

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the special meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Saturday, 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017** at **11.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### PRESENT

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

Shri Jarnail Singh, Principal N.R. Sharma, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Dr. Subhash Sharma, Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, Director Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh and Shri Lakhmir Singh, DPI (Colleges), Punjab could not attend the meeting.

### **Condolence Resolution**

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

- (i) Prof. Nirmal Mukherji retired from Department of English & Cultural Studies on October 2, 2017.
- (ii) Prof. B.K. Das of the Centre of Advanced Study Geology on May 11, 2017.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Professor Nirmal Mukherji and Professor B.K. Das 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 families.

### **Vice-Chancellor's Statement**

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that-
  - i) Hon'ble Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu, Vice-President of India and Chancellor, PU, has been invited as Chief Guest for the 67<sup>th</sup> Annual Convocation of Panjab University on a Saturday/Sunday of his choice in the in the second half of February or first week of March, 2018. The preferred dates given to him are Sunday, 25<sup>th</sup> February or Sunday 4<sup>th</sup> March,

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

2018. These dates have been given keeping in view that probably the budget would get presented much earlier and it will not interfere in the budget session. Anyway these dates are on Sundays and there is no Parliament session. The period has been advanced a little bit because later in the March, often it becomes very hot and the air conditioning of the Gymnasium Hall is not adequate when there are thousands of persons. I am in touch with his office and they will send us a reply when all the material related with the convocation over the last six years is placed before them in a file. There are some new routines in place to attend to the official matters of Panjab University in the office of the Chancellor now. I have also to bring it to your attention in the next Syndicate meeting recommendations relating to Panjab University Ratna Awards to be awarded this year as well as recommendations for the Honoris Causa degrees. The recommendations have come to me but they have to come as an appropriate agenda item. I have told the Hon'ble Chancellor that those things will also come to them. They do want to know as to who are to be honoured. Probably, the formal communication from them relating to the date would come in due course of time. It may take a month or two.

- ii) Prof. S.K. Tomar of Department of Mathematics, has been elected Fellow of National Academy of Sciences, India (NASI), Allahabad.
- iii) Dr. Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examination and Dean, College Development Council has been honoured with Chandigarh Ratan Award for his contribution to streamline the online examination system, online fee deposition and online disposal of complaints. The Award was presented to him by the Finance Secretary, UT, Chandigarh.
- iv) Ms. Reetinder Kaur, Ph.D. scholar of the Department of Anthropology has received 'Shastri Research Student Postdoctoral Fellowship 2017-18' to undertake research at the University of British Columbia from June to September 2018. Her project topic is "Traditional healing practices among Punjab Sikh Mental Health Clients in India and Canada: Insight for counseling and Psychotherapists". The University of British Columbia has a Canada-India Centre which has been given lot of funds by a Punjabi who is settled in Canada namely Mr. Berge Tdhah. That is an international programme, Canada-India Partnership which is not specific to Punjab per se. In fact, most of the support is from IITs.
- v.) Dr. Devinder Preet Singh, Senior Lecturer in the Deptt. of Orthodontics of Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences, PU, has been honoured with 'Global Healthcare Excellence Award' at New Delhi on September 23, 2017. The award was bestowed on him for his accomplishments in the field of dentistry.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) Felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - i) Prof. S.K. Tomar, of Department of Mathematics, on having been elected Fellow

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

- of National Academy of Sciences, India (NASI), Allahabad;
- ii) Dr. Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examination and Dean, College Development Council on having been honoured with Chandigarh Ratan Award for his contribution to streamline the online examination system, online fee deposition and online disposal of complaints;
  - iii) Ms. Reetinder Kaur, Ph.D. scholar, Department of Anthropology on having received 'Shastri Research Student Postdoctoral Fellowship 2017-18' to undertake research at the University of British Columbia from June to September 2018;
  - iv) Dr. Devinder Preet Singh, Senior Lecturer in the Deptt. of Orthodontics, Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences, PU, on his having been honoured with 'Profile of the Month' Award;
2. Information contained in Vice-Chancellor statement at Sr. No. (i) be noted.

**Letter dated 21.09.2017 from Smt. Hurbi Shakeel, Under Secretary to the Vice-President of India (Chancellor, Panjab University)**

**2.** Considered letter No. VPS-15/2/2002 dated 21.09.2017 (**Appendix-I**) received from Smt. Hurbi Shakeel, Under Secretary to the Vice-President of India (Chancellor P.U.), New Delhi.

**(Item I-97 & I-98 already supplied in closed cover for the Senate meeting dated 10.09.2017/ 24.09.2017 be linked for reference)**

Initiating the discussion, the Vice Chancellor said that let him come to the single agenda item of this specially convened meeting. Before they consider this item, it is enjoining upon him to share with them as to why this meeting had to be specially convened at a short notice. He expected them to have read the agenda papers sent along with the convening of the meeting. The agenda papers were sent in a closed cover and he also expects them to have read the related items which were there as information items submitted to the September 10, 2017 meeting of the Senate. The Senate had two meetings in September, i.e., on September 10 and then on September 24, but the agenda could not proceed beyond item number 38. So, large number of items were left over. They never proceeded to ratification and information items. So, why a meeting on an urgent basis has been called? The content of the material sent to them tells that certain developments have taken place over the last two weeks and a communication arrived in the University few days ago on September 29, in which the MHRD has not asked, but it is implied to take cognisance of certain allegations against the Officer on Special Duty to the Chancellor of the University, that means an Officer who is performing duties in context of issues of the Panjab University *per se* on behalf of the office of the Chancellor of the University. So, there are very serious allegations against an officer who is *prima facie* performing his duties towards the governance of Panjab University. There are not only allegations against an Officer on Special Duty attached to the Chancellor, but also the Senior-most Administrative

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Officer of Panjab University *per se* who is also the Secretary of the Governing Bodies, namely, the Government of the University Syndicate and the larger body - Senate of the University which elects the Syndicate every year. So, there are very serious allegations that they (i.e., two together) have connived to indulge in fraudulent acts for which a CBI enquiry has been desired by someone who is none other than a member of the Governing Body of the University, and the matter relates to earlier incidents and earlier allegations against the Vice Chancellor of the University, an allegation relating to a period which is April of 2015 initially, and later on also a period which relates to March of 2013. When the allegations were made in 2015, the allegations were made by a sitting Syndicate member. The allegations were made by a member of the Syndicate, that means a member of this Governing Body. The Syndicates of the University \*(elected on behalf of Faculties) are supposed to have a continuity. Right now the allegations are not only made by a sitting Senator of the next Senate, but also a Senator who is elected on behalf of the constituency of Professors of this University, and, while making these allegations, it is explicitly stated that the complainant is also the President of the Teachers Association of the Panjab University. The said officer in the Chancellor's office has now returned to his parent department, (this is what he has learnt), that Officer is no longer in the office of the Chancellor of Panjab University, but he has moved on as Joint Secretary to some other department of the Government. So, the Government of India would have its own algorithm and procedures to take cognisance of whatever has been forwarded to them by the office of the Vice President and the Chancellor of Panjab University. But, meanwhile, the MHRD could ask them as to what has the University done in view of the same letter having been communicated to the Registrar and the Secretary of the Governing Body. He is going to be away on leave from October 14 to 29, for which he has already obtained the sanction of the Chancellor and he would like some cognisance to be taken by the Government of the University before he leaves and he would like to communicate the decision taken by the Syndicate to the Chancellor of his actions in view of the copy of said letter having been sent to the Registrar of the University and the Registrar having brought that letter to his notice. He would like to do it before he leaves, instead of seeing the issue(s) blow up during his absence. That is the reason, why he felt compelled to convene this meeting as early as he could. So, what is it? They need to take notice of the fact that very serious allegations stand made against the senior most Administrative Officer of the University. They have to take a call what is the quality of this allegation, whether wrong or not. In this context, let him also recall for them that why has the matter reached this stage. It is not that the Governing Bodies of the University are not aware of these things. But if they read the entire letter, it is mentioned that whatever has been done, whatever has alleged to be fraudulently done, it has been done primarily to protect the Vice Chancellor of this University who was accused by the sitting Syndicate member of the University in April of 2015 and it is not that the then Syndicate of this University was not apprised of this matter. The first incident pertains to 15<sup>th</sup> of April, 2015 and the matter was indeed placed before the Syndicate of 20<sup>th</sup> of April, 2015. The then Syndicate did not take any cognisance of this. The Vice Chancellor presided over that meeting and the complainant Syndicate member also attended that meeting. The remaining members of the Syndicate did not take cognisance of that letter. This is the factual position. Subsequently, another complaint was filed against the Vice Chancellor of the University at the Police Station on 28<sup>th</sup> of May, 2015,

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

in which more allegations were made against the Vice Chancellor of this University under various sections. He does not know how many of them have cared to look into it. Those sections are very very serious, if there is a need, he could tell them why those sections are serious.

