

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the special meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Sunday, 12th February 2017** at **2.00 p.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Principal B.C. Josan
3. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma
4. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal
5. Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu
6. Professor Mukesh Arora
7. Principal N.R. Sharma
8. Professor Navdeep Goyal
9. Professor Pam Rajput
10. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
11. Shri Varinder Singh
12. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
13. Col. (Retd.) G.S. Chadha Registrar ... (Secretary)

Dr. Dalip Kumar, Shri Jarnail Singh, Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu, Dr. Subhash Sharma, Shri Jitender Yadav, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Shri T.K. Goyal, Director Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

Condolence Resolution

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

- (1) Shri G.S. Ghuman, IAS, former DPI (Punjab) and former Fellow, PU, on 11th February, 2017.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Shri G.S. Ghuman and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed soul.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

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

- i) Prof. G.S. Khush, Fellow of Royal Society (FRS), Prof. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia, Deptt. of Botany and Prof. B.S. Bhoop, University Instt. of Pharmaceutical Sciences were conferred Fellowship of the Punjab Academy of Sciences at 20th Punjab Science Congress held at Institute of Engineering & Technology (IET), Bhaddal on February 7, 2017 by Professor Ved Prakash, Chairman, University Grants Commission.

- ii) Punjab Academy of Sciences bestowed 'Desh Bhagat Sardar Lal Singh Oration Award' instituted by Desh Bhagat University, on Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor, PU, during 20th Punjab Science Congress on 7th February 2017. I had to give a talk to receive this oration and the talk is available on the Panjab University website.

Professor Pam Rajput congratulated the Vice-Chancellor and others for getting the award.

- iii) Department of Science and Technology, Government of India, has sanctioned an amount of Rs. 2.4 crores to the Department of CIL/SAIF for purchase of ICP-Mass Spectrometer, half of the cost for Spectrometer and half for its maintenance and AMC for five years, recurring expenditure, Seminars/Workshops related to it, etc. and other academic activities which need to be organized so that the Spectrometer gets utilized by a larger community.
- iv) Department of Biotechnology, Government of India, has sanctioned an amount of Rs. 94.25 lakhs for implementation of the project entitled 'Metagenomic and Functional Characterization of Soy-based Fermented Foods of Northeastern Region' by Prof. Kanwaljit Chopra of University Instt. of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU along with Dr. S.R. Joshi, North-Eastern Hill University, Shillong and Dr. K.K. Kondepudi of NABI, Punjab. The three of them are Co-Principal Investigators of the Project.
- v) Professor Sanjay Kaushik of University Business School has been appointed as Honorary Director of ICSSR-North Western Regional Centre (NWRC), Chandigarh for a period of three years by the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), Ministry of Human resource Development, New Delhi.
- vi) Professor N.S. Kapany has desired that the Honoris Causa Degree (D.Sc.) be presented to him during the next year's Convocation. He had earlier confirmed to come and he is now unable to come for the Convocation on March 25, 2017.
- vii) Shri Nuruddin Farah, recommended for the award of D.Litt. (Honoris Causa) in 2015-16, has confirmed to receive the degree at this year's Convocation on March 25, 2017. He would spend two weeks at PU Campus interacting with students, research scholars and faculty. During his stay he would deliver the PU Colloquium on March 16, 2017. As soon as he arrives, the very next day, he will deliver Panjab University Colloquium on March 16.

Justice J.S. Khehar cannot come on March 25, 2017. Dr. Kapanay cannot come. Dr. Nuruddin Farah's of last year is carried forward. So, now we have three confirmations from Professor Murli Manohar Joshi, Dr. G.S. Khush and Dr. Nurrudin Farah. The confirmation for the three medals has also been received. All of them will give minimum one lecture. Some of them will give several more lectures. The

Convocation benefit would indeed accrue not only to the University but also to many neighbouring universities. It is a good tradition to work for

RESOLVED: That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Prof. G.S. Khush, Fellow of Royal Society (FRS), Prof. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia, Deptt. of Botany and Prof. B.S. Bhoop, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences on having been conferred Fellowship of the Punjab Academy of Sciences.
 - (ii) Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor, PU, on having been bestowed 'Desh Bhagat Sardar Lal Singh Oration Award' by Desh Bhagat University.
 - (iii) Prof. Kanwaljit Chopra of University Instt. of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU on having been sanctioned an amount of Rs. 94.25 lakhs for implementation of the project entitled 'Metagenomic and Functional Characterization of Soy-based Fermented Foods of Northeastern Region' by Department of Biotechnology, Government of India.
 - (iv) Professor Sanjay Kaushik of University Business School on having been appointed as Honorary Director of ICSSR-North Western Regional Centre (NWRC), Chandigarh for a period of three years.
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (iii), (vi), and (vii), be noted and approved.

