What the administration is doing, why it does not honour that statement? Why do they go without being honoured but just getting assurances? She had to write several letters and e-mail time and again and every time she was asked to take the reports from different persons. When the statement is made on the floor of the House, where is the sanctity of the Senate. She reminded that in the same Senate, another assurance which was made by the Vice-Chancellor that in the next meeting, this one being a special Senate, all the CVO reports would be brought as an item for consideration and she is sure that the same would be brought for consideration of the next Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that unfortunately because of his limitations, he could not attend the last meeting of the Senate. What Professor Rajesh Gill has touched is a very technical, critical and sensitive issue. It was raised by him in the Syndicate and Senate putting straight allegations on the then Dean Student Welfare, the then member of the Senate, the then member of the Syndicate and present member of the Syndicate and Senate. He was told in the evening that as per CVO reports, nothing concrete has come

out as far as supporting the allegations is concerned and he really takes the moral responsibility on a demand made by a so-called closest friend of his own, i.e., Professor Keshav Malhotra in his absence demanding his removal from the Senate on account of making wrong allegations which could not substantiate CVO reports. Before the Senate passes a resolution to remove him from the Senate, he had already undertaken that he is ready to undergo any kind of punishment including criminal proceedings if what he had said is proved to be wrong whether it is CVO, CBI, CVC, the police, the vigilance. If the authority sitting on the helm of the affairs with special reference to the Vice-Chancellor is ready to conduct the proceedings in a transparent and honest manner. He again said that he has been told that the CVO reports say that a person named such and such about whom he had told, is the son of real maternal uncle of the then Dean Student Welfare. He had also told the name of the maternal uncle also. He requested in the Senate, the CVO in the presence of the Registrar, the Vice-Chancellor in private, in the Syndicate, in the Senate that in case his allegation is found to be wrong, he is ready to be hanged but he should be associated with the enquiry. He was assured that he would be called to substantiate. What Professor Rajesh Gill is saying is right that unless and until the corruption is removed from this University, no decision is going to help the University. As far as the demand for inviting the Chancellor to this meeting is concerned as somebody said that let them pass a resolution, he wanted to share with this House that as per the Calendar, it is the Chancellor who is to preside over the meeting of the Senate but unfortunately they even do not send the meeting notice along with the agenda to the Chancellor. How could they request the Chancellor to come and preside over the meeting? As per the Calendar, the notice has to go to the Chancellor as also the agenda, of course under the direction of the Vice-Chancellor. So, in future according to him, this should be made a practice that agenda and the notice should also be sent to the Chancellor. He wanted to say in the context of the police that so many times it has been discussed in the Senate that there was a time when the police was not allowed to enter the campus until and unless there was some emergency. But because the police was not allowed to enter, slowly they started calling the police to the hostels specially during nights. When the terrorism came, the police which was not allowed to enter in the campus, a police chowki was made in the campus for their presence 24 hours in the campus. Slowly, as has been seen when they were coming in the administrative block after the lunch for the meeting of the Senate, when they entered the administrative block, it was full of policemen inside as the students are sitting outside. He just made a request that let them try, as suggested by Professor R.P. Bambah, to treat the students as their own children and let them try to act as parents. Fourthly, this is the apprehension in the minds of all which has come true that in the morning he had requested to supply the copies of all the communication exchanged between the police and the University and it was assured that it would be provided but it has not come till now. In the absence of those documents, they took a decision before lunch that the complaint filed by the University be withdrawn. The Vice-Chancellor assured the House that he would go and address the students to announce the decision that the Senate has resolved to withdraw the complaint but unfortunately what happened. The only difference was that they were talking on the first floor and the moment the Vice-Chancellor went to the ground floor to the students and said that he would meet the Governor, would talk to the Home Secretary and would see to it that the issue is resolved. That is not the decision of the Senate. That is why there is always a doubt that what they are deciding is something else and what is recorded is something else and that pain the Vice-Chancellor has also suffered as he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has gone through the papers that what was decided in the meeting of the MHRD and UGC probably was something else and he (Vice-Chancellor) has raised objections to the minutes recorded by them (MHRD/UGC) as they (members) also feel the same pain that the discussion takes place something else and the decisions are something else but recording is something else. So, the distrust has gone to this extent that all the members of the House want to know exactly what is the decision in the form of exact resolution. That should be given as far as withdrawing the complaint is concerned. Secondly, everybody is unanimous that fee should not be increased by more

than 10% across the board, no slab system. According to him, they could take this decision in the form of resolution to be read in front of all. Let it be drafted and read.