On being asked by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma whether they have a copy of that complaint, the Vice Chancellor said, yes, they all have, it has been given to them repeatedly. Whatever was given to the Police Station, the copies of the same have been given to the members of the Senate, at least once, may be twice. Repeatedly, it has been told to the members of the Senate. The Vice Chancellor was supposed to be arrested under non-bailable sections, but the police did not do it. The police asked them as to what has the University done regarding this complaint because the police had been informed of what the University had done pertaining to the complaint of 15<sup>th</sup> April, earlier. So the police knew that the matter was growing. The police already had the report of the incident that had happened on 15<sup>th</sup> of April for which a report had been presented to the Syndicate by a Committee headed by Professor Ronki Ram in which the then Dean of University Instruction had participated. So all those things have been there, he has a copy of that with him. If there is a need, they could have a look on it. The fact of the matter is this, after the police did not act on it, its complaint was lodged to the Minister of MHRD. The Minister of MHRD marked that complaint to UGC and the UGC formed a Fact Finding Committee and he was asked to appear before the Fact Finding Committee where he made submission. After that this complaint was also sent to the National Commission for Women and UGC sent all the material back to the University so that the matter could be investigated by the PUCASH. Now two years have passed and they are well aware of the entire thing. The PUCASH was reluctant to carry out the enquiry for one reason or the other. They formed an alternative to the PUCASH. The Chancellor of the University did not favour the constitution of another PUCASH. The PUCASH was constituted as per the law of the land, as per the Government of India Act 2013. At one stage the Internal Committee of the University did not appear to fully conform to the 2013 Act. So, the complainant has herself brought it to the attention of the Governing Bodies of the University and the earlier PUCASH, earlier (pre 2013), i.e., the Internal Committee against the sexual harassment was reconstructed and the newer Committee was made fully consistent with the 2013 Act of the law of the land. So, when the National Commission for Women, via the MHRD, directed Panjab University to constitute an alternate to the PUCASH, the Chancellor of the University felt that the alternate committee is not needed because the alternate committee, in his opinion, would not be consistent with the Sexual Harassment Act which says that Chairman has to be somebody from inside whereas they said, get a Chairman from outside. So the Chancellor did not want the matter to be investigated by a Committee which would find technical objections vis-a-vis the Government of India Act. So, the Chancellor, initially, the Secretary to the Chancellor, conveyed the decision of the Chancellor to the OSD and the OSD sent this communication to the University that a Committee which is constituted, as per the Act, should look into it. So, there was a hesitancy on the part of the Chairman of the PUCASH and the Committee on PUCASH that this has to have the concurrence of the Chancellor and not the Secretary to the Chancellor. So the matter was taken up with the Chancellor's Office several times and ultimately, a letter arrived from the OSD to Chancellor once again that PUCASH which is duly constituted should do this and the matter

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

should be considered by the employer. The complainant is the Professor of the University, so the employer of the Professor is the Senate. If the Vice Chancellor of the University is appointed by the Chancellor, then if the punishing authority is the same as the appointing authority, then the punishing authority is the Chancellor. Whatever, it is, Chancellor is the Chairman of the Senate. An enquiry can *prima facie* be carried out and the report can go to the Chancellor. If guilty is the Vice Chancellor, then he (i.e., Chancellor) has to take a call. If the guilty is the Professor, then the Senate has to take a call. So, this is where the matter is at the moment.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that they have a new PUCASH in place which has been approved through the due process. It has taken charge from 1<sup>st</sup> of October, 2017. A new PUCASH is in place. So, reiteration from the Syndicate could go in view of the directive from the Chancellor. Chancellors have a continuity. A Chancellor of Panjab University had ordained that matter be investigated by the PUCASH and the report has to go to the Chancellor, whosoever is the Chancellor. So, there are two calls to be taken at two ends, one pending enquiry and second actually is the more urgent. If it is first one, there is no urgency, he could have wait it for another month. If it is second one, it is more urgent. The second one is that a Professor of the University has made very serious allegations against an officer attached to the Chancellor that he has done something fraudulent in connivance with the Registrar of the University who is also the Secretary of Syndicate. Unless some call is taken by them, it could undermine the functioning of the Registrar of the University. It could affect the functioning of Panjab University and repeated reporting of these things in the media is also detrimental to the image of the University. They are a Premier University of the Country. The Vice Chancellor of the Premier University stands accused. Earlier the Dean of University Instruction also stood accused. The case against the Dean of University Instruction in this University system never got resolved. The D.U.I. has never been absolved of the accusation levelled against him by a faculty member of his own department. So, it actually shows the governance of the University in a compromised way. What is the governance that they are providing to this University. Can they not take a call on this thing. If they will not take a call on such things, what confidence are they conveying to the public that they are Governing Bodies of the University. At one stage, they take pride that they are autonomous, they are elected in a manner that there is no scope of interference of any outside agency in the functioning of the University. But at the same time, they have also to perform, they have to do their duties and not having matters resolved, year after year is not conveying a good sense to the society at large. They are well aware that the matter is in the Court relating to both, i.e. the financial concerns of the University as well as the governance reforms, which are desired in the functioning of the University. Today is not a day to go into all these things. So, this is what he wanted to put before them.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they have just received a letter dated 21<sup>st</sup> of August, 2017. Then they got a letter with clear instructions that PUCASH is a competent authority to go for this and they are again writing this letter, why, he asked.

The Registrar replied that this was on the direction of Syndicate which was also supported by Professor Navdeep Goyal.

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the letter received in June was never shown to them.

The Registrar said that it was given on the day of Syndicate meeting. It was subsequent to the letter of 28<sup>th</sup> July, 2017 written to Chairperson, PUCASH by the Registrar. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> August, 2017, resolved to instruct the Registrar to communicate with the MHRD again. That is how he communicated.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the letter is very clear that the PUCASH is competent to enquire into this.

The Registrar said that was deliberated in the meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they never deliberated on June letter. But deliberated on the letter of May 4, 2017 written by Shri Anshuman Gaur, OSD to the Vice President of India and Chancellor, Panjab University to Smt. Ishita Roy, Joint Secretary, MHRD. He further said that when they look at the letter of May 4, 2017, it says that:

“2. In this regard, I am directed to convey that under the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013, a Committee has already formed in the Panjab University. This is evident from the communication of Registrar, Panjab University (copy enclosed). As per the Act, this existing Committee is fully empowered to take up the enquiry into this particular allegation. Creating another committee with the same mandate would be duplication.

3. I am, therefore, directed to request the Department of Higher Education, MHRD to issue necessary instructions pursuant to the directives of the National Commission for Women, for the existing Committee in Panjab University formed under the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 to take up enquiry into this matter and submit its report to the appropriate authorities in the Government and Panjab University”.

Professor Navdeep Goyal continued to say that this letter was initially discussed in Syndicate. When this letter was discussed, the Syndicate directed the PUCASH to complete the enquiry. But the PUCASH wrote back, ‘no’, a clarification has to come from MHRD and for that reason only, this was resolved and this letter has been issued. But, what Principal Gurdip Sharma is talking about is the letter of June, 2017 which is different from the May letter, quite to an extent. The June letter is quite different from the May letter, in the sense that this letter (June 14) was written to Smt. Ishita Roy, Joint Secretary, MHRD and the May letter (May 4, 2017) was also written to Smt. Ishita Roy, Joint Secretary, MHRD referring to the same letter of the Ministry. He read out Para 2, 3, 4 and 5 of letter No. VPS/15/2/2012 dated June 14, 2017 which states:

“2. In this regard, it may be noted that a committee duly constituted under the above Act is a statutory body subject to functioning under the said Act, specifically Chapter IV

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

pertaining to complaints. The contention made with respect to inter se seniority of the Committee members vis-à-vis complainee does not find mentioned in the Act and thus has no bearing on the functioning of the Committee in the execution of mandate under the said Act.

3. Moreover, the reconstituted PUCASH in the Panjab University, as evidenced from the letter No. 141/R/DS dated May 4, 2017 (attached), has been duly vetted and approved by the Syndicate and Senate of Panjab University it may be relevant to bear in mind the provisions of Section 8 of the Panjab University Act 1947, as subsequently amended, which states

“Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Supreme authority of the University shall be vested in the Senate which shall consist of the:

- (a) Chancellor
- (b) Vice Chancellor
- (c) Ex-officio Fellow, and
- (d) Ordinary Fellows”

as well the provisions of Section 11 of the Panjab University Act.