Issue regarding Legal Notice through e-mail to the Chancellor by Professor V.K. Chopra

1. Considered the issue relating to Legal Notice (**Appendix-I**) served through e-mail to the Chancellor, Panjab University by Professor V.K. Chopra, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that today's meeting is a very special meeting. Let him say that he is very anguished that such a meeting had to be convened and that also due to misdemeanour by none other than a very senior teacher of the University, a teacher who is so senior that after superannuation he has continued for over three years also as a superannuated teacher. They are well aware the kind of things the governing bodies of this University had to consider over the last three years pertaining to misdemeanours done not only by this colleague but also other faculty members. So, they have been actually very tolerant of misdemeanour of their colleagues and the society is not very kind about this tolerance because when things reach a stage that the Chancellor of this University who occupies one of the highest

offices of the nation, namely, Vice-Presidentship of the country and also the fact that the Vice-President presides over the Rajya Sabha of this country. When things reach a stage that legal notices are issued to such constitutional authority, it is no longer an internal matter of the University. The matter is in full global view. It is not confined to the borders of India that a faculty member can issue a legal notice to a constitutional authority as high as the Vice-President of India. Whatever position that the Vice-President has vis-à-vis a national University like theirs, in many things, the President of India would also be discharging some responsibility vis-à-vis some other national institutions. So, issuing legal notices to such constitutional authorities are not trivial things. It somewhere reflects the breakdown in the governance of the institutions which have been given autonomy. The nations have evolved, government patterns have changed over several hundred years, but the universities as autonomous organizations for the society have existed in the modern times or current millennium for about 1000 years. The University system or College system, may be, is of the order of 225-230 years old when the first College in India was set up by Raja Ram Mohan Roy in Kolkata which became Presidency College which became a nucleus of Kolkata University. These academic institutions have been given the autonomy of functioning. The society, by and large, thinks that the academic community is an intellectual base of the society which means intellectual thinking people would set an example of how the society has to function. So, where something as unfortunate as this has happened that the head of the institution is being served legal notice, it sends an alarm. Either the reason has to be genuine that this has to happen. Even when the reason is genuine and it happens, then it points to some weaknesses in the system that a genuine reason could not be attended to in the system. This is not a simple issue and in recent years this is the second time the Chancellor has been issued a legal notice. In the term of the previous Senate, as they are aware, as to how a legal notice was issued to the Chancellor sometime in March 2015. So, this is now January 2017. Have they not learnt anything, have they not done something that they ought to do that such a situation did not recur? This is the background in which they are meeting today and all of them have a very heavy responsibility to respond to this where the Chancellor has received a legal notice. The Chancellor has not yet received a formal legal notice but an e-mail has been sent, saying that in this digitized age, communicating the intent of a legal notice should be viewed as seriously as sending a hard copy through a lawyer. They could not take a view that this is just, that there is no formality attached to it that they could consider it only when he (Professor V.K. Chopra) sends it formally. Expressing the intent that one wanted to serve a legal notice and they ought to take it as if it is already done. The Chancellor office has taken it seriously, and they did not want to wait for it, that the hard copy would be given. They have sent it back to the University immediately to take cognizance of it. A week's notice had to be given to convene a Senate meeting. The earliest he could convene a meeting of the Syndicate, he convened it and the matter is before all of them today. He hoped that the members had time to read through the contents of the communication. It is not just one communication. That colleague has continuously been sending more and more communications and some of these had arrived in his (Vice-Chancellor) e-mail box, as also (received) by the members just 24 hours back. He has come into picture only since July 2012, but in the background of whatever has happened during the last two weeks, he was supposed to go through all the files related to that colleague

which are available in the record and he has as much as he could fish out, he has brought the files. The conduct of that colleague during his entire career in the University, many of them who have been part of the governing body of the University over the last 20 years, he expected them to be aware of as to what is happening. The matter is before them and they could have initial comment and then they could go through.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that, according to him, he (Professor Chopra) is the same faculty member who faced number of enquiries earlier for absence from duty and was censured by the Senate and that would be on record. So, a copy of that should be supplied as they did not have that document with them. All of them should know the contents of that final enquiry.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would come back to it and the document could be provided.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he wanted to know whether Professor Chopra had directly sent the notice or had earlier written any letter to the Vice-Chancellor that if he is not heard, then he would send the legal notice. He also wanted to know whether in the past also any legal notice had been served on the Chancellor directly. He thought that during the last about 20 years, nobody must have sent any legal notice to the Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Professor Mukesh Arora) has been a member of the Senate for a long time and must be knowing it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Dr. Neelam Paul had earlier sent a legal notice to the Chancellor.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that if the legal notice is directly sent, it is very serious.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is why he had said that they had spent many days in discussing the misdemeanours of Dr. Neelam Paul.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that according to him, until a person has taken the permission from the Vice Chancellor, he/she could not serve a legal notice.

The Vice Chancellor said that even with permission, the Chancellor could not be issued the legal notice.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the legal notice could be issued to the University through the Registrar.

