

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Sunday, 10th December 2017** at **11.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

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

Shri Lakhmir Singh, DPI (Colleges), Punjab, Professor Mukesh Arora and Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh Singh 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) Dr. Pawan Kapur, former Director, C.S.I.O.(Oct. 2004 – Dec. 2012), Chandigarh, on 8th December 2017,
- ii) Sh. Mohinder Singh, Sr. Assistant, Examination Branch-I, on 29th November, 2017
- iii) Revered mother of one of their colleague Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu, Member of Syndicate, Panjab University.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Dr. Pawan Kapur, Sh. Mohinder Singh and revered mother of Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

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

- i) A document with respect to Panjab University, Chandigarh, is being prepared for submission of a proposal to the University Grants Commission (UGC)/MHRD, for grant of the status of 'Institution of Excellence' on December 11, 2017. In this regard a fee of Rs.1,00,00,000 (one crore) will be paid to the UGC out of the funds of University Institute of Applied Management Sciences (UIAMS), PU, Chandigarh.

If we are successful, then we will get 500 Crores in the next five years. But, if we are unsuccessful, then Rs. 75 lakhs out of Rs. 1 Crore will be returned back. They are charging this money even from the Central Universities and IITs and also from other Universities. I see no reason why such a charge is being made, if we are setting up a competition to award Rupees 10 thousand crore to 10 State University, then collecting money out of them to enter the completion is not appropriate. But, if they do not deposit this money, they could not enter into this completion.

- ii) Panjab University, Chandigarh has been placed at 6th position in the CWTS Leiden Ranking after AIIMS, New Delhi, PGIMER, Chandigarh, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, Indian Inst of Sci., Bangalore and University of Delhi in the category of Biomedical and Health Sciences in the time period 2012-2015.

While referring to grant of status of Institution of Excellence, the Vice-Chancellor said that this reaffirms that in several departments of the University, the University stands a competition for the application for grant of the status of 'Institution of Excellence'. The Delhi University and B.H.U. will also be a competitor in the University section. Delhi University and B.H.U. are the Central Universities and we are quasi-Central; University.

- iii) Prof. D.K. Dhawan, Dept. of Biophysics, has been nominated for the prestigious Mr. M.K. Nambiar Memorial Oration Award as recommended by the Award Committee of Indian Association of Biomedical Scientists (IABMS).

- iv) Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang, Dept. of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies, has been felicitated with the 'Best Professor on Literature' Award during the 25th Business School Affaire & Dewang

Mehta National Education Awards held at Chandigarh on 1st December, 2017.

- v) Professor Gunmala Suri, University Business School, has been felicitated with the 'Women in Education Leadership Award' during the 25th Business School Affaire & Dewang Mehta National Education Awards held at Chandigarh on 1st December, 2017.
- vi) Prof. Archana R. Singh, Chairperson of the School of Communication Studies, PU, has been selected as part of the peer reviewer panel for a new study commissioned by UNESCO titled 'Youth and Violent Extremism on Social Media: Mapping the Research'
- vii) Prof. Anupama Sharma, Dr S.S. Bhatnagar University Inst. of Chemical Engg. & Tech., has been conferred with A.P.A. Young Scientist Award 2017 by the Asian Polymer Association in recognition of her seminal contribution in the domains of Polymer Engineering and Nanocomposites.
- viii) Panjab University affiliated College S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur, Hoshiarpur, has been placed in the 'A' Grade by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), has secured CGPA score of 3.21 in the College-Cycle-II.
- ix) Mr. Varun Gupta, a Ph.D. research scholar from University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences has bagged the Newton Bhabha PhD Placement Award as per recently declared results by the British Council.
- x) Ms. Yashika Bansal, DST INSPIRE Fellow pursuing Ph.D. in the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU, has been awarded Exchange Fellowship by International Brain Research Organisation (IBRO) to discover new pharmacological target for treating depression at Brain Research Institute Monash Sunway (BRIMS), Monash University, Malaysia.

RESOLVED: That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to–
 - (i) Prof. D.K. Dhawan, Dept. of Biophysics, on his being nominated for the prestigious Mr. M.K. Nambiar Memorial Oration Award.
 - (ii) Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang, Dept. of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies, on her being felicitated with the 'Best Professor on Literature' Award.

- (iii) Professor Gunmala Suri, University Business School, on her being felicitated with the 'Women in Education Leadership Award'.
 - (iv) Prof. Archana R. Singh, Chairperson of the School of Communication Studies, PU, on her being selected as part of the peer reviewer panel for a new study commissioned by UNESCO.
 - (v) Prof. Anupama Sharma, Dr S.S. Bhatnagar University Inst. of Chemical Engg. & Tech., on her being conferred with A.P.A. Young Scientist Award 2017.
 - (vi) Panjab University affiliated College S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur, Hoshiarpur, on being placed in the 'A' Grade by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC).
 - (vii) Mr. Varun Gupta, a Ph.D. research scholar from University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences on his being bagged the Newton Bhabha Ph.D Placement Award.
 - (viii) Ms. Yashika Bansal, DST INSPIRE Fellow pursuing Ph.D. in the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU, on her being awarded Exchange Fellowship by International Brain Research Organisation (IBRO).
- (2) the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No.(i) be approved.
 - (3) the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No.(ii) be noted.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have a large agenda and since the application for grant of the status of 'Institution of Excellence' have to be filed tomorrow so they would conduct the meeting upto 5.00 p.m. only. If there is something which require a long discussion they would pass it over to it and come back to it at the end. If they would not be able to take up all the items upto 5.00 p.m., then they would convene another evening sitting of the Syndicate after the Senate meeting is over and the Syndicate elections are over. So, whatever is the agenda of Syndicate of 2017, they would attempt to finish it before the start of 2018 even if they have to have another sitting of the Syndicate after the Senate meeting is over or the election process to the faculties is over.

Some members suggested that since there are elections of municipalities in Punjab on 17th December, the faculty meeting could be held on 18th & 19th of December.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that they hold the Syndicate meeting in the evening of 21st December so that they can attend to the whole agenda before that date.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu suggested that the faculty meetings could be held on 19 & 20 December and if some items of Syndicate agenda are left, those could be discussed on 21st December to which the Vice Chancellor said that he has no objection to it.

However, different views were expressed by the members with regard to holding of faculty meetings. Some members suggested to postpone the meeting of the Senate so that the faculty meeting could be held before the Senate meeting. By doing so, the Senate meeting could be held just after the faculty meeting and this would also help reduce the expenditure.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Senate meeting has to be held on a holiday and since it has now been fixed, it cannot be changed.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested to hold the meeting of the Senate on next Saturday i.e. on 23rd December..

Professor Navdeep Goyal and some other members said that winter vacations will be starting and most of the members have to go outstation.

The Vice Chancellor said that Senate meeting is already announced and they should not change it. They did not know that the elections of Municipal Corporations are on 17th December and they also do not want to come in the way of person who would like to cast their vote. Their election is a University election. It is not a societal election. So, they have to change the dates. The Vice Chancellor suggested that they could hold the election of faculties on 20 & 21 December and the Syndicate meeting could be held on 21st evening.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the items which have to be placed before the Senate meeting of 16th December, those items could be first taken up for discussion in this Syndicate meeting.

Continuing the Vice Chancellor said that the Senate meeting is the continuation of the adjourned meeting. Only the essential items will go to the Senate meeting. They would have another sitting of the Senate sometimes in January or February to consider the items which are already listed for Senate meeting. They do not have any other option, but to hold another meeting of the Senate so that much items might not pile up. The Convocation is scheduled on 4th March, 2018 and the Chancellor will be there. So, they have to compulsorily hold the meeting of the Senate. So, the Vice Chancellor suggested that they should hold the faculty meetings on 20 & 21 December and they could hold the meeting of the Syndicate in the evening of 21st December. This was endorsed by several members.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that with this schedule, the meeting of Senate on 16th December would be held in a very comfortable manner because some of them have to make some planning for the faculty elections.

The discussion which took place on the issue of holding of the meetings of the Faculties after the lunch break has been made a part of the discussion which took place after the Vice Chancellor's statement.

When the meeting resumed after the lunch, some of the members requested that since the election to the municipalities in Punjab are scheduled to be held on 17th December, 2017, the meetings of the Faculties to be held on 17th and 18th December, 2017 be postponed to 18th and 19th December. Further, the meeting of the Syndicate to finish the remaining agenda be held on 19th December, 2017 in the evening.

This was agreed to.

**Recommendations of
the Board of Finance
dated 28.11.2017**

2. Considered following recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 28.11.2017 (Item Nos.1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18):

Item 1

That the Budget Estimates 2018-19, as per **Appendix – I & II** (Budget Estimate Part – I & II appended herewith as two separate documents) be approved. The summary of Revenue Budget is as under:

NOTE: (I) There is an uncovered deficit of Rs.1793.51 lacs relating to previous financial years. As per the directive of MHRD dated 19.06.2017, such uncovered deficit is to be met by the Govt. of Punjab, for which the University has already represented to Govt. of Punjab for release of additional grant to meet such uncovered deficit.

(ii) It includes the provision for filling up of nearly 70 teaching positions (Assistant Professors) which got vacated in the last 3-4 years on attaining the age of 65 years by the teachers and also on account of resigning from University Service as well as the provision for vacant essential Administrative Officers such as Chief of University Security Officer, Dean College Development Council, direct quota posts of Deputy Registrars and Medical Officers.

With respect to Non-Teaching Staff and Pensioners the University follows pay-scale and pension rules of Govt. of Punjab. The tentative liability for implementation of pay revision of Non-Teaching Staff & Pensioners is expected to be Rs. 21.73 crore per annum, the provision of which has not been included in the BE 2018-19 as the Govt. of Punjab is yet to notify the revised scales.

- (iii) The above estimates have been recommended by the budget estimate committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.
- (iv) University shall seek concurrence of MHRD/UGC while creating new academic/Non-academic posts or filling up of vacant post.

Item 2

That the Panjab University should implement the recommendation of 7th pay commission only after the same is notified and implemented by the Punjab Government.

- NOTE:**
- 1) In the light of various provisions of the pay revision notification of MHRD dated 2nd November, 2017, the University has calculated estimated additional liability on account of implementation of 7th CPC pay revision for teachers and other staff in UGC scale. Such estimated liability has been worked out after taking a representative case for each category, namely Professors & equivalent, Associate Professors & equivalent, Assistant Professors & equivalent. As per such calculations, the additional liability on account of the implementation of 7th CPC pay revision comes out to be Rs. 100.12 crores (i.e. Rs. 66.61 crores for payment of arrears for the period from 1.1.2016 to 31.3.2018 and Rs. 33.51 crores for payment of enhanced salary from 1.4.2018 to 31.3.2019). The calculation sheet regarding additional estimated liability for implementation of 7th CPC pay revision for teachers and other staff in UGC scale is attached as **Appendix-V (Page-25)**.
 - 2) With respect to the Non-Teaching staff and pensioners, the Panjab University follows the pay-scales and pension rules of Punjab Government respectively. Therefore, as and when the Government of Punjab would notify the revised pay scale/pension, the resultant additional provision shall be incorporated in the budget of the University for seeking enhanced contribution from respective governments.
 - 3) Earlier as a practice, the pay revision notification relating to teaching staff used to be adopted by the University after the same got notified by the Govt. of Punjab.
 - 4) That as per the latest directive MHRD dated 19.6.2017, the salary expenditure towards teaching staff (i.e. 1378 as assessed by the Manpower Audit Committee of University)

and such number of non-teaching staff as would commensurate with the prescribed norm of teaching to non-teaching staff ratio i.e., 1:1.1 is to be met out of grant released by the MHRD/ UGC.

Item 4

That the pay of Col. G.S. Chadha, Registrar be fixed at the minimum of the pay of Rs.43000+GPRs.10000/- in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000 w.e.f. the date of joining.

- NOTE:** 1) The post of Registrar in Panjab University is a tenure post, appointment on which is made (at the first instance) for a fixed period of 4 years under Regulation 1.2, 1.3 under Chapter-III of Calendar Volume-I of 2007, page 104.

In terms of the above provisions, Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) was appointed by direct selection against Advertisement No.3/2014 in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000+GP 10000/-

Before the appointment as Registrar in P.U., Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) served as an officer in Corps of EME in Indian Army and retired there from as Col. on 30.09.2014. At the time of retirement, the last pay was Rs.57950 +GP of Rs.8700. After appointment as Registrar in Panjab University, Col. Chadha (Retd.) requested to protect his last pay drawn in the Indian Army.

- 2) As per the orders of the Vice-Chancellor the present pay of Chadha has been fixed at the minimum stage of Rs.43000/- in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000 plus GP of Rs.10000 as an interim measure till a final decision is taken with respect to grant of higher start.
- 3) After due consideration, the Vice-Chancellor referred the matter to the Syndicate under Regulation 1.4 under Chapter-III of P.U. Calendar Volume-I of 2007 page 104. The relevant part of which is reproduced here below:

“The pay-scale and salary of the Registrar shall be determined by the Senate on the recommendation of the Syndicate”.

The Syndicate in its meeting dated 15.05.2016 vide Paragraph 25 to

consider for grant of higher start/appropriate advance increments to Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), Registrar on the minimum pay of Rs.43000+GP10000 in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000 +GP 10000. The Syndicate after due consideration resolved to grant higher start to Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), Registrar by granting two increments on the minimum pay of Rs.43000+GP 10000.

- 4) There have been precedents where the Syndicate had allowed advance increments to the Registrars earlier also. For example, the Syndicate at its meeting dated 31.01.2012 Para (41) **(Appendix- X) (Page-50)** has resolved that two increments be granted to Professor A.K. Bhandari on his appointment as Registrar on the analogy of Professor Paramjit Singh and Professor S.S. Bari.
- 5) With respect to the above pay fixation of the Registrar, the audit made certain observation which are placed at **(Appendix-XI) (Page 51 to 53)**.
- 6) The above issue was submitted before the BOF in its meeting dated August 1, 2016 wherein it was resolved to seek the comments of the MHRD by giving comprehensive details of the case.
- 7) In compliance to the decision of the BOF, the case was submitted to the MHRD vide letter No.3513/FDO dated 24.08.2016 and No.3563/FDO dated 31.08.2016 **(Appendix-XII) (Page 54 to 84)**.
- 8) On 31st August, 2016, the University received a letter dated 24.08.2016 from Shri R.C. Bhatt, Deputy Director (IA), University Grants Commission wherein the UGC has raised certain observations with respect to the pay of the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar, P.U., Chandigarh **(Appendix- XIII) (Page 85 to 86)**.
- 9) The University submitted point wise clarification on all observations vide letter No. 3823/FDO dated 5.9.2016 **(Appendix- XIV) (Page 87 to 93)**.

- 10) Further input was given on the above issue to MHRD/UGC vide letter No.4256/FDO dated 27.10.2016 **(Appendix- XV) (Page 94 to 113).**
- 11) On 2.11.2016, the University received a communication from UGC in reference to the reply submitted by University on 05.09.2016 as referred in Point-5 above **(Appendix- XVI) (Page 114 to 116).**
- 12) In response to the above communication of UGC, the University submitted further clarification vide No.4306/FDO dated 4.11.2016 **(Appendix- XVII) (Page 117-118).**
- 13) The Vice-Chancellor has ordered to seek the Legal Opinion on this issue from Shri Girish Agnihotri (Sr. Adv. & Legal Retainer) and Shri Anmol Rattan Sidhu (Sr. Adv. & Legal Retainer). The Legal opinion rendered by Shri Girish Agnihotri is attached as **(Appendix- XVIII) (Page 119 to 124).**
- 14) **The matter was again placed vide item No. 17 in the BOF dated 15.11.2016,** which was deferred for the time being so that MHRD/UGC may be approached to give their comments at the earliest.
- 15) The Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education, New Delhi vide letter No. F. No. 2-14/2016-U II dated 27.10.2017 has clarified that in view of reply received from the Panjab University dated 8.5.2017 that the appointment has been made as per terms of regulation 1.2 of PU Calendar Volume-I of 2007, thus appropriate decision on pay fixation of Shri G.S. Chadha, Registrar, PU may be taken strictly in accordance with rules and regulations of Panjab University Act **(Appendix – XIX) (Page 125 to 130).**
- 16) The Syndicate in its meeting dated 15.5.2016 has already recommended a higher start to Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), Registrar by granting two advance increment on minimum pay of Rs. 43000+GP10000 (Note 3 above refers).

Item 6

Noted and ratified the following Memorandum of Understanding with State Bank of India:

NOTE: 1) Regarding issue of smart Combo Cards for students, Research Scholars, faculty and staff of the University in terms of recommendation of Committee dated 06.12.2016. The MoU is placed at **(Appendix-XXIV) (Page 139 to 144).**

2) Regarding disbursement of pension through SBI, the charges for same to be paid on par with the rates prescribed by RBI for disbursal of monthly pension of State/ Central Government pensioners in terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 31.07.2016 and 17.12.2016 vide Para XXII. The MoU is placed at **(Appendix-XXV) (Page 145 to 151).**

Item 7

That:-

- (i) a sum of Rs. 5.76 lacs per annum from Financial Year 2018-2019 be sanctioned under the budget Head "Hiring of Bus Service" out of Revenue Account of PURC, Kauni to hire a bus on lease to ferry rural area students from different villages to and fro PURC, Kauni.
- (ii) a sum of Rs.100/- p.m. be charged from the students for providing transportation facility to the students.

NOTE: 1) The Director, PURC Kauni raised the issues/ concerns of the students with VC for providing transportation to the students in rural area as lot of inconvenience is being faced by them.

2) In the initial years, no fee shall be charged from rural students so as to enhance the enrollment. The position shall be reviewed after two academic sessions.

Item 9

That an allocation of Rs. 50.00 lacs be sanctioned out of the interest income of "Foundation for Higher Education & Research Fund Account" under the Head "Up-gradation of Operation Theater" in the Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science, specifically for Department of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery.

NOTE: 1) The matter was discussed for up-gradation of Operation Theater on 7.11.2017 wherein the Vice Chancellor, DUI, Principal along with Professors of Dental Institute were present.

- 2) Detailed note to substantiate the need for procurement and installation of the required infrastructure for up-gradation of Operation Theater was submitted by Dr. Hemant Batra, Professor & Head, Dental Institute after the discussions held on 7.11.2017 which is reproduced as under:

“This is to submit that at the beginning of MDS program in the Dental Institute specifically for MDS in Department of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery, it was discussed that there is essential requirement of Operation Theater along with the attachment of medical college. The post-graduation started in year 2015 and today we are in the final year.

We already had a duly sanctioned approval for using the clinical facilities at Government Medical College & Hospital Sector 32 from Chandigarh Administration vide letter number Endst. No. 3926/FII(6)/2013/3493 dated 25.4.2013. Alongside there was a hope of our own 100 bedded hospital with a fully functional Operation Theater in our own institute was not envisaged and no specific amount was marked for it. As of today the 100 bedded hospital has been shelled off and GMCH is allowing us to use there facility of Operation Theater with an embargo of three years “time given to develop Operation Theatre in the Institute”

In view of the facts mentioned above this is to request you to provide the Department of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery in the Dental institute with a suitable budget for procurement and installation of the required infrastructure. The details of the minimum basic requirement for the up-gradation of the existing set up has been attached along with. Kindly help us on urgent basis as the course is in final stages from approval authorities.”

- 3) At present, there is no specific budget earmarked to develop Operation Theater in the institute. The list of minimum basic requirements for up-gradation of the existing set up is at **Appendix –XXVI (Page-152 to 155).**

Item 11

That to purchase 3 Nos. of Multifunctional Copy Printers is amounting to Rs. 21.00 lacs (approx.) for Confidential Unit of Controller of Examination out the Development Fund 2018-2019 be sanctioned.

NOTE: A Central Purchase Committee in its meeting held on 15.9.2017 recommended the purchase of 3 multifunctional copy printers for Confidential Unit of Controller of Examination. The relevant portion of the minutes of meeting are reproduced as under:

“The committee also reviewed the requirement received from the confidential Unit of Controller of Examinations office for the purchase of copy printers and photocopier for office use. The committee also reviewed the specification enclosed along with the requisition and approved the same to be purchase for office use. Thus the store section is advised to invite quotations as per purchase rules after the budget approval”

Item 12

That an amount of Rs.23.28 crores may be allocated for the completion of the under construction Multipurpose Auditorium in South Campus, Sector-25, Panjab University, Chandigarh by transferring it to the development fund for its utilization.

(After the conclusion of the meeting, the members visited the site of Multipurpose Auditorium in South Campus, Sector-25, Panjab University, Chandigarh.)

NOTE: 1) The work of construction of multipurpose auditorium is under progress. The total estimated completion cost of this project is Rs.72.67 crore (**Appendix-XXX**) (**Page- 162 to 178**) against which the following budget provisions have already been allocated:

- a) Rs.13.16 crores out of the collections from students of P.U. Campus as well as affiliated colleges and interest thereon.
- b) Rs.20.00 crores out of University funds.
- c) Rs.12.00 crores out of grants sanctioned by the UGC/Central Government (i.e., special grant, XIIth Plan, general development assistance;

- 2) It is submitted that the University receives grant(s) from various funding agencies to carry out specific research projects/ schemes/ programmes etc. under the plan head. Prior to the year 2001-02, both accounts i.e., Non-

Plan as well as Plan were transacted through a single bank account with a corresponding one cash book. In the financial year 2001-02, a separate bank account with corresponding separate cash book was opened for Plan account. A specific amount was transferred from Non-Plan account to such newly opened separate bank account of Plan fund. In the year 2006-07, another account was opened in the Canara Bank to carry out the transactions relating to Plan grant(s) from UGC. At present, the University maintains two bank accounts to carry out the transactions of all research projects/schemes/programmes with corresponding two separate cash books, i.e., one for UGC sponsored research projects/schemes/programmes and the second one for other agencies such as DST, DBT, CSIR, etc.

- 3) The proposed allocation is being sought out of the balance available under Plan account. It is pertinent to mention that from the financial year 2016-17, the Government of India has dispensed with the system of classification of budget under Non-Plan and Plan head as the concept of Revenue and Capital Budget has been introduced.
- 4) After excluding the balances of each sponsored research project/ scheme along with accrued interest thereon up to 31.03.2017, an amount of Rs. 29.62 crores is available in the Plan account (upto 31.03.2016 the amount was Rs.23.28 crores) which is an accumulated plan account balance of Panjab University and interest thereon since the period 2001-02 onwards.
- 5) The matter was placed before the Board of Finance in its meeting held on 01.08.2017, vide Agenda Item No.17, wherein it was decided to put up this agenda item in next meeting with observation that if the University wants to utilize the available balance for the proposed projects, then firstly, the University may reflect it as receipt and then make a suitable provision under the expenditure head. It may be added that the amount shall be reflected as receipt for utilization towards the aforesaid project after the approval of the governing bodies.
- 6) The office has worked out the balance of each sponsored project and scheme as on 31st March, 2017 after crediting the due amount of interest on annual basis. The due amount of interest was worked out on the average annual

balance of the individual project/ scheme by applying the same rate of proportion which the amount of actual interest earned in a given year bears to the average annual balance of composite plan account, as explained here below:

- (i) Total interest earned during the xxx year on the overall plan balance.
- (ii) Average consolidated balances* xxx available during each year
- (iii) Interest factor per Rupee of avg. xxx balance [interest(i) divided by avg. balance (ii)]
- (iv) Interest allocated xxx [avg. balance of each project in a given year multiplied by interest factor (iii)]

***avg, consolidated bal.=Op. Balance +Cl. Balance (cash book and investments) divided by 2**, ignoring the negative balance, if any.

It may be added that earlier the Syndicate has approved to calculate and credit the interest to a specific Research Project/ Scheme with a uniform rate of interest @ of 4% (the rate which was applicable on saving bank account) on the capital/non-recurring component only. However, in view of the specific query of funding agency regarding the amount of actual interest earned on specific Research Project and Scheme, the balance of each project has been re-calculated by applying the method as above.