4. Further under the provisions of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013, particularly in Section 13 (1) it is already provided that after enquiry under this Act by an internal committee, the report should be forwarded to the “employer” within ten days from the date of completion of the inquiry and such report be made available to the concerned parties.
5. No legal impediment is thus seen in the duly constituted PUCASH presently existing in Panjab University from undertaking the said inquiry into the case which has already been referred to them under the statutory provisions of the above Act”.

Now here he is making it very clear that which was not that clear, in May letter he was directing the MHRD, but here he has made it clear. But, somehow, they have never discussed this letter. May be it has been provided to them, but they have not discussed it to which the Registrar said that it was put up to the Syndicate. But Professor Navdeep Goyal again said that somehow they have not discussed this letter and based upon this letter, they never issued directions to PUCASH to which the Registrar asked if they have to do it now. That is what, they have to do it now. From this letter, it is very clear that as far as their Chancellor is concerned, because this letter also says that this issues with the approval of Hon’ble Vice President/Chancellor, Panjab University. Their Chancellor has given them the direction that the investigation into this allegation has to be conducted by PUCASH.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that he does not think that this letter was sent.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar if he has sent it to PUCASH to which the Registrar said, yes, it was sent to PUCASH.

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Professor Pam Rajput also asked whether this letter was sent to the PUCASH.

Though Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he does not think that this letter was sent to PUCASH, but earlier letter was sent. Professor Navdeep Goyal further said that it was May 4 letter which was sent although it is quite similar letter, but the Registrar said that this letter was sent to PUCASH and the Vice Chancellor also endorsed it.

The Registrar while clarifying the issue read out the last para of the proceedings of PUCASH dated 7.8.2017 which states that PUCASH is ready and willing to take up the matter referred by Syndicate. However, it is possible only after receiving express authorisation directly from Chancellor/MHRD.

Professor Pam Rajput said she thinks that they should clinch this issue.

The Vice Chancellor said to Professor Navdeep Goyal that he may not have attended the meeting of 7<sup>th</sup> August, 2017.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that is why he did not remember that. When they talk about this particular letter, whatever they discussed earlier, if they look at the letter which has been issued to them now, what they have discussed in the Syndicate in detail, is only May 4 letter.

While Professor Navdeep Goyal was continuing, the Vice Chancellor intervened and requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to cut short the story and said that PUCASH is ready after receiving express authorisation directly from the Chancellor's Office. So let the Syndicate say express authorisation for this and in view of this the matter should proceed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the first thing they should resolve is that the direction of Syndicate is that the PUCASH should start investigation immediately as per the direction of the letter dated 14<sup>th</sup> June, 2017 and they should complete the enquiry within 90 days from the receipt of the letter from the Registrar and since the employer for Vice Chancellor is Chancellor and the report should be sent to the Chancellor who is also the Chairman of Senate of Panjab University. This is the one part, but besides that they have to still talk about whatever is the exact consideration item. When they talk about this item, one thing was, the representation in original of Professor Rajesh Gill along with a copy of CIC direction, has, probably, not been received by the office of the Registrar. Somehow that has now been circulated by Professor Rajesh Gill to some of the Syndicate members. In fact, he received that from one of the colleagues and has forwarded that to Registrar. They need to discuss some of the things. There are glaring things which are there in the complaint itself. So, they can discuss some of the things which are actually required to be discussed at this stage.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that with the oral orders, the letter was issued. But she is writing that 'the letter might have been issued'. But there is nothing in it.

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that the oral orders were there from the Secretary. Later on the Chancellor has confirmed those oral orders and they have been communicated to another Ministry. If it has been fraudulently done, that means the Chancellor himself is being accused. The Chancellor also is accused that the Chancellor is being influenced.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said, it is important what she says and what has been written in the CIC order. He read out the letter where she states that on a query by CIC, Shri Dewan further stated that OSD might have obtained verbal approval from the Secretary to Vice President of India and there is no note sheet or file as such. On the other hand when they look at the CIC order, they are talking, what was the discussion over there, it says, (page 2 No.5) 'the respondent stated that the sought for information is not available as the letter was issued with the verbal approval of the then Secretary to Vice President'. He said that there is huge difference between the two statements, in the sense, 'OSD might have been' that means the person who was appearing on behalf of the Chancellor's office, i.e., PIO, was not clear whether the approval has been taken or not, and here it clearly says that verbal approval has been taken. That means, he has confirmed it from the Secretary that he has given the approval and the he is stating that. So, what he would like to say is that Professor Rajesh Gill is trying to mislead the Chancellor, i.e., Vice-President by writing such a statement whereas clear order of the CIC is available with her, but still, what she is saying and what the actual order is, there is a difference between these two. Similarly, she is writing in her letter dated 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2017 at Point No. 1.1 that

"It may be observed that quite mischievously and with mala fide, the letter, inter alia, stated,

"Article 10 of the Panjab University Act separately defines the role of Chancellor, which is limited to: (i) appointing the Vice Chancellor and (ii) determining the amount of remuneration and other conditions of service of the Vice Chancellor.... the Panjab University".

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they look at the actual letter No. VPS/15/1/2016 dated January 20, 2016, Point No.5 of the letter states as under:

Article 10 of the PU Act separately defines the role of Chancellor, which is limited to; (i) appointing the Vice Chancellor and (ii) determining the amount or remuneration and other conditions of service of the Vice Chancellor. The responsibility for entire management and superintendence of University affairs, including the management, supervision and control of the workplace thus lies solely with the PU Senate."

But, what she is stating after the PU that, "Senate remains empowered and act as employer even when the matter involves the VC and the Senators". Now, what the actual letter says. As regards point number 5, whatever is there in her letter, that is not in the actual letter because the meaning is changing.

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

But he (OSD to Vice President) is referring to Article 10 and Article 11(2) which Professor Navdeep Goyal read out:

“The Senate shall have the entire management of, and superintendence over affairs, concerns and property of the University and shall provide for that management, and exercise that superintendence in accordance with the statutes, rules and regulations for the time being in force”.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal stated that based upon this article of the PU Act only, Senate remains empowered to act as employer, this is actually true, but then the way she has presented it in the complaint is not what actually the letter says. Finally, when they look at her prayer what she is trying to say is that a CBI inquiry may be instituted to inquire into the issuance of the letter dated 20.10.2016 by Shri Anshuman Gaur. Continuing Professor Navdeep Goyal asked as to what type of CBI enquiry when in front of CIC, the PIO has clearly stated that as far as that letter was concerned, it was issued with the approval. Secondly, she further says in her letter to enquire into the, “Apparent nexus amongst the then OSD, the then Secretary to former Vice President and Col. G.S. Chadha (retd.), Registrar, Panjab University”. Professor Navdeep Goyal asked what sort of nexus, she is talking about, he could not understand.

The Vice Chancellor said that a member of the Governing Body is indulging in such things and it is continuing for the last three years and what the Governing Body is doing. Can anyone of them go and repeat what she had done. Can a sitting Syndicate or Senate member indulge in all these things?

Principal Gurdip Sharma said whether they are Professors, whether they are members of the Syndicate, those officers (officers of Chancellor’s office) are not their officers and they are not working under them. Thus they cannot order an enquiry against these officers.

The Vice Chancellor asked are they not enjoined to protect them? They are performing their duty. How they will perform their duties.

Professor Navdeep Goyal asked, then how Col. G.S. Chadha comes into the picture.

The Registrar said that office of the Chancellor says that all communications whichever received from the University has to be through the Registrar.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated she is alleging that the Col. Chadha has got this letter issued in a fraudulent way.

The Vice Chancellor said that the question is whether a Senate member should do such things. Is it becoming of a member of the Senate? Are the Senate members elected for such things? Is it the duty of a Senate member?

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that the letter which has now been issued, it is on the letter-head of President, PUTA. Should she send a letter as President PUTA? It has the logo of the University. Further, whatever has been written in that letter is about the P.U. Act.

At this point of time the Vice Chancellor intervened to say that she has written many things.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the letter received from Shri Anshuman Gaur, it simply talks about the article of Panjab University Act and the interpretation thereof. He is not able to understand what she would like to talk about.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the letter dated 21<sup>st</sup> September, 2017 which was written to Smt. Ishita Roy, Joint Secretary, MHRD by Ms. Hurbi Shakeel, Under Secretary, University Grants Commission, in the last paragraph, it is written "enclosed for appropriate attention". He said that only a copy of this letter has been sent to the University. The first question is whether they received any communication from the MHRD in this regard in reference to this letter till now. It means that they are also not very clear. They should have a very important look to this particular letter. This letter is only for information to the University. It is for the proper and appropriate attention of the MHRD.

The Vice Chancellor said though it is for the information of the University, but when the Registrar of the University is being accused, would they not have to protect (the Registrar). Where the Registrar of the University should go to seek protection when a member of the Governing Body of the University is accusing the Registrar? Can anybody indulge in these things? Where is the protection for any officer of the University?