The Vice Chancellor said that Justice Anand also, when he enquired into the case of Dr. Neelam Paul, had reiterated that one could not issue the legal notice to the Chancellor. This is the second time it has happened in less than two years. When Dr. Neelam Paul had sent the legal notice, the Chancellor's office had said that on behalf of the Chancellor there is no such issue is involved.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that one could pray or make a complaint to the appointing authority.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they talk about this particular person, as said by Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma for remaining absent from duty, he also filed a false case against the Chairperson, Department of Evening Studies for which he was censured. He has gone through the minutes of the meeting and there was a red entry in his (Professor Chopra) service book but what he did was that when he superannuated from Department of Evening Studies, at that time he was the Chairperson also. What he did was that he manipulated the things. Probably, if they go through the record, his service book was never shown at that time and it was with him only. He (Professor Chopra) concealed a few things for getting the retirement benefits and also for getting re-employment. Had those been checked at that time, probably he forced one of the Superintendents, who later on retracted from the statement that nothing is concealed or something like that, all those things need to be checked.

The Vice Chancellor said that all those documents were made a part of submissions to the Court when he (Professor Chopra) had filed the case. Those are well known things and nothing is hidden.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that nothing is hidden, but there are few things which have not been looked into at all. Even what was submitted to the Court was that he (Professor Chopra) owes something like Rs.2-3 crores to Punjab Financial Corporation. If he owes that kind of money to the Punjab Financial Corporation, he was a partner in one of the firms, which otherwise is not allowed as per the rules of the University. Even that thing has not been checked so far. What is actually happening is that he is doing something and then gets away with that. For that reason only, he is indulging into all these misdemeanours, misdemeanours to the extent that while he was in service or even superannuated, he was going to certain Colleges although he was not even a member of the Inspection Committee and then sometimes demanding TA/DA or getting into those things. All these things were very serious because if somebody is going by car to some College, although he is not supposed to be involved. Something fishy is there about this. He had been doing all those things because many people talked about that he came to the College and was not a member of the Inspection Committee and started asking/acting as if he is a member of the Inspection Committee. He has been doing that regularly, continuously. He did not know how come that he (Professor Chopra) was able to do that. All those things need to be actually checked.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in the year 2002, a red entry was made in his (Professor Chopra) service book.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was made in the year 2007.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in the year 2002, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma was also in the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that his (Professor Chopra) misdemeanours are as early as 1997.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that Professor Chopra used to live and work at Jalandhar and drew the salary from Panjab University. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma had raised this issue.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that Dr. Harjinder Singh Laltu was the President, PUTA when he raised the matter. The Administrative Committee of the Department had approved that Professor Chopra be declared as absent from duty, but nothing had happened. When it was said in the Senate that the people do not do any work and enjoy, at that time he had said that they have thrice recommended for action, why no action was taken. Then, on the floor of the House, a Committee was formed under the Chairmanship of Professor S.L. Sharma including President, PUTA, Chairperson and him (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) in the year 2002. Thereafter, the case was going on.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that Professor Chopra had also been taking the construction contracts of the University in the name of his brother. That should also be enquired into and there are so many such things.

Shri Varinder Singh said that a Committee should be formed on the issue of sending the legal notice.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that Professor Chopra is a big fraudster and if no action against him, he would create more problems.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the Chancellor has no role in the routine working of the University. If the University could reply this through proper channel and thereafter they could again examine it in the Syndicate. Today, he (Professor Chopra) has sent a legal notice, it could be that tomorrow, he might go to the Court. The enquiries have already been conducted in the allegations levelled by Professor Chopra. They could examine it legally and consider again in the Syndicate. They could also send a reply to the Chancellor. It would be a good thing for the Chancellor and also the other people related with the University. As Professor Chopra has written something against Professor Navdeep Goyal, if a common man reads it, he would feel that a big fraud has been committed. A company has got the tender for some work and being a Director in that company is not a fraud. They should get it legally examined and could again discuss the same in the Syndicate and also send the reply and for this a Committee could be formed.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that as is being said that Professor Chopra used to go to Colleges, he had gone to so many Colleges without being assigned the duty. Professor Chopra used to go in the subject of English and used to ask the Colleges to construct swimming pool.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that due to this, R.S.D. College, Ferozepur is a sufferer.

Shri Varinder Singh said that since some of the Research Scholars know him, being of the age of his, they all say that the conduct of Professor Chopra is very bad.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the brother of Professor Chopra had taken the construction contracts and had been doing so many things.

Shri Varinder Singh said that a Committee could be formed on the issue of the legal notice and other matters could be legally examined and after discussing the same again in the Syndicate, they could send a reply as there is nothing wrong.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they could prepare a reply that they have conducted so many enquiries on the complaint and the clean chit has been given and the matter has been brought to the notice of the Syndicate and Senate, then what is the meaning of legal notice when all the enquiries have been conducted. If some enquiry is pending, then they could say so.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if they get it legally examined, it would improve the image of the University.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that his thinking is somewhat different. What the members are saying is right and what kind of discussion has been done is also right. Legally, Professor Chopra could not serve the legal notice to the Chancellor. They have to keep two things in mind. Firstly, they should confirm whether Professor Chopra could send a legal notice or not and if he could send the legal notice, then they should not have brought it as an agenda item and should not discuss on it. Secondly, if Professor Chopra could send the legal notice, only then they could discuss it. If they discuss it, then they would have to discuss all the complaints that Professor Chopra has made. If the legal notice could not be served, then instead of discussing, they should stress on it that they have already discussed the complaints. If they discuss it here, it would mean that the complaints by Professor Chopra are accepted and could serve the legal notice. Then they would discuss only the two items separately which have been brought to the Syndicate. If the legal notice could not be served, then why should they discuss. They should keep in mind that the legal notice could not be served there is no need to discuss the matter. They should keep in mind only one thing whether they could discuss it or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that a communication has gone to the Chancellor and he has sent it to the University to handle it. How to handle, what to handle, that has to be a collective decision of all of them. If they wanted to do it piecemeal that this is the answer of one aspect, this is the answer of the other aspect, that has also to be collectively decided in this very forum. So, the legal notice could not be sent at all.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it should be rejected.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if Professor Chopra could not send the legal notice, then by calling a special meeting on the complaint, according to him, they should not discuss it. A separate Committee could be formed to examine all the reports of the earlier Committees and the copy of the report could be sent to the Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that discussing means that they have to handle it. If they do nothing, then more notices would be sent. What is their response?