Item 14

Noted and ratified the decision of the Vice-Chancellor for allowing the refund of fee to Ms. Sakshi Kaushal, a student of B.A LLB at PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur during the session 2014-2015 as special case.

NOTE: 1) Ms. Sakshi Kaushal was a student of BALLB 1st year at PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur who had left the department due to unavoidable reasons and applied for refund of fees on 22.11.2014 **Appendix-XXXVII (Page-205)** as stated by her.

2) The record of SSGPURC Hoshiarpur revealed that the same was received vide No. 2482 dated 10.12.2014.

- 3) Her claim of refund was forwarded by Director SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur to ARA-II on dated 31.12.2014 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) (**Page-206**) which was rejected as the same was receipt after the due date, i.e., 30th November,2014 and same was conveyed by Director PUSGRC, Hoshiarpur to Ms. Sakshi Kaushal D/o Sanjeev Sharma **Appendix-XXXIX** (**Page 207**).
- 4) Subsequently, the candidate had filed the petition in the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court vide CWP No. 2814 of 2017 for seeking claim of refund along with interest/ costs.
- 5) The university engaged Sh. B.L. Gupta, Advocate as counsel to defend the Panjab University in the CWP No. 2814 of 2017.
- 6) The University Counsel appointed that there is an ambiguity in the University Rules as two due dates have been mentioned for receipt of application of refund i.e. 30th November & 15th December of a given year. On his advise the Vice-Chancellor allowed the refund of fee (**Appendix-XL**) (**Page 208**). The legal Counsel had also advised that the date of internal process of refund of application i.e. 15th December be deleted from Handbook of information and only one date i.e. 30th November should continue. The opinion of the counsel for University is placed at **Appendix-XLI** (**Page 209**).
- 7) The present status of CWP No. 2814 of 2017 stands **dismissed as infructuous** (**Appendix-XLII**) (**Page 210**).
- 8) The ACLA had admitted and passed the payment with the observations that the payment be got approved from Board of Finance as there is financial implication involved in case so that similar other case does not occur in future.

Item 15

Noted and ratified the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor in sanctioning the Interim Relief @ 5% of Basic Pay/ Pension allowed to the Non-Teaching employees/ pensioners w.e.f. October 1st 2017 paid in November, 2017 onwards in terms of Punjab Government Notification No. 6/1/1995-1FP1/86 dated 16.2.2017 (**Appendix-XLIII**) (**Page-211**) in anticipation of approval of Board of Finance/Syndicate/Senate. The interim relief will be treated as pay for all intents and purposes. Amount of interim relief will be absorbed in the pay revision to be allowed by the Panjab University on the recommendations of 6th pay commission set up by Govt. of Punjab.

- NOTE: 1)** The Panjab University adopts the Punjab Government recommendations/ notifications issued from time to time with regard to revision of pay scales, allowances etc. to Non-Teaching employees.
- 2)** Budget Estimate Committee in its meeting held on 29.9.2017 also recommended to allow the Interim Relief @ 5% of Basic Pay/ Pension to Non-Teaching employees/ pensioners in terms of Punjab Government Notification dated 16.2.2017.

Item 16

Noted the following correction in the Budget Head:

Existing nomenclature of Budget Head	Corrected nomenclature of Budget
Stipends for Rotatory Internship @ 9000 p.m. X 100 students and Stipend to MDS students @ Rs. 10000/- p.m. per student for 14 students.	Stipends for Rotatory Internship @ 9000 p.m. X 100 students and Stipend to MDS students @ Rs. 10000/- p.m. per student for 17 students (Ist, IInd & IIIrd year).

Item 17

The audited consolidated financial statements for the year 2016-17, be approved 'in Principle' with remarks that members may convey their observation, if any, before the finalization of the minutes.

Item 18

That the budget provision be enhanced from Rs.10000/- p.m. to Rs.15000/- p.m. under the Budget head "Honorarium to Advisor Architect" of Architect Unit w.e.f. 30.03.2017.

Additional Financial Liability : Rs 60000/- p.a.

- NOTE: 1** The Vice Chancellor as per authorization of the Syndicate in its meeting held on 31.07.2016 (Para 18) appointed three Technical Advisors i.e. one each for Civil, Electrical and Architecture at a fixed honorarium of Rs.15000/- p.m. initially for a period of one year w.e.f. date of their joining. The same were approved in meeting of Syndicate on 30.04.2017 Para 41-I(vii).
- 2)** There is adequate provision to meet the expenditure of Technical advisors appointed for Civil and Electrical. However, at present, a budgetary provision of Rs.10000/-p.m. has been earmarked for Budget head "Honorarium to Advisor Architect" of Architect Unit which needs to be enhanced from existing Rs.10000/- p.m. to Rs.15000/- p.m. to enable the office to release the honorarium of Technical Advisor

appointed for Architect Unit i.e. w.e.f. 30.03.2017.

(Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Finance dated 28.11.2017, available in the separate volume).

The Vice Chancellor said that first item of discussion is that of Board of Finance. They had to do the discussion meeting of the Board of Finance in the background of acceptance of 7th Pay Commission being announced by the Central Government. There is a gazette notification which mentions as to what would be implemented for the Central Institutions and what is to be implemented for the State Universities, if States adopt to implement them. Those States which would adopt to implement them, they could claim the arrears which are due from 1st of January, 2016 upto the 31st of March, 2018. They can claim 40% of those arrears from the Central Government and the Central Government would release them. Their State is Union Territory, Chandigarh, but to implement it, the amount for teachers and for non-teaching 1.1 times of the teachers would come from the Central Government and the remaining has to come from the State of Punjab. This is what the current arrangement is. So, as to what to ask to the Centre and the Punjab Government, they have to have some estimate, so the Board of Finance meeting considered it. They have already submitted budget estimates for 2018-19. They have to have normally a revised estimate as the year commences. But they have to revise their budget estimates. This is not the revised estimate that happens once the year starts. This is a revision of the budget estimate before the year has commenced in the wake of trying to implement it. So they have to articulate both to the Punjab Government and the Central Government as to what are their needs and requirements. The Vice Chancellor said that this is the background of this item before them.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that this item is also being looked after by the proceedings in the High Court. In the High Court also, they had said that they would require additional money and the High Court had asked both the Centre Government and the Punjab Government as to what is their take on it. Now the MHRD, during the Board of Finance meeting, opined that Panjab University can think up of implementing these things. But Panjab University effective implementation can happen only when the Punjab Government announces the acceptance of it or notifies it. So, until the Punjab Government notifies it and this has been the practice when the 6th and 5th Pay Commission happened. So, unless this notification happens, matters cannot proceed. Whatever they did in the meeting of the Finance Board on 28th of November, it was reported in the Court on 4th of December. In the 4th of December hearing, the Punjab nominees said that the Punjab Government is sympathetically considering the directive of the Central Government, which had come earlier, that the previous uncovered deficit should be taken care of by the Punjab Government and the Panjab University. The Punjab Government via the enhancement of grant and the Panjab University via the enhancement of their income. At one time, they had a deficit of Rs. 45 crores which has now come down to only Rs. 17 or 18 Crores. They are claiming Rs. 17 or 18 Crores from Punjab Government extra than what has been committed to them. The Punjab Government has said that they are considering, so they have not contested the directive of the Central

Government. The Vice Chancellor said that he had a meeting with the Chief Secretary, Punjab, yesterday. The Chief Secretary, Punjab has conveyed to him that sooner or later, the 7th Pay Commission (6th Pay Commission of Punjab) would get implemented in Punjab. When that happens and comes for implementation, then the numbers they are talking, i.e., Rs.16 or 17 Crores, is a very small number. The total requirement of Punjab is going to be very large. The Chief Secretary said, sooner or later, it would happen and the demand that they have made to Punjab for implementing the 7th Pay Commission for their non-teaching employees would be met. For teaching employees, the Centre Government is going to meet their demand. 1.1. time to the non-teaching employees, i.e. about Rs. 13.78 crores, the Centre Government is going to meet their demand. The requirement from the Central Government is from Rs. 30 to 35 crores then what they are getting now. From the Punjab Government their requirement is between Rs. 22 to 25 crores. The Chief Secretary has noted these numbers and he shared with him that the amount they are paying as a grant in aid to Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University today is about Rs. 50 crores, whereas for Panjab University, it is Rs. 25 to 30 Crores. So even if they are demanding about Rs. 27 crores, still it is the number which is less than the other two Universities. The Chief Secretary said that he has noted all these things and he will bring it to the attention of the Hon'ble Chief Minister and the Hon'ble Finance Minister of Punjab. Then the Advocate General of Punjab had stated in the Court that the Chief Minister was to take cognizance of it in a fortnight during the November hearing of the High Court. That meeting has happened and subsequent to that meeting, he had called him to meet him. Actually, three of them were supposed to meet i.e., the Vice Chancellor, Advocate General and the Chief Secretary. The Chief Secretary got sick on that day and he could not come to attend the meeting. He had one to one meeting with the Advocate General. The Advocate General gave a briefing of that meeting to the Chief Secretary and the Chief Secretary called him (Vice Chancellor) to see him yesterday. Since the Punjab Government is now fully informed of their requirement and they are alive to sustenance of Panjab University. The Vice Chancellor said that the yesterday's meeting was called at the initiative of the Chief Secretary. He had not asked for this meeting as quickly as it happened yesterday. In between, the Hon'ble Governor, Punjab and Administrator U.T., Shri V.P. Badnore ji had called him again and gave him one week's time to contact the Chief Secretaries of both Punjab and Haryana. He (Vice Chancellor) did not know the authority he (Hon'ble Governor, Punjab) had been talking to. The Punjab Chief Secretary had a meeting with him yesterday. He had sought a meeting with the Haryana Chief Secretary and the Haryana Chief Secretary told him (Vice Chancellor) to see him in the next week. So, things are moving. He has just learnt today that the Hon'ble Home Minister would be in Chandigarh sometime in the 2nd half of this month. Everything was articulated by the Hon'ble Governor to the Hon'ble Home Minister during the Inter-State Council meeting in Chandigarh. The Home Ministry is intimately involved now because any changes in response to a request of Haryana that they want to get their colleges affiliated, that move has to be viewed by the Government.

When Shri Varinder Singh intervened to say something to which the Vice Chancellor requested him to finish his version and further added that he has not said that he will not listen to him.

Shri Varinder Singh said that such things are not right. They have no hope that the Punjab Government would give something. Though he has met Shri Manpreet Singh, Finance Minister, Punjab, but Shri Manpreet Singh has not fulfilled any of the announcements which he has made so far. The other question about which the Vice Chancellor is talking about is regarding affiliation to Haryana Colleges. He said that they are totally against it because the decision which was taken in 1966, that cannot be retracted.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that whatever Shri Varinder Singh has said, it is a very sensitive issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that was he not entitled even to convey the information to them?

Shri Varinder Singh said that he (Vice Chancellor) also has the view of the members about it. Why he is involving the Haryana Chief Secretary in it. First they should discuss the matter in the Syndicate and Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is the Chief Executive of this University, having certain responsibilities and duties and he is doing that. He had been keeping all of them fully informed. They have their own forums to articulate whatever they wish to do it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if he had asked the Supreme body, they can express their views there also.

The Vice Chancellor said when he has asked them not to express their views.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that he (Vice Chancellor) has said that they can discuss it at other forums, so this is the forum to which the Vice Chancellor said that this is also their forum.

When Shri Varinder Singh wanted to say something, the Vice Chancellor requested to let him finish his version and after that he could say whatever he wanted to say.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that the Governor, Punjab and the Administrator U.T. asked him to meet the Chief Secretaries of both Punjab and Haryana. The matter is in the Court. They have not gone to the Court. The Court is on its own Vs the Panjab University and there are certain directives from the Court and those directives are being followed. Haryana has become a party to the case on its own and certain directions have been given by the Court to the Haryana. As a part of those directions, certain directions were given to the Central Government and the Counsel of the Central Government was asked to contact the Home Ministry. Home Ministry asked for a factual notification when was Haryana Colleges were disaffiliated. What were the administrative steps that happened when the Haryana Colleges were disaffiliated and what did the Home Ministry do to ratify those things. So factual information was asked for via an official communication and the factual information has been sent to the Home Ministry, namely, that Haryana first issued a notification disaffiliating its colleges, notifying their intent to disaffiliate the colleges of Haryana from Panjab University from the next academic year. Whenever they did it because they could not do it instantaneously. Whatever was to happen, it was to happen from

the next academic year. It happened in the year 1973. Then the Home Ministry brought out a gazette notification in response to Haryana having expressed their intent. The Home Ministry wanted precise information on this. Whatever was available in the University files, they have just sent it to them. Though they can argue them that this information should be available with them, but they sent it. But the Government of India asked for this factual information, it was their duty to part with that information and they just sent it as a factual information. In the background, that since the Governor of Punjab and Administrator U.T. has taken initiative to articulate the financial concerns of Panjab University to the Chancellor and Chancellor has convened a meeting whose background has been transmitted to all of them. Whatever is happening is in the background of all these developments. He has been giving them an account of all the meeting held in this regard and nothing has been concealed from the Syndicate and the Senate. He is just merely doing his duty. If the Hon'ble Governor and the Administrator, U.T. asks him to meet the Secretaries of Punjab and Haryana and make them aware of all these things first hand, it is a directive to him and he as a Vice Chancellor he is duty bound to try to do it. If they give him a direction, he did not know whether it is a right thing to say that for every small day-to-day thing, he should go to the members.

Shri Varinder Singh that he (Vice Chancellor) should at least inform as to how many members are in favour of this and how many are against it. But they are totally against it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that this is a very sensitive issue and thus discussion should be held on this issue. He further said that he (Vice Chancellor) is just informing them and giving his own response, but there should be thorough discussion in the Syndicate and Senate. Whatever Shri Varinder Singh has said is right. He said that the Vice Chancellor is just going on holding talks. Without taking the only money aspect into consideration, he thinks that this is a very sensitive issue and they should discuss thoroughly.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he (Vice-Chancellor) cannot represent the University. He should first take into confidence the Senate and see how many members support him on this issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has told the Chief Secretary, Punjab, merely the amount that they need for the implementation of the 7th Pay Commission and he has not told anything more to the Punjab Government.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that their main concern is related to affiliation of Haryana colleges.

Shri Varinder Singh said that Haryana has a political motive, perhaps all of them would understand it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is a fundamental issue and discussion should be held on this. Bring this as an agenda item. Already there is water dispute and regarding claim on Chandigarh between the two States, now they would start another dispute.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the case which was listed for 4th December, he read a report in the newspaper on 5th December where

it was said to take the comments of from the Punjab Government regarding this. He further said that they should not think it like this that it has been handed over to Punjab Government. The Court has said to take comments from the Punjab Government.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has talked to the Chief Secretary, Punjab only on some financial issues. Mr. Satya Pal Jain who has represented the Central Government said that the Court directive is that comments from the Punjab Government be sought.

Shri Varinder Singh said that Satya Pal Jain and BJP has their own RSS agenda, but they do not accept it. He said first the discussion should be got held in the Syndicate and then in the Senate. First clear the position of Punjab Government and then he should represent the University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the autonomy and stand of the University should be there. The whole issue should be first considered. How the Court can impress upon them to do something? They have also to see whether they have to accept the decision or not or what is their vision. He stated that Dr. Amar Singh who is the Advisor of Punjab Government, has said openly not to do this. He said, what he means to say is that they should not do everything just for money and the other larger issue of harmony is being eroded by bringing in politics. If they would do it, they would be called guilty in the times to come.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is already a water dispute between the two States and now another dispute would start.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the University is a party in this matter and after the lapse of 40 years, they are starting a new thing and not taking in to consideration either the Syndicate or the Senate. He (Vice Chancellor) is just informing them. But it should become an issue and should be discussed and clinched, as to what is their opinion and their stand on the issue and what the Senate and Syndicate says on the issue.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it is his own suggestion that if it is decided at the official level to allow affiliation to the Haryana colleges, and after that if this issue is dropped in the Syndicate and Senate, it would then be a humiliation for the Vice Chancellor. Therefore, he suggested that first they should take the Syndicate and Senate into confidence. They should consider this issue. In case they would get some benefit out of it, then it could be discussed in the Syndicate and Senate.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that in the democratic functioning, discussion should be there and the merits and demerits should be discussed which was also supported by Shri Shaminder Singh. Sandhu.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that when they do not have any proposal, (so) they cannot discuss it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they have proposal as they daily read in the newspapers and now they have reached in the advance stage of discussion with the Haryana Government.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it is premature to discuss they receive comments of the Punjab Government.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma means to say that until they talk to the Punjab Government and also discuss this matter in the Syndicate and Senate, it is not useful. They should not take such a decision from where it might become impossible for them to come back. This was also supported by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma.

The Vice Chancellor said that when it comes to territorial jurisdiction, all this comes under the purview of Home Ministry and done by the Home Ministry only. They do not do this. When some college of Pondicherry University had asked for permission from them, they were okay with it, but the Home Ministry did not allow it. Earlier, Pondicherry and Andaman and Nicobar colleges were affiliated with their University. They would like to be affiliated with their University again, but last year, the Home Ministry did not allow it. Their request was to the Panjab University, but the Home Ministry said no to it. The Ministry said that the said college would be attached to Pondicherry University. So, as per the Punjab Reorganization Act, the right of territorial jurisdiction of Panjab University, rests with the Home Ministry. The Home Ministry asked from him (Vice Chancellor), again he is just telling them the factual position, and he has done nothing in it. When it happened, he has merely informed them of the steps. Now it is the Home Ministry which is seeking the opinion of the Punjab Government to articulate the measures. The Panjab University is a Body Corporate and the rights to change the Panjab University Act are with the Home Ministry. So, he has no role in it as an individual or occupying this office, other than merely following the direction given to him.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked as to who mooted this idea of affiliation of Haryana Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that there was a PIL kind of a thing in the Court which was not filed by any individual. It was public Interest Litigation kind of an entity whose originator was the Court on its own. So it is a *suo moto* action and in that *suo moto* thing, Haryana has become a party. He cannot ask Haryana or someone why he was become a party. PUTA has become a party, so many other individual have become party. PUTA is not a party as an Association, but some of the teachers are a party to articulate the things on behalf of teachers, which also includes the P.U. Teachers Association. So, anybody can become a party to it. The Vice Chancellor said that they can also become a party. They may say that someone is a member of the Senate since a long time and associated with the governance of the Panjab University and that he would like to articulate his concerns. They are entitled to become a party to the Public Interest Litigation i.e. already on. The next hearing is on 15th of January, 2018. Justice Mittal said in the Court that the next hearing would be held on 15th January, 2018. But the Vice Chancellor said that he has not seen the order uploaded as yet. There may be a minor change in the date, but in the middle of January, the next date will get notified and they can become a party to that as an individual or if the Syndicate decides to become a party as current members of Syndicate of 2017, they can also become a party.

Principal I.S. Sandhu enquired whether an Assistant Professor or Associate Professor or any other teacher could become a party to the PIL without the knowledge of PUTA as they are talking about routing the applications through proper channel.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the teachers became party in the PIL because they were not getting the salary.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if a decision could affect the interest of someone, he/she could become a party to the case.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the teachers belonging to the State of Haryana would go to the Court on their own interest. But they could not ignore those circumstances and the right of Punjab over Chandigarh. Similarly, a teacher belonging to Manipur could also ask to attach the Colleges of Manipur with Panjab University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the opinion of the Syndicate and Senate should be taken on this issue as after all they are the stakeholders in the University.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired whether the Haryana Government had given its consent.

The Vice-Chancellor instructed the Registrar to scan and circulate to all the members of Senate all the papers which have been filed by the Haryana Government in the Court. Whatever information they have, that could be shared with the members. The documents which have been submitted by the University in the Court ever since Haryana got into the PIL be also provided to the members. Whatever information had been given to the Chancellor, the same had also been shared with the Haryana Government. The minutes of the meeting which had been held had also been shared with the members. Whatever reply had been submitted in response to DO letter on the statement of Shri Satya Pal Jain would also be made available.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that Shri Satya Pal Jain is an Advocate and makes submissions in the Court. Everyone has his own opinion on the issues of the University. They should not accuse someone that it is an agenda of BJP or RSS. Otherwise it would lead to unnecessary accusations. It is an issue of the University about which a Court case is going on and the people are putting forward their viewpoints. It is not a political issue. It is just like making a mountain out of a molehill.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that whatever Shri Satya Pal Jain had submitted in the Court was not against the interests of the University.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if all this was being done on the directions of the Ministry of Home Affairs, then it could be said that it was the agenda of the Government.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the concern of the University is that it should get money and that is the reason why the Court wanted to attach Haryana with Panjab University. If for money considerations they take a decision which could become an issue, they should not do it. For money considerations, they should not

lose their autonomy. He appealed that before moving ahead in the matter, they should take the Syndicate and the Senate into confidence.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was sharing everything with the members.

Shri Varinder Singh said that instead of sharing, the Vice-Chancellor should take the opinion of the members. It would not be of any use sharing the information after taking all the decisions.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the matter should be deliberated in the Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the item could be placed in the next meeting.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they should be provided the documents and they could discuss the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all the documents would be given to the Syndicate members and it would be an item for consideration to evaluate whatever has happened till now.

This was agreed to.

While referring to **sub-item 2**, point 3, Dr. Dalip Kumar said that this decision was applicable for the non-teaching staff but not for the teaching staff.

The Vice-Chancellor said that funding agency, namely the Central Government said that it could not be implemented until the Punjab Government notifies it and would not release the money. The representative of the Punjab Government in the Board of Finance also said that until it is notified by them, it had not been implemented. The precedence is that when the recommendations of the 6th Pay Commission were implemented, at that time the grant to the University were not coming through UGC and Ministry of Human Resource Development but through the U.T. Administration. The U.T. also did not implement until it was implemented by the Punjab Government. The U.T. representative, the Special Secretary, Finance also said that they would not implement it until the notification is issued by the Punjab Government. So, it is not within their (Syndicate) purview to implement the recommendations. They had written to the Centre that since it had committed to pay the salaries of the teachers and for non-teaching staff by 1.1 times of the teachers, if the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission are being implemented for all the Central Universities, central funded institutions, the same should also be implemented for Panjab University and they need Rs.100 crore till 31st March, 2018 from the Centre. The Centre had not denied that they would not release Rs.100 crore but merely said that this would be considered only when Punjab Government notifies its acceptance for Punjab. Similarly, the UT has also said that the recommendations would not be implemented until the Punjab Government notifies.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there is a worry that the Punjab Government would not notify it due to financial crunch due to which the teachers would be the sufferers.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it has never been a case that the Punjab Government did not implement the pay commissions' recommendation but it could be that the same might have been implemented after 6 months or so.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that earlier the Central Government used to bear 80% of the burden on pay revision and 20% was to be borne by the State Government whereas in the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission, the burden is to be equally shared by the Central Government and the State Government.

When Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal wanted to discuss **sub-item 4**, the Registrar abstained from the meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor while concluding the discussion earlier going on said that it was the duty of the University to articulate its needs in the background of certain notifications given by the Central Government. For the University, the State is either the Central Government or the Punjab Government though they are located in the U.T. Chandigarh. The University had made its needs known to both the funding parties from where they receive the grant. As a consequence of it whatever had happened, he had shared the same with the members. Whatever more information he would get as the time progressed, he would share the same.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they could again approach the Central Government as to why the notification of Punjab Government was being made mandatory.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they could convey the sentiments of the Syndicate and there should be some autonomy for the teaching staff.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they did not have the money and from where they could pay the revised pay scales.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they could again request the Central Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are an inter-state body corporate and as a part of that till both the parties did not agree, one party could not take a decision unilaterally. India functions in a certain way. In that functioning if a matter had to be talked between the Centre and the State, unless the dialogue reached a concluding stage, what the University could do.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the U.T. Administration followed the Punjab Government and that was why there was a dispute going on the issue of payment of Rs.15,600/- to the teachers.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the 6th Pay Commission recommendations were implemented in the University before the implementation by the Punjab Government. It should be got checked.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Punjab might pay late but the Centre was asking for notification.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier, the pay scales of 6th Pay Commission must have been implemented in Panjab University after the notification by Punjab Government and the same were implemented in the Punjab Government sometime later on.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma clarified that the Punjab Government implemented the new pay scales after one year of the notification.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he clearly remembered that the Punjab Government had paid the salary of September 2009 with the revised pay scales in most of the Colleges and in rest of the Colleges, it was paid in November, 2009. The revised pay scales were implemented even before the same being implemented in Chandigarh.