Dr. Dalip Kumar said when she mentions that there is a nexus in this four pages letter, they did not find a single word which throws some light on how the nexus is there.

The Vice Chancellor referred to point number 5.5 of her letter dated 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2017, which says:

"5.5 It was submitted before the Hon'ble CIC that the letter dated 20.01.2016 written by Shri Anshuman Gaur, OSD to former VPI, divesting constitutional authority of his powers by referring to fictitious consent of Secretary to Vice President, appears to be fraudulent and had had been written in connivance by Sh. Anshuman Gaur, OSD, the then Secretary to Hon'ble Vice President and Col. G.S.Chadha, Registrar, Panjab University, solely to help out the above law accused Vice Chancellor, against whom undersigned has filed a case of sexual harassment at workplace".

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that this cannot be a nexus. Nexus means how these are involved and sit together to frame, whatever they have received in June, 2017.

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that they are sending these things at the highest level in the government. The letters are going on behalf of a sitting member of the Senate who is elected from the Professors Constituency, who is also a PUTA President as if the weight of the teaching community of the University is behind this. So, are the teachers of the University a party to this and, is such a Vice Chancellor presiding over this University? It affects the University in a hidden way. Any proposal that he puts up at the Centre for consideration, he defends it. The proposal is evaluated by the officers of the Government of India. Something is not right in this University. Why the government should give money to this University. Do they realise that they lost Rs. 50 Crores (in a competition) in the year 2015 because accusation were made against their University that the University is violating the U.G.C. regulations, that they did not implement the CAS Promotion Scheme as per UGC directions. The new template of June of 2013, the Senate of the University implemented it, from the day the Senate had approved it, and because of that they had violated the UGC regulations. Their NAAC score was withheld for three months. The NAAC score was released only when that competition was over and their application had been put outside. Did they not lose out? Now they are preparing to file an application to compete for Institute for Excellence. This is a scheme of Central Government where the government is supposed to give a substantial sum of money to enable the University to move up in the ranking. But a University whose governance is in such a shape, how can the Government of India could commit hundreds of crores to this University and hope that this money will be well spent or it will be mired in controversies, the Vice Chancellor will be continuously on the G.T. Road and Governing Body meeting will continue for ten hours or so, and the local press will only have that to report that sordid things are going on in this University. The university's reputation when it sullied, it would affect the support to the University. The Vice Chancellor said that people in Delhi do not know what is going on, on day to day basis. Complaints go to the Prime Minister's office, MHRD and University Grants Commission office. Who are the complainants? A complainant is the sitting member of the Senate and Syndicate. Complainant is the President of the Teachers Association and not elected some six years ago, just elected this year. That means what she has been saying over the last three years, it has the approval of the vast majority of the Professors of this University and Governing Council is silent about it. That means Governing Council also sees something fishy in it, otherwise why the Governing Council is not controlling it. He asked as to why the Governing Council kept quite on 20<sup>th</sup> April, 2015 when the matter came for the first time before it. They kept quiet. Subsequently, many times the matter came to Syndicate and Senate. They are trying to resolve this matter. What is there to resolve in the matter that somebody would level wildest of the allegations and they have to seek a compromise with them because he/she will continue with those wild allegations. This is what she is doing. This is what Professor Chopra was doing. This is what Mr. Munish Verma was doing. This is what Professor Komal Singh is doing, he is writing to National Commission for Scheduled Castes and

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Scheduled Tribes. At all kinds of places in the country at the highest level, everyday in the Prime Minister's Box, the sordid things are put in. How the people do and put all these things because the Governing Council does not take a call on it in a reasonable period of time. If they take a call in reasonable period of time, then the Vice Chancellor can also plead that the matters are being attended to. But if the matters are not attended to year after year, this will happen and it will affect the image of the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they talk about Governing Body, the Governing Body said it many times. The instructions were issued to the Statutory Committee, i.e., PUCASH. Unfortunately, when they talk about the previous PUCASH, somehow, they were continuously reluctant and they made excuses one after the other time and again. And for that reason, even at one point of time, he had to resign from there. Still it could not be resolved in spite of the efforts of directions of the Governing Body also and what she is trying to say is that Vice Chancellor is heading everything. So everybody is listening, what the Vice Chancellor says. The structure of this University is that the superintendence lies with the Senate, then comes Syndicate, directions were being issued by these two bodies, still the so called statutory body does not respond to that and the Governing Bodies also do, somehow, the way the things are given over here. He would still like to talk about the whole case because he was a member of the Governing Bodies, i.e., Syndicate, Senate and also as a member of the PUCASH from where he had to resign at one point of time. First of all, this matter was discussed in April/May meeting of 2015 in the PUCASH. On May 21, the first meeting was held where she was asked to appear. What she had said at that time was quite interesting. What she tried to say was, when they talk about the PUCASH, the constitution of PUCASH was made by the Apex Body which was headed by the Vice Chancellor. Obviously, when they look at the Act, it says the Internal Complaints Committee is to be constituted by the employer which is the Senate in this case. At that time the PUCASH had said because the Committee had not been constituted properly and there were some other problems with the policy that they have adopted, of course it was adopted by the Syndicate and the Senate, that needed to be amended. Only then PUCASH can look into it. That was conveyed to the Registrar to take up the matter with the Syndicate and Senate. Then the Syndicate decided to form a sub-committee which may include the Chairperson of PUCASH that they will frame a policy as per the Act. Then the policy was framed. If they look at that policy, it simply says to adopt the Act along with the rules. But they only mentioned about the disciplinary authority of various people. Once that was done, that was the first requirement which was sent by the PUCASH. It took almost a year when whole process took place and finally the approval of the Chancellor was also obtained for that. After that the Chairperson PUCASH said that they cannot take it as it has not been defined to whom the report will be sent, if it is the Vice Chancellor. On that, there was heated exchange. He (Professor Navdeep Goyal) said 'no' because the Chairman of the Senate is the Chancellor, who is the employer, so they can

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

investigate the case and send the report to Chancellor easily. Most of the members of PUCASH did not agree to it, so it continued to be prolonged. What happened in the meantime was interesting in the sense that when they look at the complainant, the complainant had made complaints to Police, MHRD, NCW, Chancellor and everywhere. In fact when they look at all these complaints, the way these were dealt with, as far as MHRD is concerned, they had sent that complaint to University Grants Commission where the Vice Chancellor was asked to appear. There he was shown some photographs and other things. The photographs were related to a hostel function and when they actually got that file from the hostel which contained all the photographs, it clearly showed that it was not the Vice Chancellor who had gone and sat with her, it was she who decided to sit with him because when the Vice Chancellor reached there, she was sitting on a different sofa. When the Vice Chancellor arrived, she greeted him and then sat along with Mrs. Vice Chancellor (Mrs. Grover). So, that was the case and obviously once those photographs and all the communications if one tries to talk about the proofs which were available, those were definitely available. When they talk about the police, the NCW, it is not that they have not investigated the matter at all. They had gone into some sort of investigation.

At this point of time the Vice Chancellor said that the NCW member came to see him in his office.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when that investigation happened and once they were reasonably convinced that the complaint is false, obviously they depended primarily upon the Statutory Body which is supposed to look into it, i.e., Internal Complaint Committee which is PUCASH in their case. They wanted that the matter be investigated by PUCASH. It was time and again told to the University by the MHRD and also by Chancellor Office. But somehow that has not happened so far. He hoped that the new PUCASH will at least follow the directions of the Governing Body, any Statutory Committee which is otherwise supposed to follow and will investigate the case and finally whatever is the truth that will come out.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal wanted to know if, except the letter of 20.1.2016, there is any other letter where the MHRD or the Chancellor office has said that the matter could be got investigated from the PUCASH.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the MHRD has asked them to constitute a new Committee. He further informed that the new Committee which was constituted, the same was sent to the Chancellor, which the Chancellor refused to approve.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Chancellor office said that the only the old Committee would investigate the case as it is constituted as per the Act.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that if there is something also regarding investigating the case by PUCASH,

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

then this letter should be left aside. They have nothing to do with the letter which is under consideration. The only objection is that Shri Anshuman Gaur has not taken written permission and it is only verbal permission, before issuing this letter.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that he has taken the permission, but its noting is not there in the file.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have used the word 'fraudulent' which is wrong.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that when they receive any letter from any quarter, they do not see whether permission has been taken or not to issue that letter.