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that then they should discuss whether Professor Chopra could send a legal notice or not.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it should be rejected and it should be resolved that in future no one could send a legal notice to the Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that what is their response? There has to be put some deterrence in the system. In his (Professor Chopra) case, if he was in service, if a person is in service, they could hold an enquiry and a person could be suspended. Some damages could be put in. But in Professor Chopra's case, since he has taken all his retirement benefits, his re-employment has also been stopped, so, other than his pension there is no deterrent that could be put to this individual. He has very cleverly got away and then started all these things. He retired in the year 2013. The service book was with him and had given a clean chit by himself, took all the retirement benefits. After taking all the retirement benefits, he started saying that the house in which he was staying, he should be allowed to stay on medical grounds. He (Vice Chancellor) told Professor Chopra that if he wanted the re-employment, he would have to vacate the house. Medical grounds could not be cited, so, he did not agree to it. With great difficulty, Professor Chopra vacated the house, he retired in March 2013 and vacated the House around 15th August 2013 and that too after a lot of persuasion. Once Professor Chopra vacated the house, there was some case going in the Court, when the Supreme Court decided that it would not interfere in the retirement age and it was left to the State to decide whether the retirement age is to be kept at 60 or 65 years. There was some lacuna in the judgment and by exploiting it, the teachers filed another case in the Court that the age should be enhanced to 65 years. The Single Judge Bench did not deliver the judgment (in favour), then the LPA was filed and in that, 14th February is the date of hearing for final hearing. When the (Supreme) Court had delivered the judgment, Professor Chopra wrote a letter to him (Vice Chancellor) that he should be allowed to rejoin. Professor Chopra had taken all his retirement benefits including PF, gratuity, etc. He sent an e-mail to him (Vice Chancellor) that he be allowed to join. Before he could reply to it, he (Vice Chancellor) got the joining report recommended by the Head of the Department, who has been a member of the Governing body of the University for the last 15-20 years. The person who recommended the joining report is having a deep experience about the governance of the University, but he sent the joining report. He was not to get this and he had to issue a notice to all the Chairpersons that no Chairperson would take the joining report and sent it to him. After that, that colleague started filing RTI applications that the scams are happening in the University, in the hostel funds and against the UIAMS, which has income from the conduct of examinations. He pleaded with Professor Chopra that being a re-employed Professor, he should focus only on teaching and research and should not interfere in other things. At least, the RTI applications should not be filed, and if he wanted to file RTI applications, he should leave the job and thereafter he is a free citizen. But when the University is giving all the benefits to a (re-employed) teacher, even the house rent allowance is being given, after three years DA is being enhanced, whichever benefits they could give to a (re-employed) teacher, these have been given. There is no such re-employment scheme in any University in India as is available at the Panjab University. They should feel proud about it and the University has always done well for the teachers. After independence, the salary which was being paid to the University teachers at Lahore, that salary was not available to teachers of any University in independent India. In fact, Dr. Bhatnagar used the salary structure of the teachers of