Professor Chaman Lal said that since Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal had to leave, he had drafted a resolution which he gave to him and he would read the resolution which would resolve one of the issues. He read out the resolution proposed by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal that “the students’ protest against the recent fee hike at Panjab University on 11<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 took an unfortunate turn leading to scuffle, lathi charge, stone pelting and use of water cannon and lobbing of tear gas shells. On a complaint by the University, an FIR was registered and cases filed against 68 students. The Senate at its meeting today discussed the matter in detail and came to the unanimous conclusion that to build up a conducive environment and reach out to the protesting students, the complaint and the subsequent proceedings be withdrawn. In view of this, the Senate decided to request the Chandigarh Administration that it may take the steps to move further for closure of the case”. He (Professor Chaman Lal) seconded this proposal and proposed that this proposal should be unanimously accepted. This is one thing. If anyone has any objection, he/she could raise it. This is about withdrawal of cases. He proposed that this proposal may be unanimously accepted. If anybody has any objection, otherwise it may be taken as approved. He handed over the proposal prepared by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal.

This was agreed to by most of the members.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the unanimous decision on the fee has also been taken to be increased by 10%.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the tuition fee could be enhanced by 10%. He read out a proposal that “in the interest of academic and peaceful atmosphere and for the positive consideration, the event that took place on 11<sup>th</sup> of April, 2017, the Panjab University Senate unanimously decided to consider the issue sympathetically and on humanitarian grounds. The incident that happened on that day was never intended by either of the sides. Keeping in view the precious future of the students who are 68 in number, the House with full unity and unanimity decides that the criminal cases against all the 68 students be dropped. In furtherance to it, it is decided that Chief Security Officer of Panjab University, Mr. Ashwani Kaul, who is the complainant in the FIR, is directed to participate in any kind of proceedings of the courts of JMIC/District and Sessions Court/Punjab and Haryana High Court or any other court of law as petitioner or respondent as the need may be to quash or drop the criminal proceedings against all students mentioned in the FIR dated 11<sup>th</sup> of April, 2017 registered at Police Station (West), Sector-11, Chandigarh”. This is the second part of the resolution. In furtherance to it, he requested that a follow-up Committee of the Senators or any other person as the Vice-Chancellor may like should be constituted to look into the progress of the above mentioned resolution which must meet once a week to keep the update.

Dr. Jagdish Chander seconded this proposal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that is it necessary to pass a second resolution as one has already been passed. The first one is enough. He would constitute a Committee which would follow-up it. They should not approve two resolutions. The resolution proposed by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal is fine.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that since the resolution has been approved, he requested the Vice-Chancellor that the students be known about this resolution so that they could end their protest.

Professor Ronki Ram enquired about the fee resolution.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar suggested that the fee resolution should also be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that regarding the fee resolution they should think over it carefully because there could be court cases if they try to increase the fee 10%. It is not 10% this year because it has to be 10% incremental every year. If they say 10% every year, then think about this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the idea behind the discussion was that as already agreed 5% every year could be acceptable but as one time measure since they have not been able to increase the fee in the past, only for one time 10% is suggested. But 10% increase every year is not acceptable. It should be 10% increase from the new entrants from the session 2017-18 onwards.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would lead to very little amount and they would have to worry about its consequences with the MHRD, UGC and Punjab Government.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever the Vice-Chancellor had suggested, on that Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has done so much work. Whatever was suggested by the Vice-Chancellor, it would reach to Rs.9 crores and what has been suggested by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, by way of that it would reach to Rs.8 crores.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has taken this figure for all the students.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the proposed quantum of income approved on 26<sup>th</sup> March, 2017 the only thing which they are reducing is 10% wherever it was applicable as per the decision of 26<sup>th</sup> March, it would remain applicable as per today's decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then the figures taken by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal are not valid.

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

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has again and again explained it. If they apply across the board, only then Rs.61 crores becomes Rs.67 crores. Whatever has been approved is Rs.9 crores for next year when it applies only to the first year. If they apply it to the students who are joining this as well as the new students who would join the next year, then it would be Rs.18 crores (9+9). In the third year, there would be no students of M.A., it being a two-year course. Then only the students of B.Sc. 3<sup>rd</sup> year and 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year students of UIET would be covered. So this practice would saturate only in the 5<sup>th</sup> year and at that time the figure would reach Rs.30 crores.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they are targeting an amount of Rs.9 crores for the next year, if they take 10% of Rs.60 crores.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a problem in it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even if it is not done, everyone knows that they could not implement any increase on the existing students whatever they propose. So, the Senate as a special case has taken a decision, though again willingly and hesitatingly keeping in view the circumstances that instead of 5% as a one-time measure, they take the decision to increase it by 10%.