The Vice Chancellor stated that yesterday, he has received a directive from the office of the Chancellor, in the background of all this mess, has taken a decision that if there is any issue related to Panjab University, they will not take any decision on their files. If the Panjab University needs any decision from the Chancellor's office, the Panjab University will send its file to Delhi and the Chancellor will record his opinion on that file. That will come back to the Panjab University. Meaning thereby that the whole record of Panjab University relating to the actions of the Chancellor's office would remain with Panjab University, so that no RTI could be filed with the Chancellor's Office relating to Panjab University or to seek information regarding noting in relation to Panjab University. This has been sent under the signatures of Shri Venkaiah Naidu. He stated that till today, in last five and half years, he has not received anything signed by Shri Mohd. Hamid Ansari. It is for the first time that he has received a noting under the signatures of Vice President (Shri Venkaiah Naidu) and it is on the file when the Registrar sent a communication to the Chancellor for approval of his (Vice Chancellor) leave and to designate Professor Meenakshi Malhotra as Vice Chancellor in his absence, as per the Calendar which is dated 6<sup>th</sup> October bearing the signature of Shri Venkaiah Naidu. From today onwards it would be a procedure that if they need any approval from the Chancellor, the file will go to Delhi and after it is signed from the Chancellor, it would come back to the University.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that they have to keep record of all this in the office of the Registrar with the name 'Correspondence with the Chancellor's Office'. The Vice Chancellor further said that now he has sought permission of the Hon'ble Chancellor to invite him, they have sought information of the dignitaries who have been invited in the last five years, they (Chancellor's Office) need the file relating to the entire correspondence done with him. In that file, the last papers would be those where he has now sought approval so that the Chancellor's Office can see through the entire record. The trust of this University in the Chancellor's Office is already reduced to this level, which has not happened till date. The campus has existed for the last sixty years, it has not happened in the sixty years. Why it has not happened,

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

because nobody of the Governing Body has done such a thing in the past. The letter which was written on 15<sup>th</sup> April, look at its language, it states,

“It is humbly stated that I again and again told him politely that I had come all the way to greet him on his personal achievement, he has insulted the undersigned through his disgraceful and foul verbal behaviour in the presence of at least 15-20 officials that includes the sitting member of the Syndicate. Unable to take such humiliation in full public view and that too repeatedly, he  
(Vice Chancellor) has indulged in such acts earlier also. I left his office. He made it obvious that he has no tolerance for members who refused to lick his shoes”.

Should a sitting member of the Syndicate use this language while complaining to the Chancellor of the University.

The Vice Chancellor further read out the letter,  
“To my understanding, the Vice Chancellor does not like objectivity and honest opinion. He intends to run the University as his fiefdom with the help of his handpicked sycophants”.

The Vice Chancellor asked, should a sitting member of the Syndicate indulge into such things? The Syndicate is a forum for them to meet once in a month. How many of them are licking his shoes, how many are the sycophants among the Senators and Syndics. The amount of abuses that the Vice Chancellor of this University gets in the Senate and Syndicate meetings and with impunity, he does not think that any Vice Chancellor in this country gets that kind of abuses. But the members of the Senate and Syndicate which include former Vice Chancellors, Members of the Parliament, former Central Ministers, all of them put together will not to react anything. He said, look at the proceedings of the Senate and Syndicate and they will realise to what extent the Vice Chancellor of this University is a victim, to what extent the Registrar of this University is a victim, every now and then. Can the Registrar of this University dare to indulge in conspiracies and that also with the officers attached to the Chancellor’s Office?

That was 15<sup>th</sup> of April, 2015 and pointing out towards Professor Navdeep Goyal, he said, he (Professor Navdeep Goyal ) was present there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he knows everything what she had spoken and that he (Vice Chancellor) he is listening only to those who are licking his shoes. She left the office only after speaking all these things.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said he wanted to request that they should speed up the enquiry.

The Vice Chancellor said that the PUCASH issue is separate, but how do they check this kind of indiscipline by a Senate member. They have to take cognisance of this.

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal further said that the enquiry should be conducted at the earliest (by PUCASH) as the delay would cause more harm.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that it has to be done in the stipulated period of 90 days.

The Vice Chancellor said how they would protect the Registrar.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that she has prayed for two things, one is CBI enquiry, which they reject. Second, she has asked for major misconduct. They also reject it.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should also say something about the alleged allegation on the conduct of the Registrar. He is doing his duty.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the allegations of connivance is a wild allegation and they do not accept it.

The Vice Chancellor said that these are not only wild allegations, but these are irresponsible and unfounded allegations. There has to be a very positive strong statement that it is not acceptable. It is an unacceptable behaviour by a colleague.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they should reject the prayer made by her in her letter.

The Vice Chancellor said that rejection is one thing, but, will they not condemn it also as rejection is not condemnation to which Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they also condemn it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they should also take very seriously the order of CIC. No future intervention of the Commission is required in this matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that is Information Commission.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that a reference is being made of the orders of CIC and so that is very significant.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are also receiving complaints regarding the orders of CIC. The reference which is coming is not in accordance with the orders. Orders are something else and the reference is something else. It has been distorted. To do such type of things with this sort of distortion is condemnable.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that something could be termed as fraud if a person says that he has not asked to do some work. In this case no one has denied that whatever has been written by the OSD, was not asked by him. The Vice President of India or somebody else should have said it. Mostly, the works in life are done on verbal orders. Citing an example, he said if his Principal asks him to do something orally, he would definitely do it. If my Principal, at some stage says, that he has not asked him to do that work, only then he could make a complaint against him and not anybody else. How another person could know about it. They should give importance to this letter if someone denies it.

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

The Vice Chancellor stated that due to this, the CIC has said that this matter does not require any further consideration.

Professor Mukesh Arora and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that there is not even a single letter where it has been mentioned that the higher authorities have not asked him (OSD) to write this letter.

The Vice Chancellor asked then why this complaint has been made.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that this is because of change of Chancellor, this is the main reason.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the officers in Chancellor's Office should say that they have not asked him (OSD) to write this letter, only then they could accept it. Secondly, he said that the Vice Chancellor used to say that they are the members of the Syndicate and Senate, the Governing Bodies. But Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma, his friend and mentor used to say that if he is able even to get a Clerk transferred, only then he would agree that they are the members of the Syndicate and Senate. They are the members of the Syndicate and Senate only for namesake. He said that they are not given any importance if they make a request to do something. Sometimes, they have to get a work done with great difficulty and that too by making so many requests. But on the other hand, there are people who are not even in the Syndicate and Senate, but they can get their works done. If they request even for the genuine transfer of someone, being a member of the Governing Body, but that transfer is not done for months together. He wanted this to bring on record that time and again it is said that the members of the Syndicate and Senate, but they do not have any power as is being projected outside.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said what is actually happening in the University, if they look at it, who is getting the investigation done, it is evident. Professor Rajesh Gill levelled objections twice. On the current issue, to his mind, he doubts, that this is also going to the direction to linger on the investigation somehow or the other. Then the stories are implanted in the newspapers as if something has happened, due to that the investigation is not allowed to be conducted by the authorities or Governing Bodies or the Vice Chancellor or anybody else. So, the things are being painted in a manner to show as if something has happened and that is why the enquiry is not being conducted. Whereas, either they talk of Governing Body or anybody else, everybody is interested that there should be proper enquiry of this issue, as per the provisions of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal), Act, 2013. Unfortunately, at some point in time, the efforts are made to hinder the enquiry and some other point of time it is painted as if the enquiry is not being done intentionally.

The Vice Chancellor said that the way this letter (5<sup>th</sup> September) has been sent, it appears as if the Vice Chancellor is not allowing the investigation to be conducted.

Professor Pam Rajput said if they see the words used in the letter by Professor Rajesh Gill, she writes that the Vice Chancellor is a law accused and by writing this she has established that the Vice Chancellor is accused by law.

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that nobody has taken any cognisance of it. Except Shri Satya Pal Jain, nobody in the Senate said that the complaint is false. Today they are saying it is a false complaint.

When the Vice Chancellor asked whether anybody has said it in the Senate, some members said 'yes'.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he had withheld himself in the meeting because he is a witness to the incident. As and when there will be enquiry in the matter and he has to speak and he would speak the truth.

The Vice Chancellor said that she has alleged that the Registrar has disclosed the identity of the witness and the complainant whereas the complainant has herself disclosed it when she went to the Police and the news was published in the newspapers next day.

While supporting the view point of the Vice Chancellor, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said she has herself disclosed her identity.

The Vice Chancellor asked then why did he, a senior member of the Senate, accuse the Registrar in the Senate meeting. Was he (Registrar) not accused by a senior member of the Senate who has been a Central Minister that the Registrar had revealed the identity? How many hours of discussion is recorded in the proceedings of the Senate relating to this whereas it should not have been more than two minutes to disperse the issue.

Some of the members said perhaps they are wasting their time on this issue.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor told as to why he has to call the meeting of the Syndicate today. He explained if he did not call this meeting today and when he would go abroad on leave on 14<sup>th</sup> October, there would have been a hue and cry on this and some letter would have come from the Central Government. He further said whatever the Syndicate would resolve today, he would send the resolved part to the Chancellor's office tomorrow.