Lahore as a benchmark. The salary, which was given to the teachers of the University at Lahore, was given to the teachers of all the universities of India in 1955. Panjab University is always in the forefront for doing well for the teachers because teachers are the drivers of the University and the University has no other product except teaching students. So, the University has been doing right things all the time. Then there are certain responsibilities also, with that much of consideration shown to the University teachers. Disregarding all these things, Professor Chopra filed the RTI applications. He requested him (Professor Chopra) not to do it but he did not relent. It was going on. Whatever material he extracted from these RTIs, (he) provided that to a leader of NSUI. Having all that material in possession and saying that there are discrepancies in the utilisation of hostels funds, that leader at the time of Convocation in 2015 said that either it should be investigated or he would sit on hunger strike. Somehow, it was contained. After about 2-3 weeks around 20th April, all those complaints which earlier one student leader was taking up, the ABVP leader also took up those saying that the University is indulging in loot and plunder and this loot and plunder is going on over the last 20-25 years and that all the living Vice Chancellors were involved in this. The University governing bodies, which every year approved the budget, are also involved in this because they are supporting it. When these complaints were sent, it was observed that the same language of loot and plunder was used. A Fact Finding Committee was formed by MHRD/UGC. After the formation of the Fact Finding Committee, the budget of the University was frozen. The University budget which has been frozen for the last three years, they may realise that, if one person has to be identified who is responsible for creating and expanding all these things, it is the same re-employed teacher of the University. So, it is a very serious issue. Should a re-employed teacher of this University indulge in all this? It is in that background that he (Vice Chancellor) felt that this person is not utilising his time to pursue academics but spending most of his time doing such things. When the academically report was required from that person, he said that he is working on a book as if he is the epitome of honesty and does great academic things and rest of the system is all corrupt and everybody is doing hanky-panky except him. It is in that background that he (Vice Chancellor) took harsh decision of curtailing his re-employment. He did not feel that these are the fingerprints of someone being academically active. Since the governing body had given this authority to the office of the Vice Chancellor, he exercised that authority and curtailed his re-employment. Once he curtailed the re-employment, he (Professor Chopra) went to the Court. When the Court did not agree with him, then in the background of the fact that LPA was filed by other teachers and after 16th August, the new Judge came, he clubbed all the cases and the case is going on. Taking the benefit of that, another LPA was filed which was clubbed with the other LPA and the Court said that the benefit which was being given before 16th August to similarly placed persons that would also apply to Professor Chopra. Professor Chopra is not similarly placed. All the other petitioners have filed the petition in enhancement of age from 60 years to 65 years before they reached the age of 60 years. Professor Chopra had taken all the benefits and is not at all similarly placed. When he is not similarly placed, he could not get this benefit at all. But he has been saying that the Vice Chancellor has been vindictive, Vice Chancellor should face contempt of court, the Chancellor also should do this and that. In the background of all this, he took the way of legal notice to the Chancellor. He (Vice Chancellor) had to do

something. The re-employment of Professor Chopra could not be curtailed until the minutes (of the Senate meeting) had been signed. When the minutes were signed, a notice was issued to Professor Chopra that his re-employment is curtailed. The plea that his case is connected with other cases, the date of hearing in which was 14th February, he (Vice Chancellor) said that his (Professor Chopra) re-employment is curtailed and they would appeal to the Court that his case is not similar. Until then, he could not allow him (Professor Chopra) to teach any class, and why because he is not in a proper state of mind as he is doing arbitrary things. In the previous semester, in a class, he said something to some women students who gave a complaint of sexual harassment against him. That sexual harassment case went to the PUCASH which said that he should not be permitted to interact with these students and then all that had to go through. So, he (Vice Chancellor) felt from that day till 14th February, he (Professor Chopra) should not be permitted to go and teach the students. It is alright, he could continue to get a salary till the Court decides one way or the other but since the job of the teacher is to teach or to do research, teaching classes are not being assigned for a period of 15 days, he could spend his time in doing research and intensify his research output. It is in that view that he issued a directive that no teaching classes be assigned to Professor Chopra because if the Court decides the case, and if the time table is prepared, then they would have to assign this duty to some other teacher. So, in any case, they have to find a teacher. The conduct of Professor Chopra is not satisfactory. Even in the last semester, he did not give him (Professor Chopra) the teaching work (after PUCASH reports came). So, Professor Chopra started accusing him as if he is not permitting him to teach and has caused some harm to him and he would put a defamation case against him. If they look at the file, it says that the fellow has never done teaching in a satisfactory way. The files are full of misdemeanours like not coming to the classes, not performing the examination duty, not doing most of the duties that he was supposed to do. He was also fighting with the Chairperson of the Department and did so much damage to the Chairperson that an Enquiry Committee had to be appointed. It is in the background of that, Enquiry Committee of 2007, that all these things had to be put in his service book. This is all how the things happened.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that now they all could decide as to what action could be taken against him (Professor Chopra).

Shri Varinder Singh said that a Committee should be formed.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that first of all, practically there is some confusion. Professor Chopra had written to the Chancellor and the Chancellor has written to the Vice Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor would take a collective decision. It is their collective responsibility and time has come to take a collective action. Secondly, 3-4 things have come out. Firstly, being a teacher, he (Professor Chopra) could not send a legal notice. Even then he sent the legal notice. Secondly, since the year 2007 to 2016, he is not sincere in teaching as the Vice Chancellor had told about it that he is engaged in something with the Chairperson and filing RTI applications. Even the sincerity of Professor Chopra in teaching is also not visible anywhere. Thirdly, after taking all the benefits, if a person is asking to allow him to continue up to 65 years, as per the Court decision, this all shows that he is not sincere. Keeping aside all the things, first they should take up this issue. Secondly, from the year 2007 to 2016, so many