The Vice-Chancellor said that his advice to the members is that they go and talk to the students' representatives and the Core Committee of the Senate should talk to the students' representatives.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this decision is not to be implemented on the representatives of the students. Here they are talking as per the needs of the society. They are talking for future entrants and need not talk to the students. After all they are taking a conscious decision as representatives of the society.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that why they are being compelled.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not compelling. He requested not to accuse him of the things which he is not doing. He is just cautioning the members and it is his duty to caution the members. It is for the members to decide. His duty is only to implement the decisions taken by the members. He cautioned that it has to be 10% across the board.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that there could be legal problems as this decision could not be implemented in the case of examination fee and they could not implement it for the present students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that prima facie they have increased the fee for everyone in the band of Rs.500 to Rs.1200 for the last two years. Technically, it is okay that they have approved 10% increase, he accepts it and there is no issue at all. It is 10% of the tuition fee all across the board.

Some of the members said that it should be only for new entrants.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they enhance it by 10% only for new entrants, the incremental increase would be very-very small. He said that they should be prepared that the Central Government is going to freeze the grant at Rs.198 crores and Punjab is also not going to increase the grant to more than Rs.20 crores.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the whole Senate is ready to go to MHRD/UGC and stage a sit in dharna.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that they could at least increase the fee in the Chemical Engineering courses.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out the case of a researcher as to what is happening in Panjab University. The Ph.D. students, who at the time of enrolment, were given to understand that this much would be the expenditure and now they have taken a decision because there it is written that the fee to be deposited by the candidate to be decided by the Syndicate and Senate from time to time. He has been given to understand that the fee of Rs.1,500/- which was to be deposited has been increased to Rs.25,000/-. According to him, they should have some rationale without keeping a target of the fee to be collected. He remembered that the Dean of University Instruction in one of the meetings of had given a suggestion that there was no alarm raised by the students of the IIMs despite of the fact that the fee was increased many times. But he had cautioned as to why there was no agitation because the students were given something which they thought that it is not even a penny which has been increased. But what the University is giving is that in spite of the best efforts of the Vice-Chancellor, in spite of the decision having been taken in the Syndicate and the Senate, in spite of the personal assurance by the Vice-Chancellor, he gave an example of a Ph.D. student who submitted his thesis on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2016. Today, it is 7<sup>th</sup> May and the issue came to his notice three weeks back that the report of the examiner is still awaited and that also known to the candidate that those candidates who submitted the thesis much later, got their viva conducted in March and got the degrees in the Convocation. Is this the delivery that they are doing? First, let they improve the system, let they deserve to increase the quantum of fee. The only thing is that the people on whom the decision is to be enforced, they should be taken into

confidence. Had it been a representative character, the things would not have happened on 11<sup>th</sup> April and the scenario would not have been as the students are sitting outside since morning and there is an unrest and they have to take care of it. He has been told that and this is also to be informed to the House which must be a shocking news to the House that whatever increase they have making during the last years also, that is also collected from the present set of students also because he has been told that the Handbook of Information contains only the session-wise fee and when the Handbook of Information is printed next year, supposing if a student is in M.A.-I, for M.A.-II, automatically would be increased quantum when the Handbook of Information for the second year is printed. So, it is good that they have become cautious that they should know what exact the Resolution is, otherwise even if they pass a resolution, not across the board as per practice it would be applicable on the existing students also and again they would reach the same stage that they had resolved something else, how that decision is being implemented is something else and they would have to cut a sorry figure to the students though they are not going to address the students and not going to explain to them. But they feel bad within themselves, they are ashamed of themselves that the decision which they have taken, even they did not know what the decision was. If the House is of the view that it should not be across the board, whatever fee is to be increased, is to be increased for new entrants for all the courses including the Ph.D. students, no increase for them also. Let them not try to tell them that it is for the University whatever they want to charge and if the students did not pay, they would not get the degrees. This is the message that they should not give.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have already resolved that the students who were in the second year like B.Sc. Honours School or equivalent, for them the fee increase was 5% subject to minimum Rs.500/- and a maximum of Rs.1200/-. So, the resolution has to be that the increase if 10% with a minimum Rs.500/- otherwise the fee of the first year student would be less than a last year's student. There would be no capping of Rs.1200/-. Whatever he is recommending is safer.

Professor Chaman Lal said that if the tuition fee of an Arts student is Rs. 2440/- which they had enhanced to Rs.10,000/-. But now they have decided to hike by 10% and in that case the increase would be Rs.240/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the band of increase in fee for the existing student would be the same as was last year, i.e. between Rs.500/- and Rs.1200/-. The increase for the first year students on the last year's fee 10% with minimum Rs.500/- and no upper capping.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the decision applicable for the year 2016-17 is automatically applicable for 2017-18.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the decision taken in 2016-17 was only for the year 2016-17. For the decision on the increase for the year 2017-18, there are two types of students, i.e., the new and the existing. For the existing students, the fee increase is minimum Rs.500/- and a maximum of Rs.1200/- with a 5% increase and not 10% increase. 10% increase applies only to the new students in which case the minimum increase is 10% or Rs.500/- whichever is more without any upper limit. He said that what he is stating is technically sound and requested to accept the same. It is resolved that the Senate recommends that for the new incomings students 10% increase on the last year's fee with a minimum of Rs.500/-. For the previous year's students/existing students, the increase is minimum Rs.500/- with upper limit of Rs.1,200/-. In the case of those where the increases was in the bracket of Rs.500/- to Rs.1200/-, for them the increase would be the same as was increased last year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this decision of increase would be only for the tuition fee and for any other course no increase in any other charges. He said that the circulars have been issued which he did not know from where the same have been issued that the Ph.D. students have been asked to deposit up to Rs.25,000/-.