Dr. Dalip Kumar referred to letter dated 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2017 written by Professor Rajesh Gill to the Hon'ble Chancellor and also another letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2015 written by Shri Sanjeev Kumar Narayan, Under Secretary to the Govt. of India, MHRD to the Registrar, Panjab University. He said that at least the facts should have been established somewhere. At least, it should be known who is saying the right thing. He read out part 4(a) of letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2015 which states as under:

"4.(a) The 'Employer' (as per the Vishakha judgement and the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013) and the 'Disciplinary Authority' [as per the CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965], is to be treated as one and the same in the present matter. This is affirmed by the DoPT guidelines. The Disciplinary Authority of the Vice-Chancellor is the Chancellor."

The Vice Chancellor said that though it is written, but the PUCASH will not accept it.

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that if he after drafting a letter and after signing it, sends it to someone, that should also be reacted in their submission that these are things which are even endorsed by the MHRD.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is fine, if the PUCASH is not doing its job properly, what they can do. The PUCASH is made by the Senate. Why does the PUCASH not take the cognisance of it and scrap the PUCASH and construct the new PUCASH. But they could not take this decision because their construct of the Syndicate and Senate is such that they cannot take any hard decision. This is their reality.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu asked if the Syndicate could give directions to the PUCASH to which the Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are giving directions to PUCASH and it has been resolved. He further added that this had been done earlier also.

The Vice Chancellor said that this was done earlier also, but the Chairperson PUCASH did not abide by the directions of Syndicate. What they can do? Can they remove her and to remove her, they cannot take decision because it needs 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority and due to division of votes it may not be passed. Let they accept the reality.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu asked if they have to take some action or if they want to change her, what is the procedure for that to which Professor Navdeep Goyal and the Vice Chancellor said that it has to go through the Syndicate and Senate where 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority is needed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that now a new PUCASH has been constituted.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that they should not give much attention to all these things, rather they should get the enquiry conducted at the earlier so that the matter is closed. He said that they should perform their duty, let the people say whatever they like.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage. However, some members opined to conduct the enquiry in a time bound period.

The Vice Chancellor said that the letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2015 refers to a complaint lodged with the HRD Minister, Mrs. Smriti Irani on 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2015. In the earlier letter of 18<sup>th</sup> April, she was saying that there is no sexual harassment. The Vice Chancellor said that in this letter she alleged harassment, but not sexual harassment. But in the letter of 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2015 which was sent to Mrs. Smriti Irani, HRD Minister it was alleged to be sexual harassment. So, sexual harassment can be investigated only by a Committee on sexual harassment as per the law of the land. As per the law of the land, it is the PUCASH which can conform to that and their PUCASH has, unfortunately, not complied. So first, while resolving, they resolve that PUCASH should take up this enquiry and complete it within the stipulated time period and forward the report to the Chancellor. It can also express concern that the previous PUCASH did not comply to the requirement of the University.

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Professor Pam Rajput and some other members said that they should not do it (express concern).

The Vice Chancellor further said that this has not come on record even once that the previous PUCASH did not do its job. It is only reluctance. The word 'reluctance' has been used only by the MHRD and not by them.

Professor Pam Rajput said that they should express their concern only on the distortion done by her.

The Vice Chancellor said that there has to be some condemnation of what she has done and there should be some deterrence. There should be some enquiry into what she has done so that no Senate member should indulge in such things. There should be an enquiry and further said that he recommends that there should be an enquiry into this kind of conduct.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that different complaints were being sent, so there should be an enquiry should be held in all that.

The Vice Chancellor said that this enquiry is not looking into PUCASH. This enquiry is looking into irresponsible act by a Professor for doing this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said this is not the only complaint, there are various types of complaints.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they are going to do this, then there is going to be no return. There is a specific complaint by this particular person. Otherwise, what is the deterrent? Is there any deterrent, he asked. At least there should be some deterrent in the system. First of all, this letter is written once again directly to the Chancellor. Should it not go through the Vice Chancellor? If it would have gone through the Vice Chancellor, he would have brought it before them. Even that is a violation. Can a Senator write this kind of letter complaining and hurling such kind of accusations against the senior officers of the University and the senior officers attached to the Chancellor's office and there will be no cognisance taken by the Governing Bodies of this University. What they are doing to protect the people who are doing their job honestly. These are hard decisions. Why they are afraid of taking the hard decisions. There has to be some enquiry and let the enquiry be conducted by people who are members of the Senate who understand, what governance is. Let people like Professor D.V.S. Jain, Ambassador I.S. Chadha, Shri Tarlochan Singh and may be Shri V.K. Sibal and take Professor Pam Rajput, some Emeritus Professors of the University and people who understand what governance is on behalf of Government of India. Can they do this? May be somebody like Professor D.V.S. Jain or Shri I.S. Chadha, Chair a Committee and look into it and bring out some code of conduct for even the Senate members to act. There should be some code of conduct. In the background of all this, there should be a code of conduct as to how a Senate member should conduct themselves.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since there is no code of conduct for Senators a Committee be constituted to look into it which was also endorsed by Principal B.C. Josan. Continuing, Professor

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Navdeep Goyal said some other cases have also come up, such as the court case relating to a College at Mohlan. So, in order to look into all such cases, a Committee should be there.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that in the background of this case, this specific act, should there not be somebody to take cognisance of this and form a code of conduct for the Senators. At some point of time, they have to take hard decisions, otherwise, it will be again such a thing like licking the shoes, sycophants. Will they protect themselves or not?

Professor Mukesh Arora said whatever the Vice Chancellor would say, it is their duty to protect them. Registrar's post is a very big post, but if there is injustice done even to a Clerk, they will protect him also.

The Vice Chancellor said that let a Committee headed by Professor D.V.S. Jain and comprising Senate members like Dr. Tarlochan Singh, Ambassador I.S. Chadha, Shri V.K. Sibal, Professor Pam Rajput. Thus, they will be having two Emeritus Professor, two Secretary level persons. Dr. Tarlochan Singh has been Chairman of Minority Commission and a Parliamentarian also. At least, if this Committee says something, they have to take cognisance of that. After all, they should send a message to the Chancellor that he is getting some advice from the people who are members of the Governing Body.

Continuing the Vice Chancellor said as already told to them, now all the files will go to Delhi, there will be no harm in it, but with this, a message of distrust has been conveyed to the Chancellor.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it has been coming in the newspapers that the Ph.D. guidelines came later on and the enrolment was done even before that. He said that Ph.D. is also got done in the Colleges, so the college teachers should also be involved as and when a meeting is held in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already requested that if a person who is getting scholarship comes to the University for doing Ph.D. he should not be denied this. If the department people have any reservation in taking that student, at least he should be allowed to register. There are many teachers in the colleges also who can guide the students for Ph.D, no scholarship holder should be refused by the University, because the number of scholarship holders who come to them for doing Ph.D. is not much. If any student who is getting scholarship would like to do Ph.D. under the supervision of a University teacher or a Colleges teacher, it is his personal recommendations he or she might not be refused, because they are not having much number of scholarship holders.

Professor Mukesh Arora requested to look into the case of University Business School for which he has already given in writing.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the decision regarding forming of a Committee to frame code of conduct rules for Fellows is not acceptable to them. He said even a Peon is not ready to listen to them. Sometimes, they do not even get room in the University Guest House

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

and they feel insulted. They are members of the Governing Body just for saying, otherwise they have no say at all.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that when they talk about the Code of Conduct for Fellows, they should also keep some other things in mind. He said that he has been associated with this House for a long time. He feels that they are having some shortcoming in themselves also and first of all he would like to talk about that. The Governing Body is a very big authority and its members do get respect in the Registrar's office, Controller's office and in the office of the Vice Chancellor also. But today he would like to talk very honestly and would not like to discuss any specific case. However, he would like to say, for example, a candidate has some problem regarding his Examination Centre. The candidate belonged to Malout and he was given Hoshiarpur Centre. He has to appear in the paper today. The candidate was a cancer patient. When he wanted to talk to the dealing hand, she said that she would not talk to the Syndicate member. Where is Code of Conduct at that time? Actually, the due respect, which should have been there, is not given to a Syndicate member. When the senior officials do not listen to them, then how their subordinate would listen to them. If they go 12-14 years back, he could say, at that time the Fellow were given due respect. He thinks that perhaps they may not behave with them properly or there is some fault in them. Whatever, Shri Varinder Singh has said that it alright. He just talks about the Syndics who are the members of the Governing Body, who are the appointing authority of all, except the Vice Chancellor, in spite of telling the dealing official that a Syndicate member would like to talk to him, he/she does not bother to attend to him. He further said that the Registrar can transfer anybody. If a Syndicate member requests him to stop his transfer or undo the transfer, because of his genuine problem, that is not done. He asked the members if any official has been re-transferred on his previous seat on their request. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu asked the members if they can help any student to solve his genuine problem. He said they could put checks on themselves, but there should be check on the office also. He said that due respect should be given to the Syndics.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they belong to good families, would always like to do good things and having good thinking. The people outside may think that they are the members of the Syndicate or the Governing Body, but they feel that they are treated as if they are robbers. They do not feel proud that they are Senate members. Except for some offices, the other offices also do not have any say. When the transfers are done, these offices are not consulted. He said that the offices such as Controller of Examinations Office, Sports Director office and D.S.W. Office, should be allowed to retain the persons who are good workers and handling the work properly. Why reshuffling is done every now and then which hampers the smooth running of work.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu further said that the candidate who was allotted Hoshiarpur Centre where as the candidate belonged to Malout and her village is situated near Haryana Border. He said that the dealing-hands are husband and wife and they are close to the other officials. One senior Clerk requested and got the case processed. But the dealing official did nothing in the matter in spite of genuine problem of the candidate. Actually, when golden chance was earlier