Enquiry Committees were formed against him. The reports of all the Enquiry Committees do not show that Professor Chopra is fair. The reports and the status of sincerity, it is being said that they frame a Committee, after framing a Committee, collective decision be taken and the reason being that some of the colleagues later on create problems in the Senate, they should take a collective decision and the matter should not be lingered on. They should take a decision and close the matter.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there should be some code of conduct for the re-employed teachers. They have to ultimately frame that otherwise it is free for all and anybody could write.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that if the service record of a person is not good, he/she could not be granted the re-employment, if that be so, how it was done.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the code of conduct would be remain the same as for the regular teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Chopra had taken all the retirement benefits, then what punishment they could give. The only punishment was that he could not teach the classes.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that could they not give the punishment related to pension.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the punishment related to pension could be given and the issue of Punjab Financial Corporation (PFC) is involved and the PFC is asking for the money which was there with the agenda earlier. Ultimately, it is the Government exchequer. Professor Chopra has been able to get away with that and they did not know and they also did not ask the PFC that what he is taking from the University. As is being talked about, they need to look into various aspects through an Enquiry Officer or an Enquiry Committee. Professor Chopra remained the Chairperson of the Department of Indian Theatre, he purchased a laptop and left the Department several years ago, but did not return the laptop. When he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) complained, only then he returned the laptop. The life of a laptop expires with the passage of five years.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Chopra kept the laptop of the Department at his house.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they could legally examine it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that now they have to do what they could do. They did not know about the further action.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the legal notice be rejected.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are going to put a caveat so that Professor Chopra could not file a case.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that an Enquiry Committee be formed on the issue that he harassed the people while visiting the Colleges in spite of not being on that duty. If he is taking the pension, they could also stop the pension. It is not that now nothing is in their

hands, they have so much in their hands to do. Therefore, a Committee be formed to enquire into the matter and a caveat be filed. If a letter is to be written to the Chancellor about the legal notice, it should be written that they have got conducted so many enquiries and the clean chit has been given.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that if a Chairperson is allowing Professor Chopra to join and sending the joining report to the Vice Chancellor, the Chairperson should also be issued a letter.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if a Chairperson had allowed Professor Chopra to join, he wanted to know whether any action was taken by the Vice Chancellor and the joining continued or it was through the Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Chopra was not allowed to join. It is morally a wrong thing what a Chairperson has done. If he was an ordinary Chairperson, then it was a different story. It is a Chairperson who is a Senator of such a (long) standing. This is for them to see. After all, the Senators also have to have some code of conduct. The Senators of University should not indulge in what some of the Senators are doing.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said agreed that a code of conduct should be there.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that he was coming to that point that if some decision is taken collectively by some Senators, then automatically the issues are diluted. If some Senators raise the issue in the Senate, let them raise it and there would be no impact. They should have their collective concept clear to face such members. If a Senator is Chairperson and allowed Professor Chopra to join, they could ask him as to how he has allowed Professor Chopra to join.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Chopra was allowed to join and the joining report was sent.

Professor Pam Rajput said that then they should ask for his (Chairperson) explanation.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Chopra was allowed to join.

Professor Pam Rajput said that the item should be rejected and caveat should be filed.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what they mean by rejection.

Professor Pam Rajput said that Professor Chopra could not send a legal notice.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to condemn.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it should be condemned. It should be recorded that all of them agree that Professor Chopra has been a delinquent faculty member throughout his career. It should be on record.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Chopra said that he is sending the legal notice through proper channel. What does he mean? He is saying that if it is not forwarded within two days, he would send it and it is what exactly he did. He was made known that he could not send a legal notice to the Chancellor. The point is that they have been lenient the way they let off Dr. Neelam Paul by saying that she would tender an apology, withdraw the legal notice and they did not do anything to Professor Neelam Paul. Professor Neelam Paul accused the Vice Chancellor, Professor Neelam Paul called her own colleagues incompetent, did they do anything. Are they protective of the teachers of the University when one teacher puts arbitrary accusations? They do nothing. They are so tolerant of the misbehaviour and misdemeanour of their own colleagues, whether they are teacher Colleagues or Senator Colleagues. This is the serious question that they need to ponder. He should not be saying this; in last Senate meeting, when a Senator accused the Vice-Chancellor of the University of serious things, they took two years and yet not retaliate. Can somebody put a false accusation against the head of the institution of a kind that was levelled against the present Vice-Chancellor?

Principal N.R. Sharma said that there is need of a collective decision of all.

The Vice Chancellor said that what is the response of the government (body) of the University? Where the Vice Chancellor is accused of false things and the governing body will not be protective of him. Governing body is not protective of the Vice-Chancellor of the University. Governing body hesitates even to protect the Chancellor of the University. You saw what type of debate they had when the Chancellor was served a legal notice for the first time. Did they condemn it, did they censure it? No, they did not express any penal action, when the legal notice was sent to the Chancellor for the first time. They just remained satisfied that the person will tender an apology and everything will be forgotten. So, this is the precedence you had set. You can do what you want. Then you just tender an apology and continue. This is not deterrent to the system. Democratic functioning has to have checks and balance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he thinks they need to revisit code of conduct for serving teachers on re-employment. Two committees may be formed. Independent committees be formed.

Professor Pam Rajput said that in this case also there are two things. One thing is that total material regarding this case be collected and a committee be formed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that first a committee be formed that will collect all material regarding this case and after that inquiry be made through a retired Judge.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the old members of the committee know all that.