After this, while speaking on **sub-item 4**, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the pay scale and the salary of the Registrar had to be determined by the Senate on the recommendation of the Syndicate. When the Syndicate had granted the increments and the same had been approved by the Senate, then, according to him, there was no need to place the matter before the Board of Finance which meant that the Syndicate had no power. He pointed out that the increments had been granted to the Registrars earlier also as in the case of Dr. S.S. Bari and others. He suggested that they should stick to the decision of the Syndicate and should not take everything to the Board of Finance which would create problems.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that since they have also granted the increments to the Principals of the Constituent Colleges, he requested that it should also be taken up.

The Vice-Chancellor said that matter had gone to the Board of Finance which had forced the matter to be referred to the UGC. Now something which had started from there, it was the opinion of the Finance and Development Officer that if the matter was not placed before the Board of Finance, it could again be objected by the RAO. In order to overcome all these difficulties, the matter had gone to those from where it started. When the matter was there, the representatives of the U.T. Chandigarh and Punjab did not permit this who said that if two increments had been granted at the time of approving the appointment, then it was okay. But they would not support it if it was done later. If the Board of Finance did not support, again the matter went to Ministry of Human Resource Development and so on. What did they achieve? The person concerned is already in the last year of his contract and his job as per the present conditions terminates on 30.09.2018. For the last two years, no increment had been given. So, how to move forward? Few increments here and there are not of concern to him. If the person wanted to apply for a job somewhere else, his salary is still disputed.

Some of the members said that it should be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the matter was discussed in the Board of Finance. When there was an audit objection, the matter was taken to the Board of Finance and the matter was referred to the UGC and Ministry of Human Resource Development. Only one comment had been received from the MHRD which was that

the action may be taken as per the rules and regulations of the University. What are those rules and regulations of the University? When they talk about the Act of the University, the Senate is the supreme body. As far as awarding increments to any employee is concerned, particularly class 'A' employees, that is also the prerogative of the Senate on the recommendation of the Syndicate. It is specifically written as far as Registrar is concerned. Similarly, they have to bother about that and talk to the people concerned. Even in the case of the Principals of the Constituent Colleges, they took the decision regarding increment at the time approval of the employment and they had approved the grant of one increment. It was written in the appointment letter also but still the RAO is not allowing that. So, if these kinds of things where the governing bodies are competent are not being implemented, they need to reply properly even in this case also because the MHRD says that they have to do it as per rules and regulations. They should talk specifically about what the rules allow the governing bodies to take this kind of decision and bring this as an item. As far as fixation of pay at Rs.43,000/- + Grade Pay of Rs.10,000/- is concerned, that is okay. They go ahead with that. But as far as this particular part is concerned, whatever are the functions and powers of the governing bodies, those are being diluted and they must take it up. Particular, this is not just in the case of the Registrar. Earlier, they had been doing it but nobody questioned that. He did not know as to why these kind of things are being questioned. Whatever objection in the case of Registrar that it should have been at the time of appointment, they had done so in the case of the Principals of the Constituent Colleges and that also was not being implemented.

The Vice-Chancellor said that on the day of the meeting, the Special Secretary, Finance who is also the head of the Local Audit Department, was present and sided with the Punjab Government and did not approve this. So, taking up the Registrar's case with the Local Audit office would not help. In the case of the others (Principals of the Constituent Colleges), they should take up it with the Special Secretary, Finance where they have some hope of succeeding. But going back to the Special Secretary, Finance in this case (Registrar's), it would be just like breaking their head against the wall and there is no prolonging the agony of an individual.

The members said that they approve the fixation of pay.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the Government was talking about rules and regulations, according to him, they should again prepare a case as far as rules and regulations are concerned.

The Vice-Chancellor said, 'fine', he was willing to take it up with the Special Secretary, Finance the case of the Principals of the Constituent Colleges.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the case of grant of two increments to the Registrar should be taken brought stating properly the rules and regulations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was not in favour of prolonging the agony of that person.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have approved one part. He was talking about the other part. Agony is one thing.

Otherwise, the authority, which the governing bodies had, would diminish.

Dr. Dalip Kumar supported the viewpoints expressed by Professor Navdeep Goyal otherwise the what is the role of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the members wanted to bring a resolution in this regard, he would put up the same to the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should take up the matter again.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whosoever wanted to take up the matter again, he/she should give a valid resolution, the same would be put up to the Syndicate.

While referring to **sub-item 7**, Shri Jarnail Singh enquired whether the charges of Rs.100/- p.m. to be charged from the students would be sufficient.

The Vice-Chancellor said that earlier there was a proposal to provide free bus service. However, it was fixed at Rs.100/-.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 28.11.2017 (Item Nos.1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18), be endorsed to the Senate for approval.

Item No.C-3 and C-4 were taken up together for consideration.

Conferment of designation of Honorary Professor on Dr. Deepak Manmohan Singh

3. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Dr. Deepak Manmohan Singh, Senior Fellow, Punjabi University Patiala:

NOTE: 1. Section-18 of Panjab University Act appearing at page 8 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, reproduced below:

18. Honorary Professor: In addition to the whole-time paid teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and of the Syndicate confer on any distinguished teacher who has rendered eminent services to the clause of education, the designation of Honorary Professor of the Panjab University who in such capacity will be expected to deliver a few lectures every year to the post-graduate classes.

2. Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Deepak Manmohan Singh is enclosed **(Appendix-I)**.

Conferment of designation of Honorary Professor on Dr. Ashok Utreja's

4. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Dr. Ashok Utreja, in the Department of Orthodontics, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

NOTE: 1. The Committee dated 10.11.2017 **(Appendix-II)** of Professors of Dental Institute has recommended that the request of Dr. Ashok Utreja for appointment as Honorary Professor in the Department of Orthodontics be considered favourably by the University.

2. Section-18 of Panjab University Act appearing at page 8 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, reproduced below:

18. Honorary Professor: In addition to the whole-time paid teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and of the Syndicate confer on any distinguished teacher who has rendered eminent services to the cause of education, the designation of Honorary Professor of the Panjab University who in such capacity will be expected to deliver a few lectures every year to the post-graduate classes.

3. Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Ashok Utreja duly forwarded by Dean Medical Faculty vide letter dated 09.10.2017 is enclosed **(Appendix-II)**.

Principal N.R. Sharma said as far as he knows, the position of Honorary Professor is a very hon'ble position. The precedent is that the case for an Honorary Professor should come through a committee with its recommendation. After having a look on his (Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh), CV, he could say that he has no research work which should be there in the CV of an academician. While referring to his CV, he said that at page 14 of the agenda papers, under the title 'Publications/Books' it has been written that 'Member of Editorial Board of 'International Journal of Punjabi Literature, and it is also written 'Contributed Forwards' to more than a Dozen Books of Language, Literature and Culture. If it goes to the public, he thinks that there is already quite a bit of controversy. If an Honorary Professor is appointed like this, it would create more controversy. He, therefore, suggested that they should once think over it before taking some decision as there is neither any major research work done by him nor he is a member of NIPA or

UGC Committee. There should be something at least in the name of text book or something like that for such Professors. They are making him Honorary Professor. He added that Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh is also hon'ble for him. So they should see to it properly so that any controversy may not arise out of it.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that perhaps Principal N.R. Sharma did not know that Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh had been associated with this University throughout his life as Lecturer, Reader and Professor.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that he was an occupant of one of the Chairs also.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh has been the Chairman of World Punjabi Centre for seven years. He has written many books a list of which is attached here.

Continuing, Shri Jarnail Singh stated that it is very surprising to level an allegation on Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh that he did not have research. He asked, who does not know him in Punjab?

The Vice Chancellor said that that he has been former Chairman and Professor, Sheikh Baba Farid Chair of Medieval Indian Literature (School of Punjabi Studies), P.U., Chandigarh.

Principal B.C. Josan said that he has been a very important person in the University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if they are giving honour to someone and if that honour converts into a controversy, it is very unfortunate. From the reaction which they are looking on this issue, it seems that they are doing it in a hurry because the stakeholders in the Punjabi Department have given in writing to him that this should not be done. To his mind, as and when they have to give some such award, there should be a Committee to assess the work of that person. But in this case, without passing through any channel, just on his own application, if they give the Honorary Professorship, it would set a very wrong precedent. Further, in the case of Dr. Utreja, who has retired as Professor from PGI, they have sought the feedback from all quarters i.e. from the Dean, Head of Department or from other Professors. But, in the case of Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh, if they do like this, it would not strengthen the credibility of the University. It would look that they are doing something without giving any proper thought to it. If the issue had to go to the Senate, they could think that the issue would be discussed there. But now, since the issue is not going to the Senate, it is the responsibility of the Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor on this issue and after that it would go to the Chancellor. If a new issue remains there till the approval of the Chancellor, this would not be good for the University. So, he requested that the consideration on the item be deferred and the same procedure be adopted as been done in the other cases like that of Emeritus Professors etc. If the staff members of the department are hostile, he should send his CV for evaluation to former Vice Chancellor such as Professor J.S. Puar, Prof. S.P. Singh or some other eminent Professors in Punjabi. In this way everything

would get right, otherwise it would not be a well thought and they have listen very much on this issue which would not be a right thing.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that he has no objection if there is some major or minor project, but, . that should be mentioned in a proper way.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he is not being appointed as Professor, but, it is only Honorary Professor.

Shri Varinder Singh said that Syndicate a bigger than all Committees and they should hold voting of the Syndicate members on the issue.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said there is no need of voting, they should get the CVs evaluated.

Dr. Dalip Kumar while referring to page No. 15 of the agenda papers said that it has been mentioned that he has supervised 30 Ph.D. and 50 M.Phil students.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said he has written in his CV that he has published stories and articles in well recognized Journals. Though he has not given the details, but all of them know that he has been a prominent person.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they should not hold unnecessary discussion on this issue as it would be an injustice to the person. He suggested that it should be accepted as he has offered his service to the University. This was also supported by some members.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that this is a very important issue and thus there should be discussion on it. There is no question of 'yes' or no'. It would set a wrong precedent for the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would respond to the opinion expressed by Dr. Rabinder Nath ji as to why he has not sought the opinion of any department or Committee he has served as Professor of this University, he has also served on a Chair of this University at a time when named Chairs were not given to the senior-most persons. The fact that somebody was a Professor of this University, served at an honorable Chair of University and after that he has left the University, now he has sought a position just to come and occasionally teach. He (Vice Chancellor) has not been considering him for the Emeritus Professor and not recommending him for consideration of Emeritus Professor, typically, when it comes to an Emeritus Professorship, he seeks opinion from outsiders and very senior committees on behalf of the University. This is the case when the person is just asking for an association with the University to occasionally come and teach. He offers to teach in a variety of departments and they could offer him to give lectures in the course that they have started on behalf of Chair for Guru Nanak Sikh Studies . They can offer him to teach in the department of Punjabi if the Department of Punjabi wants to let him teach. They cannot force him . If the Punjabi Department does not want him to teach the M.A. students. At present, the Punjabi Department has some composition and this composition may change tomorrow. Today there may be an opinion saying that he does not have the academic capability, it may

be due to any reasons. But he is not willing to accept that he has no academic capability. If he says that current Professors are going to decide whether somebody who has served as a Professor of this University, who has served on a Chair of this University, who has served on so many other positions, to whom the sister University has given a honourable position for so many years, suddenly, how he can say that the person does not have the academic capability. So, he brought this item only on this premise that his academic credentials are not to be questioned. All that he is seeking is the Honorary Professorship which amounts to his wanting to come and interact with the young people. They should not go into whatever his scholarship is, if the students want to learn, it is okay. At the moment a request has come to him from a former Professor of the University and that former Professor of the University just want to get an honorary Professorship and he has been seeking honorary Professorship only because he has left the University. If a retired teacher of the University would like to be continue to be a retired teacher of the University, then they just felt that all the retired teachers of the University will be provided a place to stay and the retired teachers of the University after the age of 65 years, may continue to participate in the academic activities. There was no such case where a Chair Professor of the University has sought an opportunity to come and interact with the students. This is the background because of which he did not refer the matter to any departmental committee. He has not sought the validation of his academic credentials. He was former Chairperson and Professor, Sheikh Baba Farid Chair of Medieval Indian Literature (School of Punjabi Studies), Panjab University, Chandigarh. He has been there in the Punjabi University on a very respectable position. So, he, felt that there is no question of questioning the academic credential. He does not have any precedent of this and that is why he has put it to the Syndicate. Whatever their wisdom, if the proposal put before them is not of merit, it is alright.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked if they have to pay him any salary or honorarium.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not to be paid anything. On being asked by some members whether he would be paid travel expenses, the Vice Chancellor further said that he is not to be paid travel expenses and no accommodation would be provided to him.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if they are not to pay anything to him, then there should not be any objection.

Many of the members were of the opinion that they should approve the item.

Shri Varinder Singh said that when they have not to pay anything, there should not be any problem it it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the issue is whether all the retired Professors of Panjab University, after some time claim that they should be given Honorary Professorship.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he (Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh) has been in the Senate for 32 years and has a good experience.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not attach it with Senate as the Honorary Professorship is not given for being a member of the Syndicate or the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor read out following Section 18 of Panjab University Act appearing at page 8 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-1, 2007:

“Honorary Professor: In addition to the whole-time paid teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice Chancellor and of the Syndicate confer on any distinguished teacher who has rendered eminent services to the clause of education, the designation of Honorary Professor of the Panjab University who in such capacity will be expected to deliver a few lectures every year to the post-graduate classes”.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was not having any precedent to send it departmental Committee to verify his academic credentials. He clarified, why there is difference between Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh and Dr. Ashok Utreja. Dr. Utreja did not served as Professor in Panjab University. He served in P.G.I.. That is the reason he referred the CV of Dr. Utreja to a Committee for evaluation. He has given his rationale and it is upto them to accept or not to accept this rationale.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he had been his student and did his M.Phil and Ph.D. under him and he has all respects for him. They have received two cases for Honorary Professorship, one is received through the Committee and the other is received directly. He opined if the same channel would have adopted for this case also, and it would have been better. If it was not possible to bring this case through the Punjabi Department, it could be brought after evaluation through the Department of Evening Studies. He further said that they have all respects for Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh. But if such a controversy goes on for 2-3 months, it would be embarrassing for him (Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh) also. A proper thought could be given to it and this case could be brought later on. His only concern is that there should not arise any controversy.

Shri Varinder Singh said that Syndicate is the senior body and since there is no controversy, this should be approved.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he had given an application to the Punjabi Department to become guide for Ph.D., no action was taken on that application. Then the Vice Chancellor constituted a Committee and got the work done. They say that no teacher from the colleges could become a supervisor for Ph.D. Only there are two three person who have been allowed by the Vice Chancellor. Specially, the Punjabi Department teachers do not allow any of the college teachers to become Ph.D. guide whereas the same is allowed by all the other departments, except the Punjabi Department and UBS. He further said that all the persons working in that department have been got appointed by Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh and today they are opposing him. They were saved by Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh. S. Beant Singh Former Chief Minister of Punjab had asked to pick up all those persons who are today speaking against him.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said it is better if they do not indulge in this discussion as there is enough to say in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not discuss all this about the persons who are not sitting here. Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that as of now he has explained the reasons for not referring this case to the Academic Committee of Department of Punjabi and referring the case of Dr. Utreja. He had given his reasons and has nothing more to add. He said that they should keep the discussion focused to facts before them instead of indulging in personal accusations of one kind or the other which is not good.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the Syndicate members have different disciplines and they did not know what is happening. As far as Dr. Utreja is concerned, he is a person of international repute, there are no two opinions about him, they have got his CV evaluated,. He is a very eminent person. If the same thing would have been done in the case of Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh also, there would not have been any controversy. Those persons who have been his students, they have given in writing against it. So, he requested that they should not do this and get his research work etc assessed from a Committee as is being done in other so many cases.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they should approve it by having voting done on the issue.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said then it should have been got done earlier and there was no need of discussion.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) has very well explained as to why he has not sent the CV of Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh for evaluation. Once the issue has been placed before the Syndicate and after discussion, it would be very bad to defer it as it would create more problems. So, he requested that it should be approved.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could be deferred only if the Syndicate wants so to which several members said they do not say to defer it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that though many of the colleagues are in favour of approving it, but his stand is still the same. Now it is being said not to put this issue in controversy as he is a big person. They should have brought this case here after completing the whole process. This controversy would not have been there, had this case been brought through that process. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma wanted to know if they have brought any case in this way in the last five years

The Vice Chancellor said that he has explained to them the circumstances why he did not go in this process.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said now it has been approved.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said it is not fair as they he has brought this issue without thought. He requested that his dissent be recorded.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would not send it to the Chancellor without full minutes of the discussion. The Chancellor would receive the input as the full minutes of what the deliberations are, when the recommendations would go. The Chancellor may or may not recommend it. He cited a case of a very eminent Scientist, a former President of National Academy of Sciences for Honorary Professorship was not approved by Mohd. Hamid Ansari, the then Chancellor although it was approved by the Syndicate unanimously. So, the Chancellor of this University evaluates all those things that go to him. The Chancellor does not do things just because he has forwarded it. The entire discussion goes along with the case and let the Chancellor take a call on it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said his views be written and his dissent be also be recorded. He further said, if they ask me, he is ready to register his walk out.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has noted two dissents and asked if there is any more to which the members said, 'no'.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that this must be noted that he (Professor Deepak Manmohan Singh) has supervised 30 Ph.Ds and 50 M.Phil students.

The draft of all these deliberations will be sent to the Chancellor after they approve the draft.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma enquired whether he would be given emoluments or house etc. to which it was told by the members that he will not be given any such thing.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) it be recommended to the Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Dr. Deepak Manmohan Singh, Senior Fellow, Punjabi University, Patiala.

Principal N.R. Sharma and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma recorded their dissent.

- (2) it be recommended to the Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Dr. Ashok Utreja, in the Department of Orthodontics, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Extension of Dr. Bhupinder Singh, Associate Professor (temporary), in Department of Indian Theatre, P.U

5. Considered if, the term of appointment of Dr. Bhupinder Singh, Associate Professor (temporary), Department of Indian theatre, P.U., be extended further.

NOTE: 1. The Senate in its meeting held on 05.12.2015 (Para XLII) (**Appendix-III**) has approved the recommendations of Syndicate dated 22.11.2015 that Dr. Bhupinder Singh, be

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

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.11.2016 (Para 41) (**Appendix-III**), has resolved that Dr. Bhupinder Singh, Assistant Professor, USOL, be allowed to continue as Associate Professor (temporary) in the Department of Indian Theatre for one more year. A copy of letter No.12816/Estt. I dated 29.11.2016 is enclosed (**Appendix-III**).
3. Dr. Bhupinder Singh vide application dated 28.09.2017 (**Appendix-III**) requested for confirmation of his post in the Department of Indian Theatre. The request was placed before the JAAC dated 03.11.2017. A copy of minutes of the JAAC is enclosed (**Appendix-III**).
4. The Chairperson, Department of Indian Theatre vide letter dated 15.11.2017 (**Appendix-III**) has made certain recommendations with regard to the appointment of Dr. Bhupinder Singh and the Vice-Chancellor has observed as under:

“Let the matter be referred to Syndicate, which had extended his appointment, after one year of approval of his movement from USOL to Department of Indian Theatre, to meet the shortage of faculty in the Department of Indian Theatre and use of the talent of Dr. Bhupinder Singh as a well known theatre person.

The arrangement has not resulted in desired input for the University. Let the matter be referred to Syndicate. Till then, let the status remain as such.

- 5.. Accordingly, the Chairperson, Department of Indian Theatre, has been informed that the status of appointment of Dr. Bhupinder Singh shall remain as such till the approval of the Syndicate vide letter No.7689-98/Estt. I dated 21.11.2017 **(Appendix-III)**.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Bhupinder Singh, was a very senior teacher in the University's college system. He has a name in his field when he applied for a position in the University. Normally people do not apply at that senior age to shift from a college to a University. He was at a higher position, he applied for a very lower position, they had difficulty even protecting his salary, but he is a renowned play writer. They had shortage of faculty as they commenced the centenary of Prof. Balwant Gargi Ji. So he took him the initiative to shift him from the USOL for this event for a period of one year. At the end of one year, commemoration of centenary was still underway and he brought the matter to the Syndicate. The Syndicate exercised its judgement and allowed him to continue for the second year. Now it is the end of second year, the department has only, at the moment, one regular faculty member, rest of the people i.e., Shweta Mahindra are reemployed. So, there is no person in the Department. So, there is one person i.e. Dr. Bhupinder Singh transferred from other department and another one person. Now somehow there is some unease between a regular faculty member and a person who is sent there. So there were some issue. In the background of this, he has received that he should not be continued. But, he is not the appointing authority. All this happened when the second year was about to end So he wrote that the Syndicate should take a call on it. Now the Chairperson of the Department took the initiative to relieve him. He requested her to take back his relieving and let the matter be decided by the Syndicate and until the Syndicate takes a call on it, till then the status quo be maintained. This is the end of the 2nd Semester as some of the work relating to examinations is to be done and there is already shortage of teachers, so let it be continued till the end of the 2nd semester. In that background he asked to maintain the status quo. Now the matter is before them. He has recorded his opinion. If there is a position which gets advertised in the Department of Indian Theatre, he can apply at that time. Once a person is selected there, then it is entirely a different thing. Whosoever would be experts, they can assess at that time whether he has that merit. He has just stated all the facts known to him.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one thing which he (Vice Chancellor) has stated that there is situation of unease as that is a small department. But simultaneously, he is eligible for promotion as

Associate Professor from May 2016 for which he has already applied in his parent department. When they brought him here, they brought him as Associate Professor. It would not be fair to relieve him immediately and send him back as Assistant Professor. Since he has been doing his work satisfactorily and his services are also required for examination related work etc. What they can do at the moment is that the interview for his promotion under CAS be conducted at the earliest as his promotion is due from May, 2016, so that as and when he goes to the parent department, he should go there as Associate Professor.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is not the right thing to do. If a person has to go back, let him go back now or they should give him some academic reasons why he should be retained here.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that Dr. Bhupinder Singh is his class fellow and he knew him well. He has given his representation since 2016, what the interview could not be held as some members could not make it convenient to attend the meeting. In his first representation he had requested that he should be told about his status. He had left this issue on the Vice Chancellor to decide whether he would be allowed to continue in this department or he would be sent back to his parent department. He, therefore, suggested that they should pass it in this meeting that until he becomes an Associate Professor in his parent department, he should be allowed to continue in this department as, to his mind, it would not take more than 2-3 months.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested to extend the term of his appointment in that department till the end of the academic year ie. Upto 31st of May, 2018.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Vice Chancellor has sent him in the Department of Indian Theatre as he is a talented person.

The Vice Chancellor said that this arrangement did not work and wrote to him that he does not want to continue in the department.