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

given, at that time Centre No. 13 was Muktsar and so the candidate filled his choice of Centre as 13. But in the current list of Centres, Centre No. 13 is Garshankar and the office has allotted her Hoshiarpur. Till this stage, the office is not at fault. But if there is a genuine problem and a Syndicate member would like to talk to the dealing official, the dealing official says, she would not talk to the Syndicate member. Though the work was got done with the help of high officers, but this has been happening with all, they may be Principal Gurdip Sharma, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Principal B.C. Josan or Dr. Dalip Kumar. Nobody bothers about the Governing Body member. He further said if a Syndicate member complains about such persons and request for his transfer, they do not bother for it because they know that he could not do anything. They have set their equations with the Registrar or the Controller of Examinations, or with the S.V.C., why they would bother for them.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is not a correct accusation to say that they have set their equations. This is the accusation which she is also levelling that they have set the equations.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu further said to the Vice Chancellor that he gets annoyed and do not listen to them. If he is wrong, they should prove it, and he is ready to feel sorry and ready to resign from the Syndicate.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu further said that they talk of Code of Conduct for Senate members, but there is no Code of Conduct for Clerical staff.

Professor Mukesh Arora while endorsing the view point of Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it looks very odd when some Clerk says that he does not want to listen to the Syndicate member. He said even the Vice Chancellor listens to them and respond to their query, but it is very bad on the part of a Clerk.

Shri Varinder Singh further reiterated that they are not in favour of Code of Conduct for Senators. They are the members of the Governing Body and they think everything better. He pointed out towards the situation in the Administrative Block, how the transfers are made. The situation is worse here than any other place. A person who is satisfactorily working on a seat for the last ten years, he is transferred from one place to other for many times. The substitutes are not provided and this upsets the whole system. He further said that they are not in favour of Code of Conduct because they are themselves members of the Governing Body. They have their freedom and they do not want to go to anybody to know about their Code of Conduct.

Professor Mukesh Arora reminded the Vice Chancellor that two months ago, he has said that a room would be provided for the members of the Senate and Syndicate where they could sit and arrangement for tea would also be made. But so far, nothing has been done.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu further pointed out that a Syndicate member cannot book two rooms, but the official used to book ten

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

rooms at one time. They can see the record to check it. The Syndicate is their appointing authority, but a member cannot book rooms if he needs it whereas an official could book ten rooms.

Shri Varinder Singh suggest that the staff in the offices of the Controller of Examinations, Sports Director, D.S.W. and D.U.I. should put as per their choice so that they could have good persons in their offices and the work could run smoothly.

Professor Gurdip Sharma and some other members requested that the resolve be finalized.

Shri Varinder Singh wanted to draw the attention of the Vice Chancellor to the resolve part which is not correctly mentioned. He said that here they talk about something else, but in the resolved part something else is mentioned. In this regard he mentioned the issues relating to the Sports Directorate and Mr. Padam, which were discussed in the last Syndicate meeting. If it is checked by anyone, it is okay, otherwise it goes as it is written. He got to know of it after five years that it has to be got corrected. Otherwise, he was of the belief that whatever is transpired in the meetings, the same would be written.

The members asked the Vice Chancellor to dictate the resolved part to which the Vice Chancellor said that they have to resolve the issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said as regards the letter, they can say many facts in this complaint have been distorted and a member of Senate and President, PUTA is not expected to make a complaint like that.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said if the President PUTA has made a complaint; it could be viewed as a complaint of teachers and not the personal complaint of President PUTA.

Shri Varinder Singh said that a Committee should be formed on this letter to which Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they should condemn it after having legal advice.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they permit him he could dictate the resolve part to which the members said 'yes'. The Vice Chancellor said that first they should state the resolves part pertaining to the enquiry by Panjab University.

- (1) After discussing the matter in its entirety, the Syndicate resolves that the PUCASH should take up the enquiry and complete it in the stipulated period and file the report to the Chancellor. The employer of the complainant is the Senate and Chancellor is the Chair of the Senate. Employer of the Vice Chancellor is the Chancellor and the punishing authority of the Vice Chancellor is also the appointing authority as per the letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2015 of MHRD. The Syndicate also took cognisance of June 14, 2017 letter from the Chancellor which stated as under:

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

- “4. Further under the provisions of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013, particularly in Section 13(1) it is already provided that after enquiry under this Act by an internal committee, the report should be forwarded to the “employer” within ten days from the date of completion of the inquiry and such report be made available to the concerned parties.
  5. No legal impediment is thus seen in the duly constituted PUCASH presently existing in PU from undertaking the said inquiry into the case which has already been referred to them under the statutory provisions of the above Act.”
- (2) That the Syndicate expresses serious concern that a sitting member of the Senate wrote a letter in the dual capacity as President, PUTA in which she has made unacceptable allegations against the officer attached to the Chancellor and the Registrar, Panjab University in the discharge of their duties. The Syndicate found it objectionable that the facts have been distorted mischievously and with mala fide intention to mislead the Chancellor. The statement that they indulged in a fraudulent activity is condemned. The orders of the Secretary to Chancellor were letter on endorsed by the Chancellor as per the letter of June 14, 2017. The same spirit has been duly endorsed by the Chancellor in letters of May 2017 and June 14, 2017 where it has been written that “”This issues with the approval of Hon’ble Vice President/Chancellor, Panjab University.
  - (3) That a Committee would be formed to look into the matters arising out of this letter without mentioning code of conduct so that such occurrences do not recur as these things amount to lowering the image of the University at the national level.

The Vice Chancellor said that this resolve part would be written and sent the draft to the members on email. Until the concurrence of the members is not received, the resolve part would not be sent to Delhi.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said it will get very late as they may not be able to send the concurrence immediately. So, there is no need of any consent.

However, some members suggested that the resolved part may be got checked from Professor Pam Rajput and Dr. Dalip Kumar before sending it to the Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor further shared with the members the recommended names for the honoris causa degrees. The names will come to them as part of the agenda in the next meeting. The names include: (i) Smt Sumitra Mahajan, Speaker Lok Sabha, for Doctor of Law (Honoris Causa). She has been nine times M.P. from Madhya Pradesh, she did not lose even a single election. (ii)

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Professor M.M. Sharma, FRS, for D.Sc. (Honoris Causa) who is considered to be the contemporary Bhatnagar and (iii) Professor Sir Tejinder Singh Viridi, FRS for D.Sc. (Honoris Causa) Professor at Imperial College, London. He is the spokesperson of collaboration at CERN and he has supported the participation of Physics Department of PU in all the high energy experiments over the last 30 years. Further, the name of Shri Milkha Singh ji is recommended for Khel Rattan, Shri Sunil Kant Munjal for Udyog Rattan who is now the Head of the Hero Handa Industries and Professor B.N. Goswami for Gyan Rattan.