Professor B.S. Ghuman clarified that this could be due to late submission of the thesis for long years. He further suggested that the decision which they have already taken for the ongoing classes should not be mentioned.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine. The earlier increase which has been approved, there is no need to make a mention of that.

Shri Sandeep Singh enquired as to what is the earlier decision.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that in the case of students in the second year in whose case the band was minimum Rs.500/- and maximum Rs.1,200/- that is not being touched. They are only resolving only for the new coming students that 10% increase across the board with a minimum of Rs.500/-.

Some of the members agreed to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as Professor B.S. Ghuman has given a statement regarding the Ph.D. thesis not being submitted for a period ranging from 10-12 years. He said that even a person who applies for extension even after 3 years is asked to deposit Rs.25,000/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would get it checked.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in some of the Departments there are unwritten rules that nobody would be allowed to complete the Ph.D. unless and until he/she has spent 5 years in the Department whereas the University is asking for an amount of Rs.25,000/- for extension after 3 years. He requested to get it checked.

Professor Ronki Ram said that now they are taking a decision that they are increasing the fee to the minimum. In the Colleges where the fee is more than the University, those Colleges should give some advantage of that to the University.

This was objected to by some of the members.

The Vice-Chancellor read out the resolution proposed by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal that "student protest against a recent fee hike at Panjab University on April 11, 2017 took an unfortunate turn leading to scuffle, lathi charge, stone pelting, lobbing of tear gas shells and the use of water cannons. On a complaint by the University, an F.I.R. was registered and cases filed against 68 students. The Senate at its meeting dated 7.5.2017 discussed this matter in detail and came to the unanimous conclusion that to build up a conducive environment and reach out to the protesting students, complaint and subsequent proceedings against them be withdrawn. In view of this, the Senate decides to request to the Chandigarh Administration that it may please take steps to move the Court for closure of the case". The Senate accepted this resolution proposed by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal. He (Vice-Chancellor) would form a Committee which would weekly pursue these things and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa would be a part of that Committee along with the Chief of University Security to see that this should not prolong. As far as possible, the new session should not open with this backlog.



Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that a letter should also be written to the Administrator, Chandigarh Administration regarding the brutal attitude of Chandigarh Police.

The Vice-Chancellor said he would write a letter. He said that the resolution on the fee hike is that for the new entrants fee hike recommended is 10% on the fee of 2016-17 subject to a minimum of Rs.500/-.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that some serious allegations have been levelled on the office of the Vice-Chancellor, the Dean of University Instruction, the Registrar and other officers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Ashok Goyal should not worry about that as he (Vice-Chancellor) has been accused of sexual harassment and what a bigger allegation than this could be levelled. There are also police cases against him. Are the members worried about those cases?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor has to act as Vice-Chancellor but not as Professor Arun Kumar Grover.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Ashok Goyal has also to act a citizen and senior member of the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he knows his responsibility. This is not the way to conduct the meeting and an enquiry should be conducted.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) resolution proposed by Shri Pawan K. Bansal be accepted that student protest against a recent fee hike at Panjab University on April 11, 2017 took an unfortunate turn leading to scuffle, lathi charge, stone pelting, lobbing of tear gas shells and the use of water cannons. On a complaint by the University, an F.I.R. was registered and cases filed against 68 students. The Senate at its meeting dated 7.5.2017 discussed this matter in detail and came to the unanimous conclusion that to build up a conducive environment and reach out to the protesting students, complaint and subsequent proceedings against them be withdrawn. In view of this, the Senate decides to request to the Chandigarh Administration that it may please take steps to move the Court for closure of the case.
- (ii) after the detailed discussion on the fee issue, the Senate unanimously resolved to increase the tuition fee for the new entrants by 10%, subject to a minimum of Rs.500/-.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That gratitude of the Senate be conveyed to:-

- (i) Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal on having made an announcement to contribute an amount of Rs.2 lac per annum and payment of a lump sum amount of Rs.20 lacs whenever he would like to exit this contribution;
- (ii) Shri Deepak Kaushik on having made an announcement to contribute an amount of Rs.11,000/- per annum and payment

of a lump sum amount whenever he would like to exit from this contribution.

( G.S. Chadha )  
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)  
Vice Chancellor