Shri Jarnail Singh said as and when he would become Associate Professor, he would become Associate Professor from the date of eligibility and he has to teach the classes whether he is an Assistant Professor or Associate Professor. To defuse the situation, if they do like this, what is the harm in it.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he has given an application in the Department on 29th September and the Chairperson did not hold any meeting. He is not being given any work by the Chairperson. He did not want to speak anything against the Chairperson of the Department. He (Dr. Bhupinder Singh) has just asked about his status as his term of appointment was going to expire on 18th November. The meeting was held on 3rd November and in that meeting the Chairperson said that it is not her purview, it is the purview of the Syndicate. The minutes of this meeting were not sent keeping in mind that if these minutes are sent, then these would be placed in the meeting Syndicate of 10th December and he would get extension. Another meeting was held on 17th or 19th November where it was said that he is not doing his work properly and he should be sent back etc. etc. On the basis of that meeting, a notice

was inserted in his room from below the door after 5.00 p.m. which was the last day of expiry of his term. Next day, he was informed on phone that he should not continue in the department as his term of extension has expired. It was done with a mala fide intention only. If it is in their purview, then how the Chairperson could recommend it. On 3rd November, the Chairperson says that it is not in her purview, then how she can recommend on 19th November that his work is not satisfactory. Even then they do not want that a dispute should remain there as in such a situation the Chairperson would also not be able to work properly.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as stated by the Vice Chancellor that on academic reasons, they can extend it upto 31st of May.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma also supported it and said that he is man of international fame and he should be retained there.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the position be advertised. If the Central Government did not allow them to recruit people in such department, where only one teacher has left, such department will reach at the verge of closer. So, they have to, at one stage, go and ask the Central government, if it is their intent to close such departments. He would bring as an agenda item in the month of January or as an information item, as to which departments are there of the University where the staff strength has reached a critical level that the department faces extinction as regards this academic responsibility. How the department would run where only one or two staff members are there? The situation of the Music Department is also the same. Either there are reemployed teachers or there is only one teacher and they know what kind of record she has. They know about her academic commitment and academic credentials. There are other departments also where the people are gradually retiring and the recruitment could not take place. The recruitment could not be done because a person who was Assistant Professor became Professor by CAS. The substantive post was that of Assistant Professor and nobody wants to come on the senior positions when these are advertised because he would not get pension or seniority here. etc. This needs some practical solution. One practical solution which they have articulated in the context of PGI is that where there is no Assistant Professor's position left and the department has reached to such a critical stage that there left no faculty. In such departments, selectively the positions of Associate Professor or Professor could be temporarily transferred to that of Assistant Professor as the faculty is available at the younger level. Leave aside one or two positions, the departments which have come down to critical level, there the posts of Assistant Professor should be filled. The Central Government should be pleaded that if they did not fill up these posts, such disciplines will be end up from the University which would not be a good thing. So, this is the tragedy that they have and let the governing body be intimated of this critical situation in selective departments and let the governing body opine on it so that some solution of the problem is found.

RESOLVED: That the term of appointment of Dr. Bhupinder Singh as Associate Professor (temporary), in the Department of Indian Theatre, P.U., be extended till the end of academic session, i.e., 31.05.2018. After that he will join his parent department.

**Request of students of
5th Semester of UIPS**

6. Considered deferred item No.19 of the Syndicate meeting dated 19.11.2017 relating to the request of certain students of 5th semester, UIPS, Panjab University, duly forwarded by the Chairperson, UIPS with regard to conduct of the exam in December, 2017 for both the semesters i.e. 2nd & 5th semester of Bachelor of Pharmacy (B.Pharma.).

NOTE: 1. The Board of Control in its meeting dated 25.10.2017 has recommended that the request of the candidates is not admissible under the existing Rules & Regulations for the Bachelor of Pharmacy (B.Pharm.) Course 2010-2011 quoted below:

The candidate will be admitted to semester 5 only if he/she has earned all the credits allocated to Semester 1 and 2.

2. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 19.11.2017 (Para 19) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the request of the students to conduct the examination in December 2017 has not been acceded to by the Board of Control in UIPS as the same is not admissible under the existing Rules & Regulations.

RESOLVED: That the request of certain students of 5th semester, UIPS, Panjab University, duly forwarded by the Chairperson, with regard to conduct of the exam in December, 2017 for both the semesters i.e. 2nd & 5th semester of Bachelor of Pharmacy (B.Pharma.) be not acceded to.

**Format of Ph.D.
Certificate to the
students after July
2009**

7. Considered, deferred item No.20 of the Syndicate meeting dated 19.11.2017 relating to the minutes dated 24.10.2017 (**Appendix-IV**) of the committee, to finalise the contents of the format of Ph.D. Certificate issued to the students for Ph.D. Programme after July, 2009.

NOTE: The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 19.11.2017 (Para 20) (**Appendix-IV**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 24.10.2017 of the committee, to finalise the contents of the format of Ph.D. Certificate issued to the students for Ph.D. Programme after July, 2009, **as per Appendix**, be approved with the changes in Annexures-I & II (attached) and the same would form part of the proceedings.

**Letter received from
Punjab Financial
Corporation regarding
loan account of M/s
Chopra Industrial
Corporation,
Jalandhar**

8. Considered deferred item No.25 of the Syndicate meeting dated 19.11.2017 relating to the letter No.PFC/JAC/2017/361 dated 27.10.2017 received from Punjab Financial Corporation, Jalandhar, regarding Loan account: M/s Chopra Industrial Corporation, Jalandhar, a partnership concern of Shri Vijay Kumar Chopra S/o Shri Prem Nath Chopra.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.6.2017 (Para 9) considered the letter dated 31.05.2017 from Chairperson, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC in respect of Professor Vijay K. Chopra and resolved that a Committee including Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. Mohammad Khalid be constituted to follow up the cases of misappropriation of funds of Punjab Financial Corporation by Professor Vijay K. Chopra.

The report of the above said Committee was considered by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 23) and resolved that legal opinion be sought as to what kind of action could be initiated against Professor V.K. Chopra.

2. Legal opinion is awaited.
3. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 19.11.2017 (Para 25) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

The Vice-Chancellor said that again Professor Chopra continues to send such things as yesterday also he has sent all these things. There was some Committee which was looking into it. There was some concern that a large sum of money was due from him while he served as part of a company. Now, it turns out that they did not know the amount. When they asked a clarification from the Punjab Financial Corporation as to how much that money was, it sent an input that the money was due because they had compounded the interest on the sum which he did not pay. It is a practice that from the Government corporations, many people take the loan but do not return. What the corporations could do? Sometimes, the corporations come out with one time settlement scheme and the amount was settled under the scheme and informed the University about it since the Committee was taking cognizance of all these things.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it was done after he (Dr. Chopra) retired. But while in service, he was a defaulter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when he (Dr. Chopra) joined the University, did not inform at any stage that he was a part of the company. He had hidden all the information. The University also came to know when they started to follow it only after he started accusing everybody. Otherwise, all this was hidden. So, his conduct even in this case is not above board. He has done things which are violative of the service conditions of the teachers of the University. In spite of he himself being a defaulter in so many ways, he has no

hesitation in continuing to defame the officers of the University, governing bodies of the University in every possible way that he could do. So, this is the tragedy of this issue. So, Syndicate is supposed to take a call whether whatever information has been presented to it, does that amount to his having violated the service conditions while he was in service of the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there 2-3 things involved in it. The first one is that the loan taken by him (Dr. Chopra) was not a small amount which he had taken in the year 1979, i.e., Rs.0.76 lac in a/c I and Rs.3.15 lacs in a/c II in terms of Deed of Mortgage dated 30.03.1979. According to him, perhaps at that time he was not in service. The firm must have continued and when the firm became sick, the Punjab Financial Corporation (PFC) took over it and sold its assets, this was done in 1998. So, Dr. Chopra was probably in service even well before that and remained in service for about 10-12 years and remained as a partner in the business. The service rules in Panjab University Calendar Volume III are very clear that if someone is a defaulter somewhere, he/she should tell about it to the University. So, there is a violation. The Committee was looking into it and some things had clearly come out and was also pointed out. However, somehow that has not been mentioned that he (Dr. Chopra) had been going to different Colleges for inspection even though he was not assigned the duty. A particular case was pointed out and again pointing out that Dr. Chopra went to R.S.D. College, Ferozepur which is available in the documents where he has signed as DPI nominee. It is a case under section 420.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then they should file a case against him (Dr. Chopra).

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he (Dr. Chopra) could not go as a DPI nominee.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that such a record was not available with the Committee.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that only a Principal and not a teacher of the University could go for inspection as nominee of the DPI.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Dean College Development Council to provide all such record in the next meeting of the Syndicate and this person (Dr. Chopra) should not be spared at all.

Principal I.S. Sandhu requested to delete the column of DPI nominee.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired whether the legal opinion sought in the matter has been received or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would talk to the Advocate to expedite the legal opinion.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the information could be gathered from the office of the Registrar of Firms and Societies as to who was the owner of the firm against whom Dr. Chopra had taken the loan.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that Dr. Chopra admits that he was a partner of the firm.

Principal I.S. Sandhu asked as to why there is a delay in getting the legal opinion. Until the legal opinion is provided, they could not take a decision in the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Registrar would make a request to the Advocate (Mr. Girish) and he (Vice-Chancellor) would also call him to provide the legal opinion before the next meeting of the Syndicate. The Dean College Development Council would provide the record and this Syndicate itself would take a call on it.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the legal opinion in the case be expedited; and
- (2) the Dean College Development Council be requested to provide the record relating to the visit of Dr. V.K. Chopra as a DPI nominee to the RSD College, Ferozepur and other places, if any, to be placed before the Syndicate in the meeting scheduled on 19th December, 2017.

Deferred item

9. Considered deferred item No.27 of Syndicate meeting dated 19.11.2017 relating to the request dated 27.06.2017 of Shri Ram Nath, Father in Law of Ms. Yogita Sarohi, Assistant Professor, P.U. Regional Centre Kauni, for her transfer to Panjab University, Chandigarh as a special case, duly forwarded by Education Officer vide letter No. 1-1/2016 (VIP Ref/SU-I) dated 19.09.2017 University Grant Commission, New Delhi along with letter No. F.17-1/2017-U.II dated 25.07.2017 of Under Secretary, MHRD, Department of Higher Education, Government of India.

- NOTE:** 1. The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate dated 01/15/28 & 29.05.2016 (Para 76), has approved the recommendations of the Committee dated 21.07.2016 regarding framing a policy for transfer of faculty within the Panjab University System. Accordingly, circular has been issued to the concerned quarters vide No.8236-8936/Estt. I dated 26.08.2016.
2. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 19.11.2017 (Para 27) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that the transfer in this case should be done as they have done in an earlier case also because the husband of the teacher is working permanently in Mohali.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is neither against nor in favour of this issue. When they had discussion in the last meeting of the Senate, they had discussed that whatever they have to do in such cases, it should be done as per policy. In couple cases, they could

not say that in one case, it should be done while not in the other case. So, he suggested that a Committee be formed to frame a policy and whoever is covered under that policy, the transfer could be allowed.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that a policy has already been framed.

The Vice-Chancellor recalled for the information of the members that a policy was framed, where all the discussion is recorded, that when an advertisement is issued, that is done for a particular place. When that person is to be transferred, that has to be done against a position in the campus. They had transferred Mr. Jasbir Singh and they got into lot of problem.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they had also transferred Mr. Negi.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they know how much problem Mr. Negi caused. Let them not quote uncomfortable precedents. They could go back to those discussions and let this item be placed before the new Syndicate in January and let them form a Committee.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma enquired whether they accept that they have considered this issue. It is wrong.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if they accept to form a Committee, it meant that they want that this needed to be considered.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it should not be considered.

Shri Varinder Singh said that this should be considered as they have already taken decision in two cases earlier.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if they accept such a request, then the posts in all the Centres would become vacant.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if there is a valid reason, then it should be done.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the husband of this teacher is working in a private company, how it became a couple case. If they transfer on such political considerations, it would be a wrong thing.

Shri Varinder Singh said that, then the transfers which they had earlier done, those should be reversed as they could not take a decision that whatever decision earlier had been taken is right and thereafter no transfer would be allowed.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in this case there is an important thing that the reason taken by the teacher is that her husband is suffering from tuberculosis and the treatment is going on as mentioned in the application.

Shri Varinder Singh said that someone gets benefit, then the transfer be done. If someone has genuine problems, then the

transfer should be done. He has no problem with the transfers earlier done. For genuine cases, the transfer should be done.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is not a difficult thing to make the genuine reasons as the material of any kind could be collected for this. If they go by asking of the political leadership and the University runs in such a way, it would not be good.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that then, they would also have to seek permission to fill up the posts.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that by way of such transfers, all the Centres of the University would have no teachers and the posts would become vacant.

The Vice-Chancellor while referring to page 84 of the agenda said that, a Committee has already looked into this and has given a categorical opinion. But it is not that the things could not be reviewed. But whoever wanted it to be reviewed, first he/she should read the para on page 84.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor is right. The matter should be placed before the new Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not take a decision in favour of the transfer in view of what is mentioned at page 84.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is clear.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Shri Varinder Singh said that the decision could be reviewed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not take a decision.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if they transfers in this way, the Regional Centers of Ludhiana, Muktsar and Hoshiarpur would be without teachers as everyone would try to get transferred to Panjab University campus. They should not take a decision to change everything.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that a Committee be formed to review the policy.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that whatever is mentioned in the para at page 84 is right.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they could authorize the Vice-Chancellor and whatever seems appropriate be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not need the authorization in this matter. He did not want to put his successors in trouble with such things.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it s a genuine case and the transfer should be done as they have earlier transferred two persons.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the item should be deferred or rejected.

A few of the members said that the item should be deferred.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there are well thought decisions and why they are bluffing.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item be deferred and be placed before the next Syndicate.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it should only be deferred. Why they are diluting their own decision as the para on page 84 is clear and a well thought decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item be deferred.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred.

Item No.C-19 was taken up for consideration after Item No.C-10.

**Letter dated
23.10.2017 received
from Under Secretary,
Vice-President's
Secretariat, New Delhi**

19. Considered letter No. VPS/15/2/R/PU/2017 dated 23.10.2017 (**Appendix-V**) received from Under Secretary, Vice-President's Secretariat, New Delhi, along with representation dated 12.10.2017 of Dr. (Mrs.) Rajesh Gill, Senator, Panjab University, regarding misappropriation of books.

Initiating the discussion, the Vice Chancellor said that this is a very serious concern whatever is happening in the University On being asked by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal about the information, the Vice Chancellor said that it is not a question of seeking information as information is being provided. First the issue was, as soon as the meeting of the Syndicate gets over, they want the DVDs immediately. Today, a proposal has come that the Syndicate and Senate meetings should be webcast. He is unaware of any system in any of the University or Institute where the governing body meetings like academic council etc. are webcast. There are so many confidential matters that are presented and discussed and they are asking for live broadcast. Even the Cabinet meetings are not webcast live. These are very strange demands which are made on behalf of the Teachers Association of the University. He is amazed that the Teachers Association of this University is making such demands whereas the teachers are supposed to be thought leaders of the University to which Shri Varinder Singh said that this should not have been there. Already a Senate meeting of the University is an open meeting where the media is sitting there. Is there any sense in webcasting the Senate meeting proceedings. The Parliament does its business through committees. He has also appeared before two Parliamentary Committees because of some issues concerning Panjab University. The proceedings of these committees are not webcast. In fact they are so confidential that they have to sign even a paper there (adhering to confidentiality). Until the minutes are circulated by the Chairman of that Parliament Committee, anybody is not even supposed to share as to what happened in the meeting. But here, even before the agenda is discussed, the pressures are being put on the members of the Syndicate as to what stand they have to take in the Syndicate. If the proceedings are webcast, then while they are discussing as they will have hundreds of phone calls, SMSs and so on. It will make a mockery of the decision making process. They

cannot take any decision in the wake of all kinds of pressures, threats and phone calls and everything will be used. If the demand had come from somebody else as an individual, he could understand, but these demands are being articulated on behalf of PUTA. What is this happening? He said that he does not know what is going on here.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they have already decided that the DVDs would be provided only when the minutes are approved.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have received something in a sealed cover which is pertaining to some other item No. 19. In the Item No. 19, they are supposed to consider the papers which are in the sealed cover. These papers have been sent to him by the Chancellor's Office. Here a Senate Member is accusing another Senate Member, a teacher is accusing another teacher that some books are pending against that teacher. Is it right to accuse a fellow teacher because some books are pending against that teacher which may have happened inadvertently. He showed page 4 of the papers sent in the sealed cover. They had a special Syndicate meeting the minutes of which were circulated to the members. The Vice Chancellor read out some portion of the letter sent by a Senate member, a former Syndicate member, a PUTA President, which says:

“The Special Syndicate meeting dated 7.10.2017, was chaired by Prof. Arun Grover, VC and attended by Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), Registrar, PU , against whom the charge of getting the unauthorised letter from VP Secretariat in connivance with certain officers, was made.

The present Panjab University Syndicate comprising 15 members is absolutely under the control of Prof. Arun Grover, VC. He gets any decision/s of his liking extracted without any resistance, because they are highly obliged by him”.

The Vice Chancellor asked, are they all obliged by him?

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they have already countered it.

The Vice Chancellor said now it is being written and read out from Para 7 of the papers sent under sealed cover:

“....that this meeting had been convened only to malign undersigned complainant and get a clean chit for Registrar, a close aide of accused VC.”

The Vice Chancellor asked, is this way that a Senator of the University will refer the Vice Chancellor as accused Vice Chancellor. He asked, by whom he has been accused? He was chairing the meeting. 91 Senators are there, there are one thousand teachers in Panjab University. Will anybody get up and level the accusation against him and then a letter is sent where he is referred to an accused Vice Chancellor? He further read out the following from the said letter :

“The undersigned complainant was condemned for making the complaint, which was resolved to be unfounded and leveled with mischievous and mala fide intentions, also without any investigation

..... it was resolved *inter alia* that PUCASH (ICC) shall conduct the inquiry in the case of sexual harassment at workplace alleged by undersigned complainant against Prof. Arun Grover, VC and submit its report within stipulated time (90 days) directly to Hon'ble Chancellor, whereas this was never an issue in the letter under consideration. This itself proves mala fide.”

The Vice Chancellor further said that if someone puts a sexual harassment case and that he/she would not allow to let the sexual harassment case investigated by anybody, and say that the PUCASH is under the control of the Vice Chancellor. Is the PUCASH under the control of the Vice Chancellor, he asked? Or the PUCASH is under the control of the politics of the teachers of the University, that the PUCASH would not investigate case put by the complainant at all. The previous PUCASH did not investigate the matter at all on the premise that Chancellor has not said that they are to do it. Even when the Chancellor said that they are to do it, they do not do it. So, what is it going on? Why this letter is attached with these papers in which a sitting member of the Syndicate is accused! In the same letter, the sitting member of the Syndicate is also referred to. He read out the following from for the members:

“To put the records straight, it may be observed that the new PUCASH is a committee constituted at the behest of accused Prof. Arun Grover, by Prof. Pam Rajput, a close aide, who singlehandedly gave the names of all the members in her own handwriting to the Syndicate”

The Vice Chancellor said it is disappointing that a sitting member of the Senate accuses another member of the Senate and writes to the Chancellor and then the governing body would not take notice of it because there is needed a 2/3rd majority to take any action against the sitting member of the Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would like to say something on this, otherwise many issues would get accumulated. The PUCASH has to be constituted by the employer and in this case it is clear that Senate is the employer. Senate can consider anything after the recommendation of the Syndicate. When the PUCASH was to be formed, the matter came to Syndicate. The Syndicate had constituted a Committee and that Committee held 2-3 meetings. The Committee considered the names and collected their CVs and then, he remembers, as he was a member of that Committee, that they held a final meeting only in this Syndicate room. Then madam (Professor Pam Rajput) decided that they would not seek help from anyone, that means they would not take any secretarial assistance and she would write the names herself, which have been recommended by the Committee, so that the confidentiality of the matter could be maintained. He further said that all the members of the Committee had recommended some names. It does not mean that all those names which were recommended by the Committee

were accepted. The Syndicate had made some changes in that list. So there were changes and additions which were made by the Syndicate here. Finally as to what would be the PUCASH, that decision was taken by the Senate and the so called Senate member, who has been accusing, was also present in the meeting. Even after having done everything in the presence of everyone, the things are being twisted in such a way as if everything is being done on behalf of the Vice Chancellor or on behalf of Professor Pam Rajput, it is really shameful.

The Vice Chancellor said that when the money for books had been deposited, he did not know what was purpose of writing such letters.

He added that, first the Vice Chancellor was accused. Initially, it was not a sexual harassment. On 14th or 15th April, 2015, it was said that the Vice Chancellor has made Panjab University a place not safe for women. The words 'sexual harassment' were not there. When it did not work, then on 28th May, she lodged a sexual harassment complaint in the police. When it did not work even with the police, they she complained to the Minister in Delhi. Most unfortunate circumstance for him was that the Hon'ble Minister, MHRD, without seeking any input from him referred the matter to a fact finding committee. He went to Delhi and did everything. He has not been given any copy of that fact finding committee till today. He cannot put an RTI to say that this is the report of the fact finding committee. Whatever it was, if there was something against him and they wanted to anything, they would have done it. But, the MHRD, on the directions of the highest ranking people in the MHRD, referred the case to the University and said that the University body should investigate and the University body says that it would not be investigated because the University body has been created under the Chairmanship of the Vice Chancellor and everybody is obliged by the Vice Chancellor. What is this going on?

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal wanted to know if they have the copy of first complaint after which it was converted to sexual harassment.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already given them a copy of that complaint many times.

The Vice Chancellor requested Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu, who was talking with other member, to give attention to this serious issue. The University is suffering because they are not taking the things seriously. Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that in the end she has made a prayer which is as under:

- i) Under the circumstances, inquiry may be conducted by an independent authority to investigate the allegations against one and all. Had the authorities been guilt free, they would have promptly referred the matter for investigation, instead of giving a clean chit, especially to an officer who is even behind the scope and jurisdiction of their powers.
- ii) It is further prayed that the complaint of sexual harassment against Prof. Arun Grover, alleged by

undersigned victim, may be got investigated by an independent agency/committee, having no connection with the powerful and high vindictive accused VC, who has even after more than two years, successfully scuttled any fair and independent investigation by either any such committee or the UT police. This has caused immense mental torture to the undersigned victim, who has been repeatedly defamed, maligned and humiliated in public and media, itself amounting to continuous and aggravated sexual harassment at workplace, as per the Act of 2013.

- iii) Undersigned may please be granted a personal hearing at the earliest.

An early action will save the undersigned the agony of going through another round of torture and harassment at the hands of the extremely powerful, corrupt and well connected accused VC and his coterie.”

The Vice Chancellor said as per the above letter, they are all a part of his coterie. The entire Senate is a part of his coterie. They are eating out of his hands and that he is so powerful that the UT police is also listening to his dictates. The Chancellor has forwarded this letter to the university for comments on the representation of Prof. Rajesh Gill. He gave a copy of this letter to the members and requested them to give their comments so that he may inform the Chancellor.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma while talking about the issue of books relating to Professor Pam Rajput said that the person who has donated Rs. One lac. for books and already deposited the amount, why such a case has been brought to the Syndicate for discussion. Information should have been provided to the MHRD and the Chancellor office as it is a separate letter.