The Vice Chancellor said that let a small committee of the Syndicate collate all these facts and put it together.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that it should be time bound, within 7 to 10 days, 15 days. It should not linger on further one year more.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that whatever he has given the contents, inquiry has already been done on all that by the inquiry committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are many things which are pending.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that whatever he has written, inquiry has been done all that contents. But his inquiry is remaining till date.

Professor Pam Rajput said that whatever he has said that should also be ready. Whatever is against him that should also be done? Both things should be done and this item should also be condemned. Legally absolutely it is against the constitution, no notice can be served to the Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that should it be put on record?

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said in future no teacher be allowed to go there. They can decide in the Syndicate that teachers cannot give any notice to the Chancellor.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they should also think about the retired teacher, who is not the part of the University. What actions can we take against them? Constitution of code of conduct may take time.

The Vice Chancellor said that when the calendar was written at a time when these things (like re-employment) were not happening.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that now these things are happening, they will have to see as what to do.

The Vice Chancellor said that these things come in technicalities. All things are indulged in technicalities, and not allowed to go forward. Even the old committee, he had seen their report. Even there was Johl Committee and Justice Garg Committee. It is the same people, same everything. Again same committee, again same technicalities, it looks like as he is reading last year's things. Things look like ten years previous.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that there is the technicality; our special meeting is for this agenda only. The views that are coming, a representation of those be sent by someone. Those things, whose inquiry is to be done, be separated. They should do inquiry on those reports; otherwise things of technicalities will come again.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said they will get the inquiry done to correlate all these things. This will be done.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they cannot form other committees here. He can just give you suggestion so that you may not

face any problem again in the Syndicate. This is a special meeting; they should concentrate only on the agenda item.

Professor Pam Rajput said that all that has been done by them. They will do it in the meeting of 25th February, 2017.

The Vice Chancellor said that all these things are correlated.

Professor Pam Rajput said that they do not handle the issues in a time bound manner. When a complaint comes, it takes 10 years to decide. As these complaints are not taken in time, they go to the higher authority.

The Vice Chancellor (pulled out a document from a file) said that this is an old report of the year 2000. There is a reference of Sharma Ji (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) in this report. There, it is mentioned in the report that they plead this issue should be reopened. He also referred to the case of Professor Vijay Kumar Chopra, Reader in English, who has been abstaining from taking classes for quite some time.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it is right; this should also be put on record.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as it is said to form a committee of the senior members, he would not be the part of this committee, as he is so much clear about this person (Prof. Vijay Kumar Chopra). He was a member of the administrative committee. This person had got raised question against me in Senate and lodged a defamation case against me in the court, which lasted two years. After that he is very much clear if the Senate gives him an opportunity to speak in the Senate, he will clear each and everything there. That's why he is not interested to become the member of the committee. He is very much clear about this person. He would request that his personal file and service book must be shown to all the members. Members don't know what has happened. Whatever you have in the report, get it copied and tell the members about him (Professor Vijay Kumar Chopra).

The Vice Chancellor said that he would bring all the details on record.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the committee will look all the details.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he has one more request. The persons, against whom he has given complaint, be not made the member of the Committee. Professor Pam Rajput from Syndicate or other outside senior members may be included in the Committee. It actually looks like that the work is going on, otherwise blame will be on us that the persons of the single group are doing all things.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is true what Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu has said.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is necessary that the committee should be formed of the Syndicate members, outside persons may also be involved as members in it.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said the committee be formed including outside members so that it looks like that the genuine work is being done. It should publically look that we are doing right work. If they are right then why to form a committee from the members of the Syndicate. This is special meeting for this, we should not discuss other issues in the meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to constitute the committee.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that today's meeting is being held as this person (Dr. Vijay Kumar Chopra) has given a complaint. . They are discussing the issues which are relevant to the person.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said they need to constitute two committees, one for code of conduct and other on his complaint of agenda.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that in a lot of committees, inquiry had been done already. Justice Brar's committee report is also there. They should read what is there in the report; a lot of things are there. That's why he is saying that he doesn't want to be a member of the committee. He knows a lot of things. When these things would be brought out, then he will tell all the things from a to z. He does not want to speak here. He had not spoken and doesn't want to speak. They will say that he is already biased.

The Vice Chancellor said that he understands his difficulties. He will see these things.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he was saying him that he is union leader and unionists now you will put him (Professor. Vijay Kumar Chopra) out. He told that he will not put him out, but he wants him inside the class. He remains in Jalahdhar. He put him in the class. Many things happened. He doesn't want to say here, these will come in the record. He has a lot of things to say in the regard. Whenever you will appoint the committee, he will say all these things to the committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that he understands that one resolved part is that the Syndicate censures this person for this act. It is an unacceptable act and the Syndicate completely abhors this, and appeals to the entire community that they should not indulge in such an act. This act is to condemned and they also appeal that nobody should do this. Syndicate expresses anguish that within two years this is second incident when the Chancellor has been issued a legal notice. Second, there should a committee formed which will correlate all the factual position on the conduct of Professor Vijay Kumar Chopra during his service and during his period of superannuation. It will be correlated and brought for further consideration in the Syndicate. The third point is that there should be some solution of proposal for the conduct of people during the period of reemployment.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the same committee in which his complaints are discussed, be given this proposal also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a separate committee be constituted for this proposal.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that for this person, all other reemployed persons should not be considered as such, this is not good. There are reemployed persons who are very honourable. They are employed by you. Who are employed from 60 to 65 age. For them, the code of conduct can be seen as per given service rules.