The Vice Chancellor further informed that now they will have to send the files relating to Honoris Causa degrees and that of various Rattan Awards to the Chancellor by putting in them the persons who have been the recipients of these degrees and awards during the last five years. Thus, the approval of the Hon'ble Chancellor will be obtained on these files and, therefore, no record would be kept by the Chancellor's Office. Now, RTIs will not be replied by the Chancellor's office. The replies to all RTIs will be given by the Panjab University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal talked about the the S.P.N. College, Mukerian. He said that the Vice Chancellor has asked him to visit S.P.N. College, Mukerian as soon as possible. Since some other members were also involved in it, so they have 13<sup>th</sup> of October to visit the College. Yesterday, he has received a letter from the College, a copy of which has been forwarded by him to the Vice Chancellor also, wherein they have stated that they are not having the whole record at the moment as the same is with the Court. They further stated that under these circumstances, the Fact Finding Committee should not visit the College. Dr. Navdeep Goyal stated that it is clear from the letter that neither they would like to cooperate nor they would like to do anything else. He, therefore, urged that if the Syndicate has taken some decision, they must discuss it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they should go by the directions of the University and by the directions of the College.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that a letter could be written to the College asking them to bring all the record for examination. How can they refuse it? They must be having the shadow file. So they may be asked to show that file.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in view of the conduct of the management, some of their approval have been rightly withheld. What they are doing is that they start a course, appoint teachers, but after sometime the teachers are dispensed with and the course remain continued. Similarly is the case with the Principal. The issue of appointment of Principals was also discussed in the Senate. If they see the record, there are more than 50 colleges where there is no Principal. Either they do not want to appoint a Principal or the Principals are not available. Some Colleges appoint the Principal just to meet the requirement of the University. Particularly, in this College they appoint the Principal and shunted him out and they have done it repeatedly.

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

The Vice Chancellor asked to take a strict action and right now they can coordinate their activity with Professor Ghuman because such a thing is happening there also. Now they can synergise their action with Professor Ghuman and see that the College should comply with the requirements.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal mentioned the names of some of the degree and B.Ed. Colleges which do not have regular Principals.

The Vice Chancellor asked Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal to give him the list of colleges which he mentioned and said that a letter will be written to these colleges asking them to inform the University about the present status of Principal at their College.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that in DIPS College of Education, Rarra Morr, Jalalpur, Tanda Urmar, District Hoshiarpur, the teachers are not being paid salary for the last four months. They are not allowed to mark their attendance. This problem is prevailing at many Colleges. Teachers are very much worried there. He suggested that a Committee should be sent there to sort out the problem.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the Governing Body of this University which is primarily is largely made of teachers and Principals or the former teachers and Principals, if they cannot protect the rights of teachers, then who will do this.

Principal Gurdip Sharma told the Vice Chancellor that there was a very good impact on the SGPC and they have withdrawn the letter issued to Dr. Jatinder Kaur. They have now made it clear that SGPC will not take any action now in this matter.

The Vice Chancellor asked the member to remain effective.

The Vice Chancellor further advised the Controller of Examinations that he with the help of Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal would form Sub-Committees and get approval from him (Vice Chancellor). He further asked to draft a letter properly asking the College to provide information with regard to the status of their Principal. If they do not have a regular Principal, when their last Principal relinquished office. Before sending that letter, they (C.O.E. office) will find out from their record from when the regular Principal is not there. They should also mention the date from when there is no regular Principal and also ask the College about the status of the Principal as per the College record. The College be also asked as to what steps they have taken to appoint a regular Principal. After the defaulters have been identified, a Committee be sent to those College.

Some of the members suggested that the Committees should be sent to all the colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should take the help of sitting members of the Syndicate and make a Chairman from themselves. They may add Syndicate or Senate members in the neighbourhood to form Sub-Committees.

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Shri Varinder Singh said that maximum visits by the Committees should be done to such colleges as they admit only non-attending students. These colleges take a very hefty fee from the students. They ask the student to give twenty thousand fee instead of ten thousand, if they do not want to attend the classes.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the problem of non-attending students had been much more in the B.Ed. College of U.P. Then the Uttar Pradesh Government closed all the B.Ed. Colleges affiliated to Meerut University overnight. There was rampant corruption.

Shri Varinder Singh said that such type of things have been happening in 90% of the private colleges here also.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that earlier also the issue of Principal who have crossed the age of 60 years was discussed. He informed that there are five such Colleges, out of which one is at Chandigarh where Principal B.C. Josan. The other four Principals who are working beyond the age of 60 years are Principal Gurdip Sharma, he himself (Principal Hardiljit SinghGosal), Principal Madhu Prashar and Principal Charanjit Mahal. He showed a letter where a stay has been granted with regard to the acceptance of their signatures by the D.P.I. Office. In this stay, they have given a reference of the Syndicate decision in this regard and the signatures of such Principals are accepted by the D.P.I. since the year 2014. This issue was put up before the Syndicate meeting of May, 2014 for the first time and after that it was placed before the Senate under Item C-75. Two persons, namely, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and Principal Kuldeep Singh, had spoken on the issue. The issue again came up in Syndicate meeting along with the issue of age of Principals from 65 years to 70 years.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to inform that this issue was rejected.

Continuing, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that a lot of discussion had taken place on the issue and it was resolved, "that the decision of the Syndicate dated 18.5.2014 Para-45) be notified to all the affiliated colleges immediately and implemented from the date of the Syndicate decision (18.5.2014)". After that this issue was not placed before the Senate because it was discussed that there is no need to send it to the Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in this regard the P.U. Act says that the power of making rules lies with the Syndicate. Mainly, Shri Ashok Goyal had spoken that one should not go beyond his powers. If something is under the authority of the Vice Chancellor, it should go to the Vice Chancellor only. If the authority of doing something is with the Syndicate, it should go to the Syndicate. But if it is with the Senate, then, of course, it should go to the Senate through the Syndicate as per the Act. This case is to be dealt with rules and falls under the purview of Syndicate, so this case should not have gone to the Senate at all and that is why even though there was no agreement in the Senate, still this should be notified. Then it was notified and even at that time it was not approved by the Senate. He further said

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

since it was only to be approved by the Syndicate and thus there was no need to send it to the Senate. In the present case, even the policy for grant of extension to the Principal has not been changed. Earlier the extension given in the pattern of 2+2+1 and now because of administrative reasons, it has been made 3+2.

The Vice Chancellor said as to how it has gone to the Senate to which the members said that it should not have gone to the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor further said that when the revised agenda will go, it will go as a new Senate agenda which would include both the new items as well as the old items.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are some items which should not have gone to the Senate to which the Vice Chancellor said that they (members) should send a mail informing about such items and those items would be dropped.

The Vice Chancellor said that now the old and new items would be mixed up. The Senate meeting would not start from last item and it would be held as a new meeting.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu asked if this is a general discussion or some decision has to be taken on it to which the Vice Chancellor said that no decision is to be taken on this.

After discussing the matter in its entirety, the Syndicate:

**RESOLVED:** That –

- I (a) the Panjab University Committee against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH) be directed to commence the enquiry at the earliest and complete it within the stipulated period and submit its report directly to the Chancellor. This directive to PUCASH follows from taking cognisance, by the Syndicate, of the letter dated 14 June 2017 from the office of the Chancellor which stated that:

“Para 4. Further under the provisions of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal), Act, 2013, particularly in Section 13(1) it is already provided that after enquiry under this Act by an internal committee, the report should be forwarded to the “employer” within ten days from the date of completion of the inquiry and such report be made available to concerned parties.

Para 5. No legal impediment is thus seen in the duly constituted PUCASH presently existing in PU from undertaking the said inquiry into the case which has already been referred to them under the statutory provisions of the above Act.”

- (b) Syndicate further noted from MHRD letter No. F.2-5/2015-U-II) dated September 18, 2015 that the

Special Syndicate Proceedings dated 7<sup>th</sup> October 2017

'Employer' and the 'Disciplinary Authority' are to be treated as one and the same. This also stood affirmed by the DoPT guidelines. Disciplinary Authority of the Vice-Chancellor is the Chancellor, who is also the Chairman of the Senate, the appointing authority of the complainant Professor. Thus the PUCASH report ought to go directly to the Chancellor.

- II The Syndicate expressed serious concern that a sitting member of the Senate wrote a letter dated 5.9.2017 in dual capacity as President, PUTA, in which she has made unfounded and unacceptable allegations against an officer attached to the Chancellor, PU and the Registrar, PU. The Syndicate found it objectionable that the facts have been distorted mischievously and with mala fide intention to mislead the Chancellor. The Syndicate condemned the false allegations made by a sitting member of Senate against the senior officers, who were discharging their duty towards PU. In particular, the Registrar, PU had no role in the execution of just duties by officers in the Chancellor's office. The Syndicate also observed that complainant did not forward her input to Chancellor's office following PU rules.
- III A Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor D.V.S. Jain, Fellow, PU, Professor Emeritus and INSA Hony. Scientist and comprising other Senate members Sardar Tarlochan Singh, Ex-MP, Professor Pam Rajput, Professor Emeritus, Ambassador I.S. Chadha, IFS (Retd.) and Shri V.K. Sibal, IAS (Retd.) and Senior Advocate is constituted to look into the issues arising out of the letter under consideration so that such occurrences as created by the action of the complainant (Senate member and Professor, PU) do not recur in future. Syndicate noted with concern that complainant's act has compromised the image of the University and its Governing Bodies.

(G.S. Chadha )  
Registrar

Confirmed

( Arun Kumar Grover )  
VICE-CHANCELLOR