The Vice Chancellor while showing the complete letter received from the Chancellor's office said, that he has received the list of books along with that letter.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it is just to defame a person as she has already deposited the money.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter is before them and requested them to give their response or say that they rightly condemn it. They have to use just as she is using unhesitatingly such strong language against everybody. At least condemnation, deep regrets which amounts to defaming the Syndicate and Senate as the bodies of this University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be done with proper reasoning. Let them take the issues one by one. The first one is about the discussion in the Syndicate. When the meeting of the Syndicate ends, the very next day, she (Professor Rajesh Gill) submits an application for providing the DVDs from where she observes as to who had spoken what in the Syndicate which does not suit her. Then she starts targeting that person. That is what is happening and that is why she keeps on asking for the DVDs. After getting the DVDs, the same are checked as to who had spoken what

and then that person is targeted whether it is Professor Pam Rajput or Professor Navdeep Goyal or any other member or the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is intimidation.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that intimidation is being done. In this particular case, way back, Professor Pam Rajput had asked about the pending books from Professor Rajesh Gill when she was the Director. Thereafter also Professor Pam Rajput had again asked for the pending books. Thereafter, after taking the details of the books, she had deposited the price of the books. In addition to that, Professor Pam Rajput has donated an amount of Rs.1 lac for the same library, about which they are talking of the books amounting to Rs.4,000/-. She has also offered the scholarship to two students. Professor Pam Rajput was also talking with them in private that the books, the price of which could be about Rs.2 or Rs.4 or some book might be costing Rs.50. The books which would have been able to find would return and it could be also that some of the books might not be in print. Everything is being done as per University rules. So many books stand in the name of a teacher who serves the University for about 30 years that at the time of retirement, one does not know about the books whether some colleague or a student had borrowed the books. Sometimes instead of the book being returned to the library and then get it issued, the books are directly borrowed by the colleagues as they might be teaching a particular course. So, the proper record could not be maintained and the whereabouts of the books are not known. It happens with every teacher in the case of the books. The teachers have two options regarding the books, i.e., either to get the books written off which most of the teachers get done as there is such a provision or make the payment as per rules. Professor Pam Rajput had not used the option of getting the books written off. Rather, she has made the payment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they all know that all this is being done with an intent of trying to intimidate the colleagues, Senate members and it is an intimidation of the worst kind.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they condemn it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be out-rightly condemned. His advice is that some of the Syndicate members sit together and prepare a resolved part like that which was prepared last time and give the resolved part to him so that the resolved part, of course the discussion would take some time, to this is sent to the Chancellor as early as possible.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are discussing items C-10, C-19. There is another item, the last one (Item No.C-39), which they are rejecting. They are taking up these three items together as the discussion has taken place.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that item is a resolution.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the resolution proposed by Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor J.K. Goswamy has been placed before the Syndicate just after two days of the

submission whereas there is another resolution submitted by Shri Deepak Kaushik.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had brought that resolution because the meeting of the Senate is scheduled. That meeting would not be allowed to commence on the plea that the Vice-Chancellor had not placed the resolution of PUTA for consideration.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that resolution proposed by Shri Deepak Kaushik be also considered.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that resolution proposed by Shri Deepak Kaushik be also considered as the same had been submitted twice.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Professor Pam Rajput submitted a copy of the resolution proposed by Shri Deepak Kaushik for consideration in the next meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this resolution be considered otherwise the non-teaching employees would also have the same viewpoint.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have already discussed the issue of this resolution. However, they could discuss it again.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they could discuss it in the next meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that now they have discussed the three items (C-10, C-19 and C-39) together.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma suggested that the third item of Resolution (C-39) should be dealt with separately because that is a resolution proposed by the PUTA.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be dealt with separately. He asked the members to give him the resolved part of the other items. They would circulate that resolved part and once they receive, or no objection is received, then that would be treated as final resolved part and the same would be sent to the Chancellor.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the first part of the letter which was concerned with Professor Pam Rajput, which they have already discussed, the damage which has been caused by the news story has set aside her contribution made for the public during her life, it gives the impression as if there was a great embezzlement. Had it been dealt with separately and replied to the Chancellor, the damage would have been much more less. It would have been better if a separate reply had been sent at that time when earlier the reply was sent to the Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter has come to him in a combined form, what he could do.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that perhaps the whole letter has not been published in the press but just only the first part.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to who has given it in the press.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there might be some such people.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these are the persons who provide the information to the press after collecting the documents from the members.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the news appear in the newspapers even before they get the agenda papers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even in today's news paper Daily Post there is a news item regarding Professor O.P. Katare that the Registrar had said such and such thing.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that he had not talked to anyone.

The Vice-Chancellor said that here the people use their connection. The fellow, who is writing the story in Daily Post, has been roaming about in the University for the last 10 years. He is the same guy who got stopped the NAAC thing. He is the one who wrote a story that to tarnish the image of the University over last twenty five years, the Vice-Chancellors had been instrumental. It meant that the Vice-Chancellors right from Professor R.P. Bambah to till date have worked against the interests of the University. But they could do nothing as they are a toothless body. They are a public institution and they have more works to do and they do not go after such things, that defamation (suits) should be filed against such persons. When they are living in a democratic society, they have to accept these types of weaknesses of the democratic society and the press and so on.

Professor Pam Rajput brought it to the notice of the members that the Centre for Women Studies was started somewhere in 1986-87 from a cycle shed. Since then till her retirement, she did not take even a single penny as honorarium. She remained as Warden of Mata Gujri Hall (Girls Hostel) for 5 years. She neither even took a single penny from the University for this nor availed the accommodation facility meant for a Warden. She further informed that she did not claim the electricity and telephone bill charges. She was the Founder-Director of IAS Coaching Centre and even did not charge even a single penny. Professor T.N. Kapoor, the then Vice-Chancellor even had called the then Finance and Development Officer (Mr. M.G. Sharma) and asked him as to why she was not being paid the honorarium. But she refused and said that other than the salary she was receiving as a teacher, she would not take even a single penny for other works. She also brought it on record that while on visits to UNO or China, instead of shopping, she brought the books for the Centre. She felt very hurt over the allegation. It could be checked from the Centre that some of the reports which are available nowhere, are available in the Centre. This Centre of Panjab University is the best Centre in the country, how did it become. On 8th March when she was addressing a meeting in UN, she received a message and came to know that the Centre was being demolished for construction of some building. She made a telephonic call to Professor K.N. Pathak (the then Vice-

Chancellor) on this issue and after returning also had a talk with him after returning. She shared this information in the meeting with the representatives from different countries as to what had happened to her Centre. The very first day she returned, the Vice-Chancellor reached the Centre and she told him the condition of the Centre. The books of the library of the Centre were scattered. She was stunned to see the condition of the books which she had brought. She had chaired a Committee of Government of India on the Status of Women without charging even a single penny for two years. The rank of this position was equivalent to that of the highest officer (Secretary) of the Government of India but she did not take any honorarium. Even she had spent on her travel from her own pocket except for a rare chance where the officials must have provided the travel tickets. Such kind of reports appear in the newspapers for such a person (i.e. she herself).

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is very painful.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is what he is saying that the governing bodies of this University should attend to these things seriously.

Professor Pam Rajput said that when she retired, she received a communication that some books are pending. She made a telephonic call there. She put it on record that her teacher had said that where one was in a very high position, the person should not go there again. That is why, she did not visit the Centre after her retirement. She made a telephonic call to the Centre to tell her the names of the books and the price. Since the boxes of books were lying packed in her house, she would look for the same and if not available, she would pay for the same. She did not write to Panjab University to write off the books. Fortunately, again in the month of April, she wrote to the Centre for providing the list of books. The list of books was provided by the Centre. The Registrar is a testimony to this fact that she had written a letter to him that the books amounting to Rs.4474/- were standing in her name and wanted to know the procedure for depositing the money for the same. However, that letter was somewhere misplaced in the Registrar's office. She again wrote a letter on which the Registrar directed the Finance and Development Officer on this issue. She received a call from the Finance and Development Officer informing that the cheque is to be deposited in the name of the Registrar. She has already deposited the amount by cheque. When the meeting of the Advisory Committee of the Centre was held, the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee, in the presence of the Secretary to Government of India, Department of Women and Child Development, said that they have a paucity of funds. After the meeting was over, she asked about the books which were issued in her name, she offered to donate Rs.1 lac to the Centre to purchase the books to enrich the library for the students. She did not want it to be known but she had talked with Professor Navdeep Goyal that she would provide scholarship of Rs.2,500/- each to students out of her pension. She had written a letter to the Centre in this regard and the other to Professor Ronki Ram as she was not aware that some other person had taken over the charge of the Centre.

The Vice-Chancellor said that why they are failing to defend such a colleague. Why they are not writing to the PUTA to condemn this. Why the teachers are not condemning it?

Professor Pam Rajput felt very hurt over the item which had been brought for consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to write as he is a representative of the Professors of the University and why such a wrong act by a University Professor (namely Professor Rajesh Gill) has not been countered.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma suggested that this item should be withdrawn.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item would not be withdrawn. They have to opine on and send it as their response to the Chancellor.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that only the part which was against Professor Pam Rajput.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it should be condemned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be out-rightly be condemned.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that a letter should go on behalf of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they did not counter such things, these would escalate. The item is a complaint against a sitting Syndicate member and with it the Vice-Chancellor is being accused along with the members of the governing body and everybody else. What is the item and what is being done under the disguise of that? What is this happening? Do they have teeth?

Professor Pam Rajput added that she was invited to deliver a Panjab University colloquium some time ago for which she was presented with a cheque as honorarium but she refused it. Dr. Archana, the organizer of the colloquium, had said that she receives the letters from USA asking for the payment of the lectures delivered in the colloquium and she (Professor Pam Rajput) was the first person who was not accepting the payment. She (i.e. Professor Pam Rajput) never took any honorarium for delivering the lectures in the Refresher Courses. She never took any honorarium except for the salary which she received from the Department where she was a teacher. She enquired as to has anyone seen her filling up the TA form for the Senate meetings.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he processed her case for Professor Emeritus. So many persons, because of the University's politics, were against giving Emeritus Professorship to Professor Pam Rajput. If he had asked her parent department to confer the title of Emeritus Professor on Professor Pam Rajput, the parent department may have given a negative report. Such is the situation at Panjab University that if one asks for a report from the parent department for an Emeritus Professor, no one would be able to become an Emeritus Professor in this University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this could be a problem in many of the departments, but not in Physics.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Dr. Dalip Kumar said that exceptions are there, but in maximum of the departments, there are problems.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the people would not allow someone to become an Emeritus Professor because there is so much of inherent jealousy that if a person is being conferred the title of Emeritus Professor (from a given Department), then there are four others who also desire to be considered from the same Department.

Professor Pam Rajput, hurt by all this and with heavy heart, said is this the reward of serving this University, it is very-very unfortunate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the day he was accused of sexual harassment, after 5 days of that, the matter was brought to the Syndicate. This forum (Syndicate) did not take any cognizance of that, and Professor Navdeep Goyal was a member of that Syndicate. He did not remember who were the other members of the Syndicate in 2015. Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu was also a part of that Syndicate. They took it lightly thinking that the matter would end but such things did not come to an end. After a period of one month, a complaint was filed with the police and thereafter referred to the Minister by the complainant. It is that cancer which today has taken such a shape. So, the item would not be deferred. A response to it on behalf of the governing body would be sent to Delhi. The recording would be provided to the members and whatever Professor Pam Rajput has said would be written. She (Professor Pam Rajput) has forgotten to tell that she served as Chairman of a national body for 5 years. All this would be written and all the related documents when she was made Emeritus Professor would be taken from the University record and would be attached and sent. It has to be outrightly condemned. It could not be such that a Senate member, or using also the thing that she is the President, PUTA, one would defame the colleagues, Senate members, Emeritus Professors and all the members of the body which the Vice-Chancellor chairs, that everybody is a part of the Vice-Chancellor's coterie. Would they not take cognizance of it? If they did not take cognizance of it, all the employees of the University would be helpless. There is such kind of a terror. Such kind of a terror is not there even of mafia in Mumbai, as is being spread by some of the people in the University. All this is because they (governing bodies) did not have the courage to counter that.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they have the courage to counter but the Vice-Chancellor did not support the persons who wanted to counter that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not correct, he enquired as to who has not been supported by him.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he (Vice-Chancellor) did not support. If somebody wanted to intervene, the Vice-Chancellor says that such and such thing has happened. He (Vice-Chancellor) does not value.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not correct.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) having taken cognizance of the input provided by Professor Pam Rajput regarding the compensation for the books which stood in her name at the time of her retirement and other exemplary material contributions made by her for the progress and enrichment of the Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies & Development of which she was the first Honorary Director, the Syndicate abhorred the act of Professor Rajesh Gill in tarnishing the respectful image of an Emeritus Professor and a Senate and Syndicate member of Panjab University, who has been her own senior teaching colleague. Syndicate out-rightly condemned the accusation of misappropriation levelled on Professor Pam Rajput by Professor Rajesh Gill and its transmission to the Chancellor, Panjab University violating all norms of functioning by a faculty member and a Senate member of Panjab University. Professor Pam Rajput contributed as Emeritus Professor of Panjab University to the academic need of Panjab University in preparing the curricula for new courses on Governance and Leadership, which are being administered via Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies & Development. Professor Pam Rajput deserves appreciation of her contribution instead of baseless and false allegations in the most intemperate tone and language by (Ms.) Professor Rajesh Gill;
- (ii) Syndicate reiterated that Professor Rajesh Gill has developed a habit of levelling allegations against anyone who does not toe her line. Syndicate is an elected Governing Body of Panjab University, which is elected by the Senate, whose majority of members are elected. However, she is making allegations against that elected Body, over which Vice Chancellor has no direct control, which is unfortunate. She has levelled allegations against Registrar, OSD to former Chancellor, Members of Syndicate, Mrs. Rekha Sharma (Officiating Chairperson National Commission for Women), Ambassador I.S. Chadha, just because, they have not been aiding her unacceptable onslaughts. In order to intimidate her teaching colleagues, members of Panjab University bodies and other officers performing their duties, she accuses everyone on one account or the other. This is most unfortunate and it deserves to be resisted;
- (iii) suitable reply ought to be sent to the Chancellor amounting to strong rebuttal of the allegations against Registrar, OSD to former

Chancellor, Panjab University, members of Syndicate, Smt. Rekha Sharma (officiating Chairperson, National Commission for Women) and Ambassador I.S. Chadha . Insinuation against Ambassador I.S. Chadha for being a part of Selection Committee which shortlisted the name of present Vice-Chancellor is demeaning and severely irresponsible.

Minutes dated 04.10.2017 regarding eligibility criteria/admission process for M.Phil./Ph.D.

11. Considered, deferred item No.36 of the Syndicate meeting dated 19.11.2017 relating to the minutes dated 04.10.2017 (**Annexures A to E**) (**Appendix-VI**) regarding eligibility criteria/admission process for admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. programme:

- NOTE:** 1. A copy of the circular No. 7959-8058/DUI/DS dated 10.10.2017 is enclosed (**Appendix-VI**).
2. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 19.11.2017 (Para 36) (**Appendix-VI**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

RESOLVED: That the minutes dated 04.10.2017 (**Annexures A to E**) regarding eligibility criteria/ admission process for admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. programme, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Minutes of the Committee dated 04.08.2017 to look into the complaint by Shri Balwinder Singh

14. Considered minutes dated 04.08.2017 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the complaint made by Shri Balwinder Singh, Flat No. 18, Lal Kothi, Naya Gaon, Distt. Mohali, regarding forgery of admission of Mr. Gaurav Rattan in Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical & Engineering & Technology in the year 2001.

- NOTE:** 1. A copy of the report dated 06.04.2017 of the CVO is enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).
2. The above minutes were placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.08.2017 (Para 37) (**Appendix-VII**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as far as the complaint was concerned, the admission was made about 20 years ago. At that time, the precedent was for NRI/industry sponsored admissions, the candidates used to apply under that category and as the candidate had sought the concession, the concession was granted by the University. So, it does not become a matter of complaint. Why this person is making complaint is that this person is a 50-year old research scholar of the Department. The teachers in the Department

have some issue of their own and to fix a teacher, the complaint is being made through this person. This person is making complaint after complaint continuously.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then they have to take a hard call. Why are they permitting these people to defame the University? When this matter had come, they took a call that Mr. Gaurav Rattan was not at fault. The concession to be given to him under the industry-sponsored should not have been given.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the concession was being given to everyone.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the concession was not admissible. That is what the CVO has said. But it was resolved that let bygones be bygones.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that now there are no industry-sponsored seats.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no fault of the individual. If a person makes a claim, the claim could have been denied but it was not denied by the University authority.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have to check as to who is the person and why he is making the complaints and for how many years he is in the University. It needed to be checked as to why he is being permitted against the rules. He said that he has got inputs about the person. When this person applied for Ph.D., he was working somewhere and he has hidden this information. The complete information is available. Rather the enrolment should be cancelled if someone hides something. So, an enquiry should be conducted on this issue. A Committee could be formed on this issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that such people have to be fixed. Since such people are not fixed, that is why they continue to write complaints.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the person makes the complaints of the persons of the Departments. They could form a Committee of Syndicate as it is a simple matter. They should check as to why the candidate has submitted the misinformation.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that a Committee could be formed and the complaint should be checked.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Committee has checked it.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that then it is misinformation and they should take action against the person.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Committee is to be formed against the person who has made the complaint. They authorize the Vice-Chancellor to form the Committee in this regard.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) minutes dated 04.08.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the complaint made by Shri Balwinder Singh, Flat No. 18, Lal Kothi, Naya Gaon, Distt. Mohali, regarding forgery of admission of Mr. Gaurav Rattan in Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical & Engineering & Technology in the year 2001, **as per Appendix**, be approved; and
- (2) the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to constitute a Committee to enquire into the concealment of facts by Mr. Balwinder Singh while taking admission in Ph.D.

Minutes dated 13.10.2017 regarding clarification on ACITE Regulations dated 05.03.2010

15. Considered minutes dated 13.10.2017 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding clarification on certain issues arising out of AICTE Regulations dated 5th March, 2010 (received from Professor Dileep Malkhede, Adviser-I, (RIFD Bureau), AICTE, New Delhi.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 13.10.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding clarification on certain issues arising out of AICTE Regulations dated 5th March, 2010 (received from Professor Dileep Malkhede, Adviser-I, (RIFD Bureau), AICTE, New Delhi, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Minutes dated 25.10.2017 of the Committee regarding increase in percentage of reservation for backward classes

16. Considered minutes dated 25.10.2017 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 12), to examine the issue envisaged in the letter dated 17.08.2017 of Principal Secretary, Welfare, Department of Welfare of SCs, BCs and Minorities (Reservation Cell), Government of Punjab, regarding increase in the percentage of reservation for backward classes in Educational, Technical and Professional Institutions for admission in affiliated/constituent Colleges of Panjab University.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 12) (**Appendix-IX**) considered the letter dated 17.08.2017 of Principal Secretary, Welfare, Department of Welfare of SCs, BCs and Minorities (Reservation Cell), Government of Punjab, regarding increase in the percentage of Reservation of seats for the members of Backward classes in Educational, Technical and Professional Institutions for admission and constituted a Committee to examine the issues envisaged in the said letter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this decision taken by the Punjab Government for the Colleges situated in Punjab is right. Whether they need to adopt it for the Panjab University campus, that has to be seen.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that a Committee be formed on the matter.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the U.T. of Chandigarh is also involved as it has its own reservation policy.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that U.T. follows the central reservation policy.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 25.10.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 12), to examine the issue envisaged in the letter dated 17.08.2017 of Principal Secretary, Welfare, Department of Welfare of SCs, BCs and Minorities (Reservation Cell), Government of Punjab, regarding increase in the percentage of reservation for backward classes in Educational, Technical and Professional Institutions for admission in affiliated/constituent Colleges of Panjab University, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Request dated
10/15.11.2017 of the
Coordinator, Centre
for Medical Physics**

17. Considered request dated 10.11.2017/15.11.2017 (**Appendix-X**) of the Coordinator, Centre for Medical Physics, U.I.E.A.S.T, Panjab University, that the following recommendations of the Academic Council dated 21.06.2017 (Item LXX) (**Appendix-X**), be approved and the same be allowed to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information 2018 i.e. for the academic session 2018-19:

1. Total number of seats in M.Sc. Medical Physics shall be 10+2 NRI only from the academic year 2018-19. There are no additional seats as mentioned in Handbook of information.
2. Availability and utilization of laboratory charges collected from students as part of fees were discussed and it was decided to enhance laboratory charge to Rs. 1000 p.m. from the current charges of Rs. 120 p.m. (from Indian students) and to enhance development fund to 400 \$/semester instead of current of 200\$ from the NRI students from the academic year 2018-2019 and also be made part of the budget of the Centre for Medical Physics.
3. Weightages for Common Entrance Test (PG) and the qualifying degree are discussed and decided that the B.Sc. marks will contribute weightage of 40% & Common Entrance Test (PG) will contribute weightage of 60% towards admission merit for the M.Sc. in Medical Physics first year.
4. The members of committee proposed one seat of tutor cum RSO post in the Centre for Medical Physics

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the first three recommendations are right. But the post of RSO should not be for this particular Centre only but for the whole of University as it is a requirement and the person would perform the job for the whole of the University.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it should be got checked that the weightage of marks should be uniform for all the courses and not particularly for this course.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it be approved subject to checking.

RESOLVED: That request dated 10.11.2017/15.11.2017 (**Appendix-X**) of the Coordinator, Centre for Medical Physics, U.I.E.A.S.T, Panjab University, that the following recommendations of the Academic Council dated 21.06.2017 (Item LXX) (**Appendix-X**), be approved with the modifications and the same be allowed to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information 2018 i.e. for the academic session 2018-19:

1. Total number of seats in M.Sc. Medical Physics shall be 10+2 NRI only from the academic year 2018-19. There are no additional seats as mentioned in Handbook of information.
2. Availability and utilization of laboratory charges collected from students as part of fees were discussed and it was decided to enhance laboratory charge to Rs. 1000 p.m. from the current charges of Rs. 120 p.m. (from Indian students) and to enhance development fund to 400 \$/semester instead of current of 200\$ from the NRI students from the academic year 2018-2019 and also be made part of the budget of the Centre for Medical Physics.
3. Weightages for Common Entrance Test (PG) and the qualifying degree are discussed and decided that the B.Sc. marks will contribute weightage of 40% & Common Entrance Test (PG) will contribute weightage of 60% towards admission merit for the M.Sc. in Medical Physics first year.
4. The members of Syndicate decided that one post of tutor cum RSO be created in the University.

**Minutes dated
02.11.2017 of
Executive Committee
of PUSC**

18. Considered minutes dated 02.11.2017 (7, 9 & 10) (**Appendix-XI**) of the Executive Committee of PUSC.

RESOLVED: That the minutes dated 02.11.2017 (7, 9 & 10) of the Executive Committee of PUSC, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Minutes dated
27.10.2017 of Youth
Welfare Committee**

20. Considered minutes dated 27.10.2017 (**Appendix-XII**) of Panjab University Youth Welfare Committee:

NOTE: The annexure-I as mentioned in the minutes dated 27.10.2017, involves financial implications, thus, the matter

should also be considered by the Board of Finance, as the Part-I of the annexure exists in the Budget Estimates of 2017-18 Appendix-I at page 102-103.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 27.10.2017 of Panjab University Youth Welfare Committee, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Minutes dated 10.10.2017 of the Committee for effective utilization of Rs.10 lakhs donated by Dr. Kewal K. Tewari

21. Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Committee, constituted for the effective utilization of Rs.10 lakhs donated by Dr. Kewal K. Tewari, to increase the corpus of "Professor DVS Jain Merit Scholarship Endowment.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 31.08.1995 (Para 1 (i) had accepted the initial donation of Rs.45,000/- from students and Alumni of Chemistry Department for the award of Professor DVS Jain Merit Scholarship @ Rs.400/- p.m. for 10 months to the students of M.Sc. (H.S.) 2nd year who has passed the M.Sc. Part-I and all previous examination of B.Sc. (Hons.) including subsidiary subject examination/B.Sc. in chemistry in the first attempt and secured top position i.e. highest in M.Sc. (H.S.) part-I examination.
2. Dr. Kewal K. Tewari, 4058 Hardwoods Drive, West Bloomfield, Michigan 48323, USA, vide letter dated 18.04.2017 (**Appendix-XIII**) has donated an additional fund of Rs.10,00,000/- to increase the corpus of Prof. DVS Jain Merit Scholarship Endowment and requested to constitute the Committee for preparing guidelines for this purpose in consultation with Professor DVS Jain.
3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XIII**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that last night he has received a proposal from Professor R.K. Kohli that he wants to institute an award to give Rs.1 lac to a mid-career scientist in Panjab University. It is a very good proposal and the criteria have been provided. It is for Panjab University, CRIKC institutions and Central University of Punjab, Bathinda. He would give an endowment and from the interest earned on that money, an amount of Rs.1 lacs per year would be given for the award.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the thanks of the Syndicate be conveyed to Professor R.K. Kohli.

Dr. Dalip Kumar enquired as to what is the mid-career criterion?

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that only the persons up to the age of 50 years would be eligible. The e-mail received from Professor R.K. Kohli reads "I wish to establish an endowment fund with Panjab University in the name of my revered father late Shri Shiv Nath Rai Kohli for instituting an annual award comprising a cash prize of Rs.1 lac and a plaque with citation. The cost of this award would be met with from 90% of the interest earned on the applicable principal amount which I propose to deposit for establishing the award". 90% of the interest earned would go for the award and the remaining 10% for the conduct of the event. Further, the e-mail says that "the applications will be invited by the Dean, Research Promotion Cell, Panjab University or as the University deems fit". The conditions for the award have also been proposed, one of which is that any researcher scientist below the age of 50 years at the end of the year prior to the year of convocation. For instance, for the convocation to be held in 2018, the applicant must not be above the age of 50 years on 31st December, 2017. The Selection Committee would comprise the Vice-Chancellor, Director, PGIMER, Director, GMCH-32, Director, IMTECH or CSIO, Director, PEC or IIT Ropar, Director, IISER or NIPER. The proposal would be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate. He also shared that Professor Kessar who had given an amount of Rs.5 lacs for the Urmi Kessar Memorial Lecture. This lecture would be delivered by Shri Vikram Seth on 8th January, 2018 at 4.00 p.m. Suddenly, the number of prestigious awards in the University has enhanced.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 10.10.2017 of the Committee, constituted for the effective utilization of Rs.10 lakhs donated by Dr. Kewal K. Tewari, to increase the corpus of "Professor DVS Jain Merit Scholarship Endowment, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the proposal submitted by Professor R.K. Kohli, for instituting an annual award namely Shiv Nath Rai Kohli Memorial Mid-Career Best Scientist Award be accepted and thanks be conveyed to Professor R.K. Kohli.

Sanction of Rs.73 lacs out of UIAMS examination fund for furnishing of two laboratories

22. Considered if, an estimated expenditure of Rs.73.00 lacs, for furnishing of two laboratories, for accessing SWAYAM and SWAYAM PRABHA modules programme of MHRD, under National Digital Initiatives in Higher Education, be met, from the saving of UIAMS Examination wing out of UIAMS Examination fund:

NOTE: A copy of recommendations dated 15.09.2017 with regard to implementation of National Digital Initiatives in Higher Education in Panjab University, Chandigarh is enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**)

RESOLVED: That an estimated expenditure of Rs.73.00 lacs, for furnishing of two laboratories, for accessing SWAYAM and SWAYAM PRABHA modules programme of MHRD, under National Digital Initiatives in Higher Education from the saving of UIAMS Examination wing out of UIAMS Examination fund be approved.

Fee structure of affiliated Colleges

23. Considered minutes dated 29.09.2017 (**Appendix-XV**) of the working Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to work out a road map for rationalization and revision of fee structure, examination fee and all other charges for the session 2018-2019 to achieve the task of augmenting the resources for affiliated colleges of Panjab University.

Principal I.S. Sandhu pointed out that budget head-5 appearing at page 345 needed to be corrected with commas (,) among the various budget heads.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired whether the information asked for from the Colleges regarding the retirement benefit fund has been received or not.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Dean College Development Council to provide the consolidated information in the next sitting of the Syndicate so that the outgoing Syndicate had a satisfaction.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that since the fees are being enhanced, the salary of the teachers working in the Colleges on less salary, should also be enhanced.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has taken up with the U.T. Administration that the teachers should be paid the full salary. If any College of the U.T. pays a salary of less than Rs.50,000/- to the teachers, then the approval would not be given.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if they did not grant the approval, it suited the Colleges because after serving for a period of 2-3 years, the teachers would leave the Colleges. He suggested that the courses against which the teachers are working should not be granted the approval if less salary is paid.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be done.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the Managements of the Colleges find an excuse that if the Government is not paying the full salary, why they should pay.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has also taken up the matter with Mr. Sandhu. This is for the information of the members that the Chief Secretary, Punjab has agreed to convene a meeting of all the three Vice-Chancellors, namely, Panjab University, Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University on common concerns like fees, salary, etc.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested that the issue of CBCS syllabus should also be taken up.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma to give him a note which he would discuss in the meeting.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that what Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma is saying is right. But in the other two universities, Punjabi is a compulsory subject which is not the case in Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there would be a meeting of the Finance Officers also because the Government wanted to have some authoritative information as to how the finances of the University are running and what is the distribution of the internal income.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma enquired whether this 5% increase is to be enhanced every year or it is a one-time enhancement.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that at the moment the increase is for the current year only.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the fee has not been enhanced for the last two years.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the fee should not be increased @ 5% every year.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 29.09.2017 of the working Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to work out a road map for rationalization and revision of fee structure, examination fee and all other charges for the session 2018-2019 to achieve the task of augmenting the resources for affiliated colleges of Panjab University, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Technology Transfer Agreement between Panjab University and Unique Biotech Ltd.

24. Considered if, Technology Transfer Agreement (**Appendix-XVI**) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Unique Biotech LTD (UBL), Plot No. 2, Phase-2, S.P Biotech Park, Shameerpet, Hyderabad, Telengana, be executed, as recommended by the Research Promotion Cell Committee dated 30.10.2017 (Item No. 7) (**Appendix-XVI**).

RESOLVED: That Technology Transfer Agreement between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Unique Biotech Ltd. (UBL), Plot No. 2, Phase-2, S.P Biotech Park, Shameerpet, Hyderabad, Telengana, as recommended by the Research Promotion Cell Committee dated 30.10.2017 (Item No. 7), **as per Appendix**, be executed.

MoU between Panjab University & CRIKC and IC-Impacts Centres of Excellence

25. Considered Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XVII**), between Panjab University, Chandigarh & Chandigarh Region Innovation & Cluster (CRIKC) Institutions (Hosted at Panjab University, Department of SAIF/CIL) and IC-Impacts Centres of Excellence (A Networks of Centres of Excellence Hosted at The University of British Columbia, Canada), be executed).

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is an institution by the name of India-Canada Impacts in which major universities and industries of Canada are partners. It is a Canadian University which includes the universities of British Columbia, Simon Fraser, Toronto, McGill. The Canadian Minister for Science, Technology and Innovation is Mr. Bains. So, it is an initiative propelled by him and they have a Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India. The DST contributes the same amount of money which is collected by that institution. So, there is a common fund and the headquarter of this common fund is situated in University of British Columbia and Mr. Nemi Kumar

Banchia, who is a graduate of IIT, Delhi and a Professor of Civil Engineering in Canada is its head. There are so many sponsored projects being funded in India including the one at LPU. So, they have signed a MoU with Panjab University and CRIKC institutions that whoever from these institutions would apply, he/she would get a preferential treatment. Panjab University is the only University in the State sector in India with which directly a MoU has been signed. This was done in a held meeting at Delhi recently where 3 Ministers of Canada had come to Delhi. There was an India-Canada two-day summit in Delhi. This would give them access to lot of institutions in British Columbia. So many ex-students of Panjab University and PEC are the faculty of the University of British Columbia and Simon Fraser. University of British Columbia is in the list of top 50 universities in Times Higher Education ranking and Simon Fraser University has also a very high rank which is premier University of science and technology. This University was established in Canada parallel to the University of British Columbia in 1960s. Both the universities have wonderful campuses. In the central portion of the University of British Columbia, there is ban on driving. Simon Fraser University is on the top of the hill and overlooks the ocean. These are amazing universities and in the long run because there is a huge Indian Diaspora in the University of British Columbia and the Panjab University campus students have an Alumni Association in Surrey. This offers Panjab University Alumni Association to become a Panjab University Alumni Association global. It is a registered society and has contacted the Minister who has agreed to come to the 5th annual meet of Panjab University Campus Alumni Association in Vancouver. So group of Panjab University alumni from England, Australia, east and west coast of America would be going to the annual meet. Whoever is the Vice-Chancellor must go there and he has promised that he would go there in his personal capacity. This also allows Panjab University to eventually create an endowment from the alumni based globally which could help the University in the long run and the IC-Impacts people would help in it. He also shared with the members that the University of Birmingham is setting an India Institute to be inaugurated on 29th January, 2018 where the Indian High Commissioner would be present. The University has also sent him (Vice-Chancellor) an invite to come to Birmingham for the inaugural function. He has to seek the permission of the Chancellor and if permitted, he would go there. So, these are good things. They have put all this information in the application submitted for Institute of Excellence.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu enquired whether there is any limit on the grant to be provided under the MoU.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no such limit and he would give a copy of the annual report to him. It is open to all and even the College faculty could also apply.

RESOLVED: That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh, Chandigarh Region Innovation & Cluster (CRIKC) Institutions (Hosted at Panjab University, Department of SAIF/CIL) and IC-Impacts Centres of Excellence (A Networks of Centres of Excellence Hosted at The University of British Columbia, Canada), **as per Appendix**, be executed.

Minutes dated 11.09.2017 of the Committee regarding conversion of posts of Demonstrators at Dental Institute

26. Considered recommendations dated 11.09.2017 (**Appendix-XVIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to review the recommendations submitted by the said Committee on 05.06.2017 regarding conversion of 9 posts of Demonstrators out of 14 at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, that:-

(i) the following 9 posts of Demonstrators be shifted from Medical to Dental side:

1. Physiology	One
2. Biochemistry	One
3. Anatomy	Three
4. Pathology	One
5. Pharmacology	One
6. Microbiology	Two

(ii) out of 14 posts of Demonstrators (9 posts for dental side and 5 posts on medical side), be approved, with the following qualifications:

Qualifications for 09 posts of Demonstrators (Dental side)	Qualifications for 05 posts of Demonstrators (Medical side)
BDS from a recognized Dental College/Institute with minimum 8 years experience in recognized Dental College/Institute (with certificate of experience)	1. Medical Qualification with minimum eight years teaching experience in a Dental Institute. 2. Dental Qualification i.e. BDS with eight years teaching experience in a Dental Institute.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.06.2017 (Para 25) (**Appendix-XVIII**) had resolved that the minutes of the Committee dated 05.06.2017 constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.03.2017, relating to deferred Item No.9 of the Syndicate meeting dated 20.03.2017, with regard to the request of contractual Lecturers working at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, be approved.

2. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

RESOLVED: That recommendations dated 11.09.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to review the recommendations submitted by the said Committee on 05.06.2017 regarding conversion of 9 posts of Demonstrators out of 14 at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Minutes dated 09.11.2017 of the Committee, to look into the issue of seniority and promotion rules of Lab and Technical cadre

27. Considered minutes dated 09.11.2017 (**Appendix-XIX**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into and decide the inter-se seniority between the applicant who become eligible by counting the service span of Group III and Group IV and the applicant who become eligible by counting the service span of

Group III alone in light of Para 23 of Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 vis-a-vis the promotion rules of Laboratory and Technical Cadre.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.04.2017 (Para 23) (**Appendix-XIX**) has amended the guidelines with regard to span of service for promotion of Laboratory, Technical Staff, from Group III to Group IV.
2. During general discussion (9) (**Appendix-XIX**) in the Syndicate meeting dated 25.06.2017, regarding promotion policy of technical staff, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the screening will be done again by the Committee and this was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 09.11.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into and decide the inter-se seniority between the applicant who become eligible by counting the service span of Group III and Group IV and the applicant who become eligible by counting the service span of Group III alone in light of Para 23 of Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 vis-a-vis the promotion rules of Laboratory and Technical Cadre, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Request dated 11.09.2017 of Ms. Monika Sood to grant permission to her son to attend classes at UILS, PU

28. Considered the request dated 11.09.2017 (**Appendix-XX**) of Ms. Monika Sood, Senior Assistant, Establishment Branch (N.T.), with regard to grant of permission to her son- Mr. Ujjwal Sood, student of 1st semester B.A. LL.B. (Hons.), SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur, to attend classes and semester examination at UILS, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

- NOTE:** 1. The Registrar has observed that he has personally examined her case and find her case to be genuine, she is a sincere and competent official of our University and merits to be considered sympathetically within the existing provisions of PU rules.
2. As desired by the DUI, Professor Navdeep Goyal has opined that “the case is not covered under existing provisions as approved by the Syndicate. A copy of the decision of the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 (Para 39) is enclosed (**Appendix-XX**).
3. The Registrar has further observed that in order to promote welfare of employees we may seek approval of the competent authority on individual merits of the case.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the matter be referred to the Committee already looking into the rules for such cases.

RESOLVED: That request dated 11.09.2017 of Ms. Monika Sood, Senior Assistant, Establishment Branch (N.T.), with regard to grant of permission to her son- Mr. Ujjwal Sood, student of 1st semester B.A. LL.B. (Hons.), SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur, to attend classes and semester examination at UILS, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be referred to the Committee already constituted to look into the rules for such cases.

Mercy request dated 28.09.2017 of Shri Ashutosh, Sr. Assistant, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur

29. Considered mercy request dated 28.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXI**) of Shri Ashutosh, Sr. Assistant, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, in respect of the memorandum issued vide No.11428-29/Estt. dated 01.08.2017 (**Appendix-XXI**) pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 25.06.2017 (Para 33).

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.06.2017 (Para 33) (**Appendix-XXI**) has considered the enquiry report dated 23.11.2015 submitted by Professor R.K. Gupta, Enquiry Officer and resolved that:

- (i) enquiry report dated 23.11.2015, submitted by Professor R.K. Gupta, Enquiry Officer, USOL, P.U. in respect of circumstances in which a sum of Rs.3,31,937/- payable to Ms. Aruna Sud, Deputy Librarian (Retd.), Hoshiarpur was credited in the account of Shri Ashutosh Sharma, Sr. Assistant, Regional Centre Hoshiarpur, as per Appendix, be accepted.
 - (ii) major penalty of "removal from service of the University which does not disqualify from future employment" be imposed upon the delinquent official Shri Ashutosh Sharma, Sr. Assistant, Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.
2. The case of Shri Ashutosh Sharma was discussed by certain Syndics during general discussion (**Appendix-XXI**) in the Syndicate meeting dated 23.07.2017 and the Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into it.
 3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 18) (**Appendix-XXI**) considered the reply dated 10.08.2017 Shri Ashutosh, Sr. Assistant, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, in respect of the memorandum issued vide No.11428-29/Estt. dated 01.08.2017 and resolved that the representation of Mr. Ashutosh, be not accepted.
 4. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXI**).

The Vice Chancellor said that he has made an appeal and asked the members if they want to take a call on it or they would like to defer it to the next meeting.

Some of the members requested that the punishment of major penalty may be converted to minor penalty. After some discussion by the members among themselves, they requested the Vice Chancellor to accept his mercy appeal and a punishment of stoppage of 3 increments be imposed on him to which the Vice Chancellor said 'okay'.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu enquired whether he has made a mercy appeal.

RESOLVED: That mercy request dated 28.09.2017 of Shri Ashutosh, Sr. Assistant, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, **as per Appendix**, be accepted and the major penalty imposed on him be converted to minor penalty and punishment of stoppage of 3 increments be imposed.

Appointment of various Committees

30. To appoint the following Committees for the period noted against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Committee	Enabling Regulations on the subject	Tenure of the Committee
1.	Revising Committee	Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 at page 32, P.U. Calendar, Volume- II, 2007	Calendar year 2018, i.e., 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2018
2.	Regulations Committee	Regulation 23.1 at page 33, P.U. Calendar, Volume- I, 2007	Calendar year 2018, i.e., 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2018
3.	Youth Welfare Committee	Regulation 4 at page 155-56 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007	Two Calendar years, i.e. 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2019
4.	Publication Bureau Committee	Regulations 3.1 and 3.2 at page 179 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007	Two Calendar years, i.e. 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2019

- NOTE:**
1. Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 for composition of Revising Committee along with present membership of the Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2017 to 31.12.2017 is enclosed.
 2. Regulation 23.1 for composition of Regulation Committee along with present membership of the Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2017 to 31.12.2017 is enclosed.
 3. Regulation 4 for composition of Youth Welfare Committee along with present

membership of the Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2017.

4. Regulations 3.1 and 3.2 for composition of Publication Bureau Committee along with present membership of the Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2017.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should form a Committee consisting of Professor Pam Rajput, Dr. Dalip Kumar and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal to suggest the names for forming the Committees.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu suggested that the name of Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma may also be included in the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to appoint the Committees for which Professor Pam Rajput, Dr. Dalip Kumar, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma be requested to suggest the names.

Assignment of Fellows to the Faculties

31. Considered that the following Fellows be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against their names:

1.	Dr. Raj Kumar Chabbewal MLA Village Manjhi P.O. Nare Distt. Hoshiarpur	1. Medical Sciences 2. Languages 3. Business Management and Commerce 4. Pharmaceutical Sciences
2.	Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu MLA 50, Model Gram Ludhiana	1. Medical Sciences 2. Arts 3. Education 4. Engineering & Technology

RESOLVED: That the following Fellows be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against their names in anticipation of approval of Senate:

1.	Dr. Raj Kumar Chabbewal MLA Village Manjhi P.O. Nare Distt. Hoshiarpur	1. Medical Sciences 2. Languages 3. Business Management and Commerce 4. Pharmaceutical Sciences
2.	Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu MLA 50, Model Gram Ludhiana	1. Medical Sciences 2. Arts 3. Education 4. Engineering & Technology

Fee Structure for Panjab University Teaching Departments and Regional Centres

32. Considered minutes dated 07.11.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for working out a road map for rationalization and revision of fee structure, examination fee and all other charges, for P.U. Teaching Departments and its Regional

Centres, for the session 2018-19, to achieve the task of augmenting the resources for Panjab University.

Dr. Dalip Kumar pointed out that at page 11 of the agenda papers, there seems to be no uniformity in all the five points given there. He read out the points which are as under:

1. The Tuition Fee of all self-financing courses (except UIAMS & UIPS-M.Pharm in Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance, M.Pharm in Pharmaceutical Analysis) may be enhanced by 5% for the ongoing students and 10% for the new admissions during the academic session 2018-19 (to be rounded off to the next tens).
2. The Tuition fee of all Traditional/Professional Courses may be enhanced at the rate of 10% with minimum annual increase of Rs.1000/- (to be rounded off to the next tens).
3. The Tuition fee and other charges of all Courses of USOL may also be enhanced at the rate of 10% with minimum annual increase of Rs.1000/- (to be rounded off to the next tens)/
4. The Tuition fee of UIAMS may be enhanced by an amount of Rs.7500/- per annum.
5. The user and maintenance charges of all courses across the board may be enhanced by 10% (to be rounded off to the next tens).

Continuing, Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they should bring the range of hike within 5-10%. In UIAMS, the flat increase in fee of Rs. 7500/- is not fair, they should also think of percentage increase in UIAMS also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this matter was discussed in the Committee. Their fees is already much more i.e. about 2 lakhs. If it is increased even by 5%, there would be much increase. That is why this increase was in a particular figure. Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the traditional courses where the fee is about 4000/- there the increase would not be much.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the increase in the fee should not be more than Rs. 1000/- as the fee has been increased some time ago.

The Vice Chancellor said if the fee is not increased, how they would pay the increased salaries.

Shri Varinder Singh requested to arrange the money from somewhere else.

The Vice Chancellor said that 55% of the expenditure of this University is done with the internal income. He further informed that 80% of the income is being spent on salaries.

Shri Varinder Singh asked as to where they have decreased the expenditure. They have to decrease the expenditure on lectures etc.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have not increased any charges for lectures, they are still paid Rs. 1000/- per lecture.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he does not agree with the increase in fee and stated that his dissent be recorded.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is not fair if they increase minimum Rs. 1000/-.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they should see if they can decrease the expenditure somewhere. They always put the burden on the students.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to increase the projected income of the University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and some other members suggested that they should increase the fee moderately.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should see what was the fee earlier and what increase is being made?

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that when they had increased the fee last time, there was great hue and cry. Then they have to decrease it and they decreased it unilaterally. He said the Government has given Rs. 204 crores to the University.

The Vice Chancellor said, take a decision that there would be no increase in salary in the next twelve months.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Shri Varinder Singh said that they should not burden the student.

The Vice Chancellor said it is wrong to say that entire burden is being put on to the students, the Government is also requested to bear the burden. The Vice-Chancellor said that if the government has promised to give 6% hike in the budget, then they have to increase the fee and allied charges in same proportion. On a question, the Vice Chancellor stated that last year also, they did not withdraw the total increase.

Dr. Subhash Sharma stressed that they should make moderate enhancement in fee. When there is excessive hike, then there are agitations and much time is wasted and ultimately they decrease the fee.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that they should form a Committee to sort out the issue. He said that they could discuss this issue among themselves, but they should keep in view the projected expenditure of the University. They have to meet those figures of the budget which they have already passed. They should keep in mind that they also have to meet that expenditure on salaries, which would increase from next year.

The Vice Chancellor said that the entire Syndicate without the Vice Chancellor or whosoever may like to come, may meet and decide on the issue. The senior most member of the Syndicate may accept the responsibility to do this. He further requested Dr. Rabinder Nath to take up the responsibility to hold the meeting. The Vice Chancellor

further said while resolving this issue, that they should keep this in mind that the University should not face any problem in its smooth functioning.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the University is not running from the revenue collected from the students.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would be surprised to know that when this University was started, the government did not give even a single penny. These are very serious things. The Government did not give any money to run this University.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he (Vice Chancellor) should not worry about the funds as the current financial crunch is short-lived and all problems would be solved in near future. So that which the Vice Chancellor said that, he would be very happy if it happens so.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is shocked to know that their University, even today, is just running according to the Act of 1904, just with some minor changes. When that Act was introduced, they asked to appoint teachers. Their problem is that they created campus at Chandigarh. Had they not created University departments, there would not be any such problem. The expenditure of the University increased only after the creation of campus. The government was giving the salary of only government college teachers. From 1904 till 1947, the University was running in profit. The University went into loss when the second world war ended and then there was inflation. Then examination fee was increased by 15%. That increase was used to pay the enhanced salaries of employees engaged for the conduct of examinations and to 15-20 teachers on the pay rolls of the University. When India became independent, education in India expanded and number of people appearing in the matriculation examination of Panjab University increased. That was the major source of income of Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as more schools were opened, number of students appearing in Matriculation examination increased manifold. There were crores of refugees in Punjab. Punjab University was very liberal to permit writing the Matric examination by appearing as private candidates. Delhi School Board did not give permission to pass the end of school examination by appearing as private candidate. The refugees were scattered at many places. Punjab University was very liberal so that all children could write Matriculation Examination. With this, the University's income kept on increasing. Many new Colleges were opened and accordingly the number of students increased and until 1966, they did not face any problem. When the re-organisation of Punjab was done, they did not suffer any problem because Haryana Govt. opened more colleges and schools. The real problem came for the first time when Shri Bansi Lal issued orders that all the Haryana colleges should be disaffiliated from the Panjab University and the same was ratified by the Centre Govt. When the same was ratified, all income from Haryana Govt. was finished. By then Guru Nanak Dev University had come up in 1969. First, there was an announcement, and then campus was built. When campus was built, recruitment of teachers started. When recruitment of teachers started, the expenditure of Guru Nanak Dev University started to increase. To provide income to the Guru Nanak Dev University (as Haryana had disaffiliated the colleges from Panjab University), Chief Minister of Punjab issued orders that

colleges near Chandigarh i.e. Chandigarh to Patiala and Patiala to Sangrur were disaffiliated from Panjab University and attached to the Punjabi University. This was done to cope with the expenditure of Punjabi University which was increasing day by day as the Punjab Govt. had no money to give to the University. One third of the colleges were attached with the Punjabi University and one third to the Guru Nanak Dev University. Whatever remained was given to the Panjab University. Only Hoshiarpur, Ludhiana and border area of Ferozepur and border area of Rajasthan were left with the Panjab University. College education was not widespread in those areas. So Constituent Colleges were opened. SGPC also did not open colleges in that belt. Some colleges were opened in Amritsar and Jalandhar cities by rich people, which were already the hub of education. Suddenly University's income collapsed and for the first time, financial crisis was experienced in 1976. At that time Professor R.C. Paul was the Vice-Chancellor of the University. He went to Delhi. He was in dilemma as to what to do. At that time the status of Chandigarh was not clear. To avoid the political crisis, Central Govt. said that they will pay 40% share earlier being given by Haryana Govt. The ratio was fixed as 60: 40 and somehow University was managed its affairs. Then in the year 2001, there was deficit of Rs. 49 crores. With the ratio of 60: 40, the share of Punjab came to Rs. 19.36 crore and the remaining was that of U.T. Then Punjab Govt. said that they would pay only that much amount which they were paying till last year, i.e., Rs.16 crore and the share of U.T. was Rs.30-32 crores. The Punjab Govt. gave them a diktat about introduction of self-financing courses and it was not the creation of any Vice-Chancellor to open self-finance courses in the Panjab University. They dictated that Panjab University should open self financing courses. By 1998 when Punjab Technical University had come up, Engineering Colleges were opened in every village of Punjab. The Punjab Government said that since all these managements are running engineering and other courses and plying the buses, Panjab University should also open as Engineering College in Chandigarh for which they also need not ply the buses. Land was lying in Sector 25, and with the help of U.T. administration, the land occupied by slums was got vacated. The U.T. administration helped the Panjab University to open as Engineering College otherwise the U.T. Administration had to bear all the expenditure being incurred. Self-financial Colleges were opened and the fee was fixed Rs.70,000/-. For some years, these courses were in profit because the teachers retired from different Departments were employed in the Engineering College. Initially for engineering, study of physics, chemistry and mathematics is needed. Slowly and slowly the engineering teachers were required. For engineering, persons having M.Tech. qualification were appointed to teach the engineering courses.. All teachers were recruited temporarily and they were not paid salary as per grades. Till to-date they are being paid fixed (basic) salary plus increased D.A. So in the beginning, shortfall of funds was met from the profit of self finance courses. After that sixth Pay Commission came. University pension scheme which was lingering on for the last about 15-20 years was started with the efforts made by PUTA and also Professor Pathak (the then Vice-Chancellor). Notification for Pension was issued. But now the question was as to who would give the money for this scheme as the U.T. declined to give the money. Both the Governments were not ready to pay more money than their share. It is not the fault of the Punjab Govt. only in freezing the grant but U.T. administration is also responsible for the same. When the Task Force visited Panjab University, the U.T. Administration's

contribution in the year 2001 was Rs.32-33 crore as per record. Neither the U.T. nor the Punjab Govt. increased their share, rather the share of Punjab Government which earlier was nearly Rs.19 crores slipped to Rs.16 crores. At the start of 21st century, the share of both the Governments got frozen. Then there was hue and cry regarding the closure of the University. Dr. Manmohan Singh was given another Doctorate degree, though he had already been given one Doctorate degree earlier. He felt that the University where he had taught, the University which used to attract such good students, would close. He took interest and his Cabinet Secretary who was the former Chief Secretary of Punjab, Shri T.K.A. Nair, who was well versed with the matter, and with his intervention, the Task Force visited Panjab University. The present Chairman of AIU was a benevolent guy, who was also in some way involved in the process. With intervention of lots of people, a formula was evolved. It was felt that the University has some income of its own and as per the formula, the deficit would be borne by the Central Government. That was the situation when he arrived as Vice-Chancellor of the University, that time, 400 positions had already been advertised. To fill up 400 positions, how much expenditure would be required, that was part of the budget. If they go back and look up in the University budget, there was huge (projected) deficit of Rs.200 crores. When they demanded so much money, UGC was in a state of shock that what monster, they had taken in. From where they would pay the money? UGC asked the Centre to pay the amount otherwise they would not absorb it. Subsequently, the Central Government asked UGC to estimate the realistic requirements of Panjab University. UGC squeezed them for asking the money for filling 400 posts whereas they could not fill up even 20-30 posts per year. So, the UGC asked the University to ask for the money only for the posts which they could fill up. Only that number of posts should be advertised which they could fill up. Then they got back and started advertising as many posts as that they could fill up.

Principal I.S. Sandhu enquired as to whether they had advertised the existing posts or some additional posts were also added.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they informed the Centre that they had 1510 sanctioned posts. Then the UGC inquired as to from whom the University had got the sanction for 1510 posts. They were told that Syndicate accorded sanction. But Syndicate has no authority to sanction the posts. Since there was no money, the UGC asked to review the number of posts. The Manpower of Committee PU approved 1378 posts in place of 1510. Centre okayed the 1378 posts. At least some posts were reduced. The UGC accepted to pay the expenditure on 1378 posts of teachers and for non-teaching staff it would be 1.1 times that of the teachers and the remaining expenditure would be arranged by the University itself. Today that is the situation. Out of 1378 posts, 1125 posts are notionally filled up against which the salaries are being paid. The Government asked that before filling any further post, they have to seek permission from them otherwise the Government would not accord permission. As regards the non-teaching posts, they are not giving permission to fill up any officer's posts, such as DCDC post, etc. When they demand for sanction of a high paying position/post, Centre does not give sanction. If Centre Govt. sanctions the post, then expenditure on that post have to borne by the Central Govt. Whole of the matter has been frozen. So as on date, they could not advertise any position

and the people are retiring. When the teachers would retire, then teachers would be fewer. But number of students would remain the same. Teacher student ratio would get disturbed. If the teacher-student ratio would be disturbed, teachers would not be able to do research. The Central Government says that if the University demands grant from them, their performance should be at par with that of the central institutions where every teacher must publish a research paper in a year. In their campus real research paper average per teacher is 0.3. He suggested that they have to take the research paper average per teacher from 0.3 to 1; student teacher ratio has to be increased. If they would not do, in every ranking, they would be on lower side. So they are sinking on the academic output parameters. They have no money. What would they do? Situation is very serious.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the Vice-Chancellor had been working hard and there is great stress on him.

The Vice-Chancellor said okay, for society, he could take the stress, but the problem should be solved. Getting rid of him is not the solution to the University problem. He further said just to take cognizance of this as they are contributing very little to save the University. If they would not do so, then the pressure be created on the Central Govt. to promise to pay Rs.100 crore per year for Institute of eminence for which the University is submitting the proposal. While sharing the salient feature of the proposal of Institute of Excellence, they have to see their weaknesses. Their weaknesses include worsened teacher-student ratio, less publication output, inadequate placement of the students. How to repair all these weaknesses? In any way, they need teachers. Their proposal says that all their vacant positions would be filled up by them via paying salary like the Govt. of India pays to the Inspire faculty which is paid Rs.75,000/- per month for five years. Phase I of the Institute of Eminence is five years, Phase II is again five years and phase III is for five years. If they achieve the target for the first phase, only then they could step into the next phase and so on. So the proposal is that they would induct tenure faculty as that of Govt. of India's Inspire Faculty. Faculty is taken as per the project requirement. From the day they get project, the very next day they recruit any person. For example, they recruit someone for a period of 4 years and 364 days because in the first phase review is after five years. They could give a tenure appointment to these people against their vacant positions. As they recruit the faculty, student teacher ratio would improve. When teacher-student ratio will improve then 300 Ph.D.s would be awarded and subsequently 300 research paper would be published in each session. At least one research paper should be written in some reputed journal in Science faculty and one chapter for some book by Humanities faculty. Two research papers are a must for Ph.D. For writing a research paper to be published in a journal, a teacher might be sanctioned furlough once in three years. Furlough means less teaching load so that he/she could write paper. When such a teacher is on furlough, guest faculty might be paid against his/her post. So their proposal is that some new labs and new courses be opened and seats in old traditional courses like M.A., M.Sc. in the Panjab University be shrunk, as the same courses are now being introduced in colleges at Chandigarh and other places. In place of that, Integrated Master Ph.D. Programme courses should be started so that students are research oriented. In Master courses number of student would not be reduce, if number of students

reduced, then the ratio would be disturbed. It would be re-distributed in a manner that every students who comes in the campus for study, when leaves the campus, he/she must have at least some research on his/her part. Until they could not do that in a focussed way, they would be failing in all parameters. New courses to be started would be self-sustaining or partially self-sustaining so that the University's income is not reduced. It is very complicated. He was so worried because the financial model was to be filled in columns. He was very anxious about the model. But FDO worked very hard and he has made a convincing financial model.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he has prepared it very well. It is very difficult to regroup the languages and humanities.

The Vice-Chancellor said that grouping has to be done everywhere. The proposal seems little lofty but they have to put in something lofty otherwise they would not be able to do anything. Many faculties have worked. He did not so much time at his disposal to check every line of the proposal. But conceptually that is their proposal for Institute of Excellence. Though for Institute of Excellence they (MHRD) have invited proposals from 134 universities, but they would give such a status only to 10 universities and their chance is 10% out of 134 govt. universities.

RESOLVED: That the Syndicate members under the Chairmanship of Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma might discuss the issue among themselves and submit their suggestions to be considered in the next meeting of the Syndicate, while keeping in view the need to enhance the internal income of Panjab University commensurate with the expected increase in annual maintenance expenditure of the University, which is largely spent on salaries and the infrastructural maintenance and essential needs of the University.

Grant of permanent affiliation to Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce and Management, Village Jhande (Ludhiana)

33. Considered if, permanent affiliation, be granted to Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce and Management, Village. Jhande, P.O. Tharike, Distt. Ludhiana, for (i) B.Com. (Three Unit) and BBA (Two Unit).

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 01/15/28 & 29.05.2016 (Para 74) (**Appendix-XXII**) considered the matter relating to grant of permanent affiliation to the said College for B.Com. course (3 units) and BBA course (2 unit) w.e.f. the session 2015-16 and resolved that the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item 56.

Accordingly, the Committee constituted under item No.56 met on 27.06.2016 under the Chairmanship of Shri Ashok Goyal and decided that the College be asked to send the certain documents (**Appendix-XXII**). The College was requested to sent the required document vide letter dated 01.07.2016 (**Appendix-XXII**). The College vide letter dated 28.07.2016 and 14.12.2016 (**Appendix-XXII**) sent the reply in response to letter dated 01.07.2016.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 vide Para 7, 8 & 9 **(Appendix-XXII)** has authorized Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of the Syndicate, form a affiliation Committee consisting of members of Syndicate who are authorized to take decision regarding affiliation of the Colleges on behalf of the Syndicate for the session 2017-18.
3. The Affiliation Committee constituted for the session 2017-18 visited the College on 25.07.2017 and recommended that permanent affiliation be granted to Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce and Management for the above said course **(Appendix-XXII)**.
4. The Affiliation Committee in its meeting dated 31.08.2017 **(Appendix-XXII)** considered the case (Sr. No.2) along with the cases of certain other Colleges and recommended that the report submitted by the Inspection Committee dated 25.07.2017, be put up to the Syndicate.
5. An office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XXII)**

RESOLVED: That permanent affiliation, to Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce and Management, Village. Jhande, P.O. Tharike, Distt. Ludhiana, be granted.

**Minutes dated
27.10.2017 of the
College Development
Council**

34. Considered minutes dated 27.10.2017 **(Appendix-XXIII)** of the College Development Council.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the Board of Studies in Education has sent a proposal to conduct a seminar to sensitize about the CBCS. He requested that since the funds are available, an amount of Rs.1 lac be sanctioned for this purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the funds are available, the amount could be sanctioned.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that what Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal is saying is right but the contribution of Education Colleges to the fund is just about 10%. Degree Colleges contribute a lot to this fund and should be given more funds for holding seminars, etc. Since the funds for holding the seminars to Degree Colleges is just about Rs.30,000/-, it would not be justified to give Rs.1 lac to the Education Colleges for this purpose.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the month of July a decision was taken that there would be regional level seminars at Ludhiana, Hoshiarpur on sensitization about CBCS. He suggested that instead of allocating an amount of Rs.1 lac to one College, a specialized programme for Education Colleges be conducted. If they allocate

Rs.1 lac to a College, the other Colleges would also make such a demand.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the decision was taken to hold seminars to sensitize the Principals and the staff about CBCS at Chandigarh, Hoshiarpur, Ludhiana and Muktsar. The Principal of the Education Colleges could also participate in the seminars.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that such seminars have not been conducted till date whereas the decision had been taken about a year ago.

Principal I.S. Sandhu also endorsed the viewpoint of Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal.

It was informed (by Dean College Development Council) that they have started the process and the first meeting was chaired by Professor A.K. Bhandari on 17th November, 2017 at Chandigarh which was attended by the Principals and the Nodal Officers for CBCS. The other meetings are scheduled to be held at the three regional centres between January 8 to 25, 2018. The expert who attended the meeting at Chandigarh would go to these Centres to make aware about the CBCS. Principal Sidhu had suggested to put the names and profile of these experts on the Panjab University (Dean College Development Council) website so that the Principals could contact the experts.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that the financial subsidy for attending seminars within India be increased from Rs.10,000/- to Rs.15,000/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the amount be enhanced to Rs.15,000/-.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 27.10.2017 of the College Development Council, **as per Appendix**, be approved with the modification that the financial subsidy available (under Item No.2) to each applicant for attending seminars within India be enhanced from Rs.10,000/- to Rs.15,000/-.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Dean College Development Council/Vice-Chancellor will allocate required funds for conducting workshops for implementation of CBCS of Education Colleges to Dean, Education.

Minutes dated 30.08.2017 of the Committee to work out the Regulation regarding merit of M.E./M.Tech. Modular Programmes

35. Considered minutes dated 30.08.2017 (**Appendix-XXIV**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to work out the Regulation regarding merit of M.E./M.Tech. Modular Programmes.

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

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 30.08.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to work out the Regulation regarding merit of M.E./M.Tech. Modular Programmes, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Condonation of delay
in submission of Ph.D.
thesis by Mr. Stanzin
Dawa**

36. Considered if, delay of 2 years, 10 month and 12 days beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Stanzin Dawa, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, be condoned w.e.f. 18.02.2015 and he be allowed to submit his thesis by 30.12.2017, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons as mentioned in his request dated nil (**Appendix-XXV**).

- NOTE:** 1. Mr. Stanzin Dawa was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Arts on 19.02.2009. He was granted extension of three years i.e. upto 18.02.2015 by the DUI. He was required to submit his thesis upto 18.02.2015.
2. The extract from the clause 17 of Revised Ph.D. Guidelines, duly approved by the Syndicate/Senate is reproduced below:

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

3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXV**).

RESOLVED: That delay of 2 years, 10 month and 12 days beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Stanzin Dawa, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, be condoned w.e.f. 18.02.2015 and he be allowed to submit his thesis by 30.12.2017, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons as mentioned in his request dated nil (**Appendix-XXV**).

**Implementation of
letters issued in view
of Syndicate decisions**

37. Considered if letter Nos. 12473-772 dated 14.08.2013 and 12155-454 dated 11.07.2017 (**Appendix-XXVI**) issued, in view of Syndicate decisions dated 27.07.2013 (Para 46) and 20.03.2017 (Para 7), respectively, to the Colleges and Teaching Departments and Regional Centre of the University, be implemented, pursuant discussion held in Senate meeting dated 10.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXVI**).

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.07.2013/13.08.2013 (Para 46) (**Appendix-XXVI**) considered the issue regarding review equivalence already granted to the examinations conducted by the CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya in view of recommendations of the Hon'ble Governor of Meghalaya, as informed by the Principal Secretary to the Governor vide Letter No. GSMG/CMJU/82/2009/Vol. II/493 dated 12.06.2013, that the CMJ University, Shillong (Meghalaya) be dissolved in terms of the Section 48 of the C.M.J. University Act, 2009 and resolved that the degree/s awarded by C.M.J. University, Shillong (Meghalaya), irrespective of year of award of degree, which are placed or are to be placed before the Registrar or Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate after 12.06.2013, be not granted equivalence.
2. Accordingly letter No. 12473-772 dated 14.08.2013 was issued.
3. One Mr. Akashdeep Singh sought admission in M.A. Social Work during the session 2016-2017 on the basis of having passed B.A. Examination from Eastern Institute of Integrated Learning in Management (EILM) University, Sikkim which was established by an Act of State Legislature of Sikkim as a Private University and was empowered to award degrees as specified under Section 22 of the UGC Act through its main campus in regular mode with the approval of Statutory Bodies/Councils, whichever is required. The matter was placed before the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 (**Appendix-XXVI**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred and the item along with the matter related to CMJ university be also placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.
4. Shri Vinod Kumar, Assistant Professor, Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City vide representation (**Appendix-XXVI**) written that decision of the Syndicate dated 27.07.2017 (Para 46) is completely illegal and needs to be reviewed. The Vice-Chancellor passed orders that Dean, Law, Chairperson, Department of Laws, Syndicate members from Law faculty may study/examine the request of Shri Vinod Kumar and put up a note.

Accordingly, a Committee constituted by the Dean, Faculty of Law in its meeting held on 13.02.2017 authorized the Dean faculty of Law and Chairperson, Department of Laws to prepare a detailed note on behalf of the Committee. The detailed note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).

5. The matter was again placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.03.2017 (Para 7), along with the request of Shri Vinod Kumar. A copy of the decision of the Syndicate is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).
6. **As per Sr. No. 11 of chapter XLVII at page 670 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, the power of granting recognition and equivalence of examination vests with the Syndicate which stands delegated to the Vice-Chancellor.**
7. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the matter was discussed in brief in the Senate and that was decided that Shri Ashok Goyal would meet the Vice-Chancellor and would hand over some paper to him (the Vice-Chancellor).

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the Senate meeting it is recorded that the item would be brought back in the Syndicate. So the item has been brought back to the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he wants to clear two things. First thing is that this item was resolved in a very clear manner after seeking the opinion of Dean, Law and Chairperson.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item has again been brought to the Syndicate so that frequent ruckus is not created in the meetings of the Syndicate. He had a long meeting with the Controller of Examinations. That matter is settled. There is nothing remaining in it. Since there is nothing remaining in it but in the proceedings of the Senate meeting it stands written that matter would be brought in the meeting of the Syndicate. This matter would not go to the Senate because Senate has no authority on it. Thus that matter has been brought to the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is repeating all the matter and he wants to clear as he was involved in the committee, he remembers that in 2013 Meghalaya Governor de-recognised CMJ University. Later on after de-recognition it was realised that degrees which are already issued, what would happen to them. Many allegations were made. U.G.C. said that they would verify the degrees and so on. Universities never close in that way. CMJ University went to the Court. Court has written so strong against the Governor that he has not seen the merits of the CMJ University. The court termed it as a vendetta and dismissed the orders of the Governor. After that, they went to the Supreme Court. The State Govt. withdrew the case from the Supreme Court. As such as on today legally the CMJ University stands. When the University is in

existence and is legal till then their degrees are valid. So Syndicate had passed it clearly rather clear instructions might be sent because old decision of the Syndicate has been nullified as it has no legal sanctity today and new decision taken might be sent clearly that CMJ University degrees are valid. As regards EIILM, EIILM is derecognised now. So its degrees are not valid.

The Vice-Chancellor said in between they did not grant admission to the students of CMJ University for one year.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, that was a situation prevailing in the year 2013.

The Vice-Chancellor said later on whatever he could understand and go through the papers there is no issue left. But again and again it is said and presented as if some members of the Senate are being favoured. The Vice-Chancellor asked the Controller of Examinations to tell him whatever he had talked to him (COE).

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that he has read it thoroughly and now the case for consideration at page no. 104 does not relate to CMJ and EIILM University. They have some students. They have to confirm the admission of Mr. Akashdeep Singh and there is no issue at all. They are only considering that admission. They have not de-recognised all the courses of EIILM University. They have de-recognised only BCA, MBA and B.A. Hospitality courses of IILM University where as remaining courses of EIILM University are recognised. A table has been drawn on page no. 104 and that is as per the requirement of the Registrar indicating how many students admitted in the 2012-13 and 2013-14. The table is provided there. Now there is case of Mr. Akashdeep Singh who has done B.A. from EIILM, has sought admission in M.A. Social Work.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they have been given to understand that EILLM University is not being considered anywhere. They have received a notification from the University office not to consider the degrees of that university from 2014 onwards. That issue should not come repeatedly in the meeting which creates humiliation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter has been placed before the Syndicate as it is written in the minutes that it has to go back to the Syndicate.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that Shri Ashok Goyal says repeatedly that degrees have been cancelled. If these degrees are being cancelled and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Court has reprimanded, if these documents attached are then it would be proper.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that all related papers are attached herewith.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they are considering the degrees upto 2015. Why they are not considering the degrees after 2015. They have to decide the issue once and for all so that it might not crop up again and again. If the degrees are not being considered after 2015, they have to quote the reason. He has already spoken to DCDC regarding that issue. Similar cases have already

been done. That issue has been discussed with Principal Josan also. Some cases are held up. He asked Why these were held up.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there are cases of two colleges from Ludhiana. These cases are pending from the last three years which are of similar nature. The question is that if they have resolved similar cases, why these cases are pending. Today they are talking about the Senate and the society that is very important if these cases are selected through their University panel, why they have not approved so far. The students have given their representations a many times to the Vice-Chancellor. But they have not been answered

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that there should be proper guidelines.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the way out of that is they are going to meet again. Dean College Development Council would sit and prepare the detailed report and mention the cogent reason against the cases which are not to be approved.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that UGC de-recognised CMJ and EILLM Universities and after that UGC recognised both the universities. This can be cleared whether these are on list of the UGC website. It might be checked from website of the UGC and not from the list of fake universities. If the same are on website then they could agree.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that there were two issues. First issue was to close the university, it was told to complete the process and proceed again in the matter. Another was to de-recognise the degrees issued by the university. University demanded representation from the students. Supreme Court had said that after getting representation, sympathetically consider and decide. After getting representation from the students Govt of Meghalaya de-recognised the degrees and conveyed the students accordingly. Govt. of Meghalaya issued the letters to the students. That issue did not come in the High Court. Only dissolution of University issue came in the University. De-recognition of degrees issue did not come in the High Court. That has to be checked why Meghalaya Govt. de-recognised the degrees of CMJ University and clarification be sought from Meghalaya Govt.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the letter has been withdrawn. That is the truth.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he is talking in favour of the candidates. Let him complete. They should write to the Meghalaya Govt. asking whether they have de-recognised the CMJ University's degrees and withdraw the letter. When the information is received from the Meghalaya Govt., the same should be placed before the Syndicate to resolve the issue permanently. Otherwise this matter would come in the Syndicate again and again.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that in November 2013 and January 2014 two show cause notices were served by the Governor of Meghalaya to the CMJ University about the malfunctioning and maladministration of the University. After that, in March 2013 Governor of Meghalaya who is Visitor and Chancellor,

he ordered under Section 48 of the CMJ University Act, 2009 that University stands dissolved. CMJ University Vice-Chancellor filed an application in the High Court stating that it is injustice. The order of the Chancellor, i.e., Governor of Meghalaya was quashed by the High Court and said that Governor could not do whatever he did. The Governor could de-recognise a degree but Governor could not dissolve the University. That was done. At the same time, Governor of Meghalaya and State of Meghalaya went for appeal in the double bench. Within that time, Director of Higher Education and Technical Education circulated an order to all the students that they are restricted to get admission in the CMJ University. Again CMJ University went for contempt of the Court under Section 32 and CWP 19 contempt notice. That order was withdrawn. As Principal Josan has said admissions were re-started. By the time State went for SLP in the Supreme Court which was never listed. When SLP listed in the Supreme Court and hearing started, at that time the State Govt. withdrew the case. As Dr. Subhash Sharma said that dissolution part stands corrected that the dissolution was wrong. Second issue which Dr. Subhash Sharma is saying that Govt. of Meghalaya has ordered that all students/stakeholders should apply to the University to revalidate their degrees. They have to get the details of that orders. Till that time admissions were withheld and degrees were not verified. Whosoever applied, they were issued letters through registered letters and they applied to the CMJ University which were accordingly validated. The students seeking admissions, who have not revalidated degrees; they could seek the status/details from the University. They could confirm the validity of Dr. Dalip's case and other cases with the CMJ University.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the case he is talking, the degree is verified.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that many students have been issued provisional degrees.

Principal B.C. Josan said that students have original degree with them.

It was informed (by Controller of Examinations) that in between Syndicate had taken a decision that those students who have passed out from CMJ University, might submit an affidavit. With regard to the query of Shri Ashok Goyal, he has represented to the Vice-Chancellor through an email. On the basis of that email, they have taken an extended affidavit that those students who have passed from CMJ University whether they consider their degrees as valid. Mr. Mandeep Josan has given us the affidavit whereas Mr. Gagandeep has not submitted.

Principal B.C. Josan said that Mr. Gagandeep is on leave.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they have procured the affidavit. That is fine. On behalf of the affidavit, they should write a letter to the CMJ University asking for the validation of the degrees. When they would receive a reply, the same could be kept for consideration of the Syndicate.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the students have original degree with them. If they wish, they could see.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he has original degree with him. If he goes for a job, his degree would be verified from the University.

Principal B.C. Josan informed that a student studying in Govt. College, Sector 11 has asked for validation of his degree under the RTI Act from the CMJ University and the same was received after validation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that (Mr. Ashok Goyal) contention is that candidates were informed that their degrees are invalid and the candidates are hiding the information. The point is that it is just an accusation.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if they send a letter to the CMJ University asking that these degrees are valid or not. The reply would be received from CMJ University that they verify the degrees. In their University many people send its degrees for verification. When they go for service somewhere, their degrees are verified. What is problem in doing verification?

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that CMJ and EILLM Universities might be got checked from the UGC.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that there is public notice that EILLM University has been shut down.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that there was such a student in his college and they had returned his fees.

Most of the members were of the opinion that degrees might be verified.

The Vice-Chancellor asked whether they are accepting the degrees of students who have passed out from CMJ University or not till date.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have to.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if it is so, then a notice must go to all the colleges what the University is doing in this case.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the degrees be got verified from the University by sending two officers from the University to CMJ University otherwise they would be held responsible.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that a letter might be sent to the U.G.C.

Some members said that the degrees should be got verified.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they have already verified.

Principal Hardaljit Singh Gosal asked if the UGC has recognised the CMJ University. The website of the U.G.C. must be seen.

Principal B.C. Josan said that CMJ University has been displayed on the UGC website.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no reply would be received from UGC. Non-receipt of reply should not be taken as 'by default'.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he has a request that degrees might be verified as this is a simple procedure otherwise later on unnecessary issues would arise.

Principal B.C. Josan said that students who had provisional degrees, again they applied for degrees. They went there and received their degrees personally.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he agreed with it but they should get the degrees verified and that would be fine.

Principal B.C. Josan said that they should read the orders of the Chief Justice of High Court in this regard.

Most of the members were of the opinion that degrees might be verified to which the Vice-Chancellor agreed.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the orders of the High Court are available at page 97.

Principal Hardaljit Singh Gosal said that at Page 97 is an application of Mr. Vinod Kumar from Dev Samaj College. He has written the application.

Principal B.C. Josan said judgement is also attached with the application. The judgement is with the University.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) said that the said judgement has been delivered by the Court in case No. CWP 177 of 2015.

Members were of the opinion that degrees might be got verified so that nobody would get a chance to complain. The problem would be permanently solved.

Principal B.C. Josan said that there nobody stops from asking question.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if the degrees are got verified, then they would have a letter of verification, then there would be no issue.

Principal B.C. Josan said that they constituted the committee. The Committee has verified. Do they not have faith in the committee?

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if they get the degrees verified, then what is the harm?

Principal B.C. Josan said that there is no harm. But the matter would linger on unnecessarily. He has no objection for verification of the degrees.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said if they verify the degrees from the CMJ University then how the validity would be proved that

these degrees are valid or not, as the degrees have already been issued by the University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that verification process could take time from six months to one year. Till then controversy would remain. If the issue has already been examined by a Committee, then why they are repeating this exercise.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that even after getting the verifications done, the objections are being raised. That is the problem.

Principal B.C. Josan said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has raised objections many times but till date has not submitted the related paper to the Vice-Chancellor.

Principal Hardiljit Gosal said that why this item has been sent to the Senate.

Principal B.C. Josan said that this item should not have been brought to the Syndicate as it has already approved it many a times.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is not true. It is recorded in the minutes that the matter would be brought back.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the verification could be done. He has no objection to that.

Members were of the opinion that the degrees should be verified.

Professor Pam Rajput said that the matter should not come again and again.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to take the decision. He does not want to call him (Shri Ashok Goyal) because he does not want to have verbal dual over this issue. He had asked for all the concerned facts and was convinced that till now all those cases where approval has been granted are based on solid grounds. Now the issue is that there are some approvals which are pending. Cases of approvals which are pending should be attended to. That is what he had said to sit with him and see that before the next sitting tell him whose approval should have been granted but are pending. After that, if some approval has to be kept pending, reasons should be given as why it is to be kept pending. In the meanwhile there is another issue that his (Shri Ashok Goyal) contention is that candidates had applied and candidates have been told that their degrees are not valid. The original degree is not with the candidate. He claim to have the document which was a photostat copy and how the same could be got verified. He says that the candidate is hiding that information. As far as records are concerned, candidates have not hidden anything. That is an accusation.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said if they ask from CMJ University whether they have issued or not. After the reply from the University, the matter would be closed.

The Vice-Chancellor said okay, send the degrees for verification and the UGC would only tell about the status of the University and nothing else.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they should not wait for the preparation of the Minutes. A letter must be sent for verification.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that letter would be sent tomorrow.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not call him (Shri Ashok Goyal) because calling him means that he would come and give a story like Vice-Chancellor has done this and that, etc., etc. He is tired of these accusations and continuous insinuation against the office of the Vice-Chancellor that the Vice-Chancellor did not reply this or that. How many things he could answer? Everyone says that as per the Calendar the Vice-Chancellor should reply within one month but the Calendar also says that dignity of the Vice-Chancellor must be preserved. Does the Calendar say that any Senator could abuse the Vice-Chancellor in any way. They could oust him. He has done lot of work for this University. He is tired of such insinuations and baseless accusations against the officers of the University including him. All of them (Syndicate Member) are accused. They are part of the coterie. They are eating out of my hands. What is this happening in the University? Look at the academic performance of the University. He does not blame his teaching colleagues, what could they do, like doing teaching load and other things. They do not have enough time. For one paper per teacher they are being compared with JNU, look at the time a teacher has at his disposal in JNU for research vis-a-vis time available to the teachers of Panjab University. Some of them might be loitering around here and there. However, a large number of them do not actually have time to sit down and do serious research. When some serious research is sent to some serious journal, paper could be returned three times. Again and again replies would have to be written. So they typically send the paper to a journal from where serious referee report(s) do not come. Few colleagues should sit with the Controller of Examinations and resolve the issue. Original degrees would be obtained, if necessary, let a candidate whose degree is verified and an official of the University would go and get the same done. That is both in the interest of the candidate as well as the University to resolve the issue and the University would not be defamed. So many people are dependent on the efficient working of the University, like, employees of the University, Colleges which are affiliated to the University. If University is defamed, then the students' degrees would get a bad name because their colleges are affiliated with this University. It would be said that these degrees are from a university where frauds are going on. If some student of Punjab is wanting to immigrate to Australia or Canada, it could be said that Panjab University is University of frauds; that student would not get the job. For them they have to protect the image of the University. Let them sort out this issue once for all as it is a very minor thing. Why Panjab University should suffer because of CMJ and EIILM. If anybody raises that issue in the meeting of Senate to be held on 16th December, 2017, he would not allow any discussion on the issue. Till the matter is subjudice, he would not allow further accusations on the floor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they have any input about the same, they would provide.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they could not complete the old Senate meeting agenda on 16th, then when they would hold next meeting of the Senate. Whole process could not be choked and keep on waiting that new Vice-Chancellor would come then all things would be done. New Vice-Chancellor would also be drowned in the past controversies.

RESOLVED: That the College Branch will check that the name of CMJ University exists in the list of approved universities by UGC from UGC website. The degrees of the students, who have applied for any job or applied/admitted in any course in the University and its affiliated Colleges, issued by the CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya be got verified by writing to the said University.

**Resolution proposed
by Professor Rajesh
Gill and Professor J.K.
Goswamy**

38. Considered the following Resolution proposed by Professor (Mrs.) Rajesh Gill and Professor J.K. Goswamy, Fellows:

“Webcasting of all the proceedings of Senate, Syndicate and Board of Finance be implemented for complete transparency in governance and these may also be posted on the web portal for an easy access to all stakeholders. Further, the DVDs/Audios of proceedings of all meetings, which are videographed/audio-recorded, should be supplied to any teacher on his/her request immediately.”

EXPLANATION:

In the recent past, there has been a strong demand from the teachers at Panjab University, to implement transparency in the functioning and governance of the University. It is generally argued that if Parliamentary proceedings can be telecast live, why not the proceedings of the Syndicate, Senate Board of Finance etc., where all important policy decisions regarding the University are taken amidst vibrant discussions and dialogue.

Moreover, the University teachers are underrepresented in these governing bodies and that makes it all the more pertinent that these teachers at least are in the knowhow of the manner in which decisions are taken concerning them and their professional career, in these meetings.

PUTA Executive in its meeting held on 15.11.2017 passed this Resolution unanimously.

- NOTE:** 1. A copy of resolution proposed by Professor (Mrs.) Rajesh Gill and Professor J.K. Goswamy, Fellows enclosed (**Appendix-XXVII**).
2. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVII**)

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that what stand they have taken.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the stand they have taken is that they are already providing video recording and they have already decided that Syndicate's meetings would not be web-casting at all. Senate meeting are already being held in front of Press. There is no need of webcasting of Senate meetings. Senate meetings are already in front of Press. There is no need of webcasting of Senate as some student sitting in the hostel sees the webcasting as to what is happening in the Senate. That is also not correct. Parliament is something else. Firstly, the Senate is presided over by somebody who is executive thus he is presiding over. In the meeting of Senate who is presided over, is so called person whom they want to attack, has no candidate in the Senate. Everybody is representing some constituency.

RESOLVED: That the resolution proposed by Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor J.K. Goswamy be not accepted.

MoU between Panjab University and Self Employed Women's Association

39. Considered if, Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XXVIII**), between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Self Employed Women's Association, Bharat Concerning Cooperation Towards Women's Empowerment, be executed.

RESOLVED: That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Self Employed Women's Association, Bharat Concerning Cooperation Towards Women's Empowerment, **as per Appendix**, be executed.

Representation dated 04.12.2017 of Ms. Muskaan Verma student of B.A. LL.B Law five years integrated course PURC, Hoshiarpur

42. Considered representation dated 04.12.2017 (**Appendix-XXIX**) of Ms. Muskaan Verma D/o Shri Ajay Verma, student of B.A. LL.B Law five years integrated course PURC, Hoshiarpur, with regard to attending the classes of 3rd semester in UILS, P.U., Chandigarh, pursuant to the orders dated 28.11.2017 in CWP No. 2104 of 2017 (**Appendix-XXIX**) passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court.

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

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that a representation has been received by the Registrar. As per orders of the Judge, they have to take a decision within one month.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that Court has allowed the benefit of Single Girl Child. The student higher in the merit has requested for the benefit. Therefore, they should consider the request.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is done.

RESOLVED: That pursuant to the orders dated 28.11.2017 in CWP No. 2104 of 2017 (**Appendix-XXIX**) passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, the request made in the representation dated 04.12.2017 (**Appendix-XXIX**) of Ms. Muskaan Verma D/o Shri Ajay Verma, student of B.A. LL.B Law five years integrated course PURC, Hoshiarpur, be accepted.

**Minutes dated
17.11.2017 of the
Committee regarding
compassionate
appointments**

45. Considered minutes dated 17.11.2017 (**Appendix-XXX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds.

RESOLVED: That the minutes dated 17.11.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would come back to the rest of items in the next meeting.

General Discussion

(1) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he had earlier raised the issue of Research Centre for Dev Samaj College of Education, Sector 36, Chandigarh. The College was denied for Research Centre by the University. On the asking of the Vice-Chancellor, the proposal for Research Centre was again sent to the University. He has come to know that proposal submitted by College has been sent to the Department of Education, Panjab University. Again the Department has taken its earlier stand of denying the approval of Research Centre.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into the report and would give reply.

(2) Dr. Rabinder Nath raised another issue about the complaint of Mr. Amit Joshi. He wanted to know that report has been received or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would hand over the same when received.

(3) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that issue is of general interest but they are interconnected with it. He requested that they might show their concern for the change of name of Dyal Singh Trust or College, Delhi. Shri Dyal Singh Majithia has lot of contribution for education and Panjab University. They might show their concern that keeping in view his contribution, his name, legacy and contribution might be kept intact.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him share with them, today Governor came to the University and a Press Conference was organised in Chandigarh. The host was The Tribune Trust. He shared about Shri Dyal Singh Majithia on the platform. It was in the yesterday's newspaper that contribution of Shri Dyal Singh Majithia for the Panjab University does not stand recognised by the Panjab University itself. He started The Tribune newspaper to give directions to the Panjab University. Why did he start The Tribune? He started The Tribune because the British wanted to use education to source out people who will help them to govern India. All over there was campaign of University. Shri Dyal Singh Majithia was the first person who saw the potential of higher education to get the power or the authority of

governing India in the hands of the educated people of India and get rid of British. He saw it when Indian National Congress was not constituted/formed. Indian National Congress was constituted in 1885 but The Tribune was started on 2nd February, 1881. It was a weekly paper in English. So Shri Dyal Singh Majithia tried to influence the people who could read English about the view which is independent of the views that they publish in the Civil and Military Gazette. He had that foresight that the leaders would come out from the higher education of Punjab, they would be able of the same calibre as the leaders coming out from higher education in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. As the three universities emphasized on English, science and technology, he argued that the Panjab University would not be for oriental studies, it would be a university of modern science. Shri Dyal Singh Majithia died in 1898. Till then The Tribune paper did not come daily. Tribune was coming still four times a week. Shri Dyal Singh Majithia made a Will and created governance structure for The Tribune which was considered the most ideal at that time, having trustees, trustees which were so eminent, trustees which would protect the dreams of Shri Dyal Singh Majithia. Prof. Ruchi Ram Sahni became the life trustee after he retired from the service from the Govt. College at the age of 55. Sh. Ruchi Ram Sahni retired in 1918 and after that he became the life trustee. He remained life trustee till 1948. There was once a long dispute, thereafter five members came in the Trust in place of earlier three. Even today there are five members in The Tribune Trust. In the past when some trustee died, then another trustee was appointed in his place in the Trust. But, now trustees are getting changed in between. Governor N.N. Vohra has taken over the Chair of The Tribune Trust. So they should appeal to Governor N.N. Vohra keeping in view stature of The Tribune Trust and Shri Dyal Singh Majithia's contribution to the national life, as Shri Dyal Singh Majithia contribution in starting the Tribune paper is just not for Punjab, but for the country. If the name of Dyal Singh Majithia is removed from the College (in Delhi), then his symbol for contribution to the national life would get compromised. So the name of Shri Dyal Singh Majithia College should not be changed. In fact, they should get a plaque created in Dyal Singh Majithia College where his contributions to the Panjab University should be recorded. Dyal Singh Majithia College has come out in Delhi only after the shifting of Camp College from Delhi to Panjab University, Chandigarh, which is now Evening College. He recalled that he had suggested how to resurrect the contribution of Shri Dyal Singh Majithia to the Panjab University and to the national life. Sometime ago, Justice Sodhi had told him that The Tribune has set aside some money to create a Tribune Cultural Centre in Chandigarh. He had proposed that they create Tribune Cultural Centre within the premises of Panjab University Alumni Association land of five acres and let the Tribune Cultural Centre and P.U. Alumni Association (existing on the five acre land that the University has given) be merged as India International Centre like entity in Chandigarh and this entity should carry the name of Shri Dyal Singh Majithia. So that is the way to recognise the contribution of Shri Dyal Singh Majithia to higher education. According to him, he wanted to use the

higher education to have the governance of India in the hands of Indians because he was the grandson of a General of Ranjit Singh, Lehna Singh. He was not born in Punjab. General Lehna Singh left Punjab and went to Banaras. It is a very fascinating thing how he was educated, how he went to Europe and he came back with these very modern thoughts when he was just 30 years of age. At the age of 27, he went to Europe and stayed there for 1-2 years and came back to India. He was influenced by Brahma Samaj, he adopted the Brahma Samaj. Then he came in contact with first ICS Officer Surendra Nath Banerjea who motivated him. He took him to Calcutta and purchased old press from there and then Surendra Nath Banerjea gave Tribune its first Bengali editor of the Tribune and Bengali editor tradition of Tribune continued up to W.C. Bounerjee. When W.C. Bounerjee retired as editor of the Tribune, then he (Vice-Chancellor) was the student of Panjab University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma requested that an appeal should be sent.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

- (4) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said during last meeting he had raised the issue of allocation of works to Shri Satish Kumar Padam, Executive Engineer and he is thankful to the Registrar as he has received a letter regarding the works to be allocated to Shri Satish Kumar Padam, Executive Engineer and other petty issues which have also been solved.
- (5) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said during the last meeting he had asked for non-receipt of payment of practical examinations conducted by teachers to which the Vice-Chancellor had replied that he will collect the feedback and then would constitute the committee.

It was clarified (by Finance & Development Officer) that the payment of all practical examinations have been made up to December 2016. The bills have not been received after December 2016 examination. He has written to Conduct Branch to send the bills after December 2016 examination.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu further said he had spoken that earlier also and sent two-three lists in that context. There are many teachers who have not received payment.

It was clarified (by Finance & Development Officer) that some specific case might be. It is not a general case. That is not correct.

- (6) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he had sent a message to the Vice-Chancellor regarding special chance to students. He had talked to the Controller of Examinations regarding those students who could not appear in the examination as they had not deposited the examination fees. Many students were left.

It was clarified (by Controller of Examinations) that last date was 24th November, 2017 for depositing the examination

forms with late fee of Rs.22,000/-. Undergraduate examinations were started from 2nd December, 2017. Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, Dean of University Instruction who was officiating as Vice-Chancellor cleared some cases on 26th of November, 2017. Till then centre statements and cut off lists were not prepared. But most of the cases were from D.A.V. College, Sector 10, Chandigarh. That was little bit upsetting to COE office and Examination Branch that the College which is nearest to the Panjab University and headed by Principal B.C. Josan. Without Principal Josan's knowledge, some cases came to them. On December 2, 2017, he travelled from Delhi and arrived in Chandigarh in the morning at 6'O clock and reached office at 7.30 a.m. At 6.30 a.m. three cars full of students came to his residence stating that they are from DAV College, Chandigarh and their examination is at 9.30 a.m. That was very embarrassing for him as there was no provision in the University Calendar where he or Vice-Chancellor could allow. When the examination started he went to the DAV College to meet Principal Josan and students. They convinced the students. Where things went wrong? The mistake has been committed at the College level. Examination forms of students were not filled. Their returns were not sent. Yesterday on 8th December was M.A. English paper. No dues were issued to the student. Then he intervened also. He told the student if there is special chance, then the examination would be held, otherwise it is not possible. Till 30th November and 1st December, they tried to accommodate all the students, but not after that. That is why they are asking for some chance.

Dr. S.S. Sandhu said students should not suffer for this. They are there for the students.

The Controller of Examinations said that a decision would be taken on 20th.

- (7) Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that in the zero hour he has only the issue of constituent colleges. He had requested to the Vice-Chancellor which was allowed. The University has sanctioned budget of Rs. 4,00,000/- each for non-teaching staff outsourcing to the constituent colleges. When they kept persons on outsourcing, Establishment Branch of the University says that how the persons are hired under wages. They hire the persons on six or seven thousand rupees per person as they have to hire eight persons. If they hire eight persons on a salary of Rs. 11800/- to 12,000/- then the budget comes to 8, 64,000/- whereas sanction is for Rs. 4, 00,000/- only. Their problem is that if they hire person on less salary, then the Establishment Branch of the Panjab University objects and if they hire eight persons on a salary of Rs. 11800/- to 12,000/- then the budget exceeds the sanctioned amount.

The Vice-Chancellor said that by paying lower wages the University would be defamed. He instructed Finance & Development Officer to send the revised budget.

- (8) Principal H.S. Gosal enquired whether Senate, Syndicate or the Vice-Chancellor has given the right to Controller of

Examinations to waive off the fees (late fees) or there is any provision in the University Calendar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if any case comes, then he recommends.

Principal H.S. Gosal said that is right. Could Controller of Examinations waive off the fees directly.

Principal B.C. Josan said that he had also got such a case done.

Principal H.S. Gosal said that is not the matter.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that application could not be sent to the Vice-Chancellor. Controller of Examinations acts on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor. Later on Vice-Chancellor's approval is sought on all those cases.

Principal H.S. Gosal said that if Vice-Chancellor's approval is sought then it is okay.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is nothing wrong in it as sometimes the poor students are involved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let it be put up to the Dean of University Instruction and Vice-Chancellor. That is the right thing to do.

Shri Varinder Singh said that is easy for the students. All students could not approach to the Vice-Chancellor.

Principal H.S. Gosal said that everybody is asking for increase of fees whereas crores of rupees are being waived off.

The Vice-Chancellor said once he (Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal) has raised an issue that whether the power is there or not there. Everything is recorded. If the power is not there even if it had been a practice in the past, let bygone be bygone. From now onwards, they follow what Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal says, it is in the interest of all of them. The Controller of Examinations could take the post facto approval.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that solution is that cases which are waived off by the Controller of Examinations, those be got approved from the Vice-Chancellor later on.

Shri Varinder Singh said that first Controller of Examinations should waive off the fees, then approval be sought from the Vice-Chancellor.

Principal H.S. Gosal said then it is okay.

This was agreed to.

The Vice-Chancellor said that where/what Principal Gosal has said, he has not closed the option.

Dr. Rabinder Nath said that if there is not any rule in the University Calendar as to who is authorized. Authority might be exercised by that person who is authorized. That might be cleared who is authorized.

The Vice-Chancellor said that power is not with the Controller of Examinations. If in the case of exigency, some student approaches at the house of Controller of Examinations in morning, that so on, on humanitarian consideration, he would seek the approval from him.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that when some issue comes, that is very critical phase for the student.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that time with the students is also very less.

The Vice-Chancellor said that why should they make mistake. They should minimise the mistakes. Let they not use word relaxation.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that Vice-Chancellor might fix the amount (up to which amount) the Controller of Examinations could waive off the fees.

9. Dr. Subhash Sharma said that four persons have been appointed as Technical Officer directly in U.I.E.T. They have requested that their promotion policy should be as that of Programmers directed appointed in U.I.E.T.

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

- (10) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they have two and half lakh students. The late fee cases might come from such a large system.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they minimise the mistakes. Do not make it a routine. It should not be expanding rather than it should be shrinking.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that 6,000 students are left. The mistake has been occurred somewhere.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the Controller of Examinations office is running very smoothly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that is okay, Principal Gosal has rightly said.

- (11) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as per previous practice, if Student Council calls any student for some function, then the student gets help in the lecture shortage. He handed over a representation of LL.B. final year students whose two papers are already been held and next paper is on 12th. That might be looked on.

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

- (12) Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is another case of a student which has been shifted from Hoshiarpur to P.U. Campus, Chandigarh. He attended classes but his attendance was not marked. As his attendance was not counted from both quarters, his attendance became short. Those cases which are not being considered at chairperson's level could be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into it.

- (13) Principal B.C. Josan said that he has one submission. UGC has approved some vocational courses to the colleges. Our inspection team has inspected these colleges four to five times. There is no use to inspect these colleges again and again.

- (14) The Vice-Chancellor said that before they conclude, he needs the resolved part pertaining to Professor Madam Pam Rajput's item. That part might be given to me by tomorrow evening so that draft is circulated to all members and ratification could be obtained and the same is filed to the Chancellor before the Senate meeting to be held on 16th December. He has to do that and would not delay.

- (15) The Vice-Chancellor briefed the Item R-9 which was left in last meeting.

Some of the members said that item R-9 needs debate so it would be considered in the next meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that after thinking they might tell him before the meeting, so the time is not wasted