The Vice Chancellor said that this should have been in the calendar.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be put in the calendar.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that code of conduct should be same for a person during employment and re-employment.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it may not be the same. There may be need of different code of conduct at some places. The reemployed person might have taken all his benefits from the University. What can be done and what cannot be done in these cases? This need revisit only.

Professor Mukesh Arora said the reemployed person cannot take all his benefits from the employer.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that in re-employment the benefit is given after two years.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that it is not fair to stop that. They need P.F., leave encashment, etc. He cannot curtail the service benefits of the people as they are. They should bring some service rules. That would not be fair, but if a person of re-employment does such and such offence, re-employment should be instantaneously stopped. When a re-employed person starts sending RTIs, his/her re-employment will be stopped. If someone wants to send RTIs then why should he be reemployed. As a citizen of India, they can exercise their right and send RTIs.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they will teach as well as send RTIs. All persons are not Chopras.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is not he who has to decide.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that they can decide this is for normal and this is for abnormal.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that in their government colleges, a person get two years extension after 58 years age, i.e., upto 60 years. If a person withdraws hundred per cent GPF, then the extension is not granted.

The Vice Chancellor said that but he is not recommending suggestions. If a reemployed professor levels serious allegations against the officers of the University.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that some funds can be retained by the University in case of re-employment.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if they retained some funds of the re-employed teachers, their behaviour will be good. If

they give all the benefits to the re-employed teachers, it will their own will to teach or not to teach, but they will get the salary.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the committee decide. He will not personally recommend anything. The retirement benefits are also for the family of a person. Someone had to take a new house, someone had marriage of their children, etc.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that it may be noted that the Vice-Chancellor is authorized to form the committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will talk informally to the present President of PUTA and previous Presidents of PUTA. He will ask them informally, first what to do. Teachers' representative should themselves tell him something which is protective of them as a community and their image in the society. What this person is doing, actually lowering the image of the University teachers in the society. So, let the teachers themselves decide to what extent a person should go to air one's grievance. There should be some limit to air the grievance. So let them involve. Every teacher is going to be a re-employed teacher. So let people, senior teachers tell us that what should be a code of conduct for them during the re-employment. So these are the three things. First is, the Syndicate unanimously condemns this act of Professor Vijay Kumar Chopra. Then, collates all these things and bring it back in the Syndicate and then after they have brought it back, they will go to the next step of forming a committee as to how the collated information has to be handled in the form of an inquiry, in the form of whatever. Third thing is that since this has bearings upon now how to the conduct and the image of re-employed teachers so they will have to reach the senior teachers so that some way he may bring back some material for the re-employment committee or whatever it is, so that there is some code of conduct for the re-employed teachers also. It is also with regard to airing of grievances. There has to be some limits on this. And in number one, that Syndicate and governing body also sincerely expresses anguish as the Chancellor has to face a legal notice twice in a period of two years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is good that they at a time give 5 years extension, but its other text is not working.

The Vice Chancellor said that let it to be done. Point is that he does not want to recommend very serious things, while they get re-employment.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they have to ask the committee to review.

The Vice Chancellor said you must understand that why they are given five years re-employment, because they do not want to loose good teachers while they are nearing the age of 60, they may leave Panjab University to join nearby Universities. There are five Central Universities in our neighbourhood. One Central University is of Haryana, Jammu has two Central Universities, Rajasthan has also Central University. What will happen in future! There is no pension for teachers who had joined after 2004, when they will cross the age of 50, they will prefer to go out to the nearby Central Universities. So, we will loose the better teachers.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is all right. The re-employment was done continuous five years, first it was three years continuous. Earlier it was there that they were given re-employment on yearly basis. There was a procedure that that was done through the Senate/Syndicate. It was a good step that we had done, but simultaneously there was a check on reemployment when it was on yearly basis. Some check should be there.

The Vice Chancellor said that the check should be effective. No one should have loss in default

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said they should get the related material.

The Vice Chancellor said that yes.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the Syndicate unanimously condemns and censures Professor V.K. Chopra for having served legal notice to the Chancellor;
- (ii) the Syndicate expresses anguish that the Vice-President of India and Chancellor, Panjab University has been served legal notices by two faculty members of Panjab University in a span of two years. Steps be thought of to prevent this in future;
- (iii) a caveat petition be filed in the High Court;
- (iv) the Vice-Chancellor be authorized, on behalf of the Syndicate, to form a Committee to collate all the factual position on the conduct of Professor V.K. Chopra during his service and during the period of re-employment, to be placed before the Syndicate for further action; and
- (v) the Vice-Chancellor be authorized, on behalf of the Syndicate, to constitute a Committee to get framed a code of conduct for re-employed teachers to air their grievances. The Vice-Chancellor offered to seek suggestions from former and present Presidents, PUTA which the Syndicate appreciated.

(G.S. Chadha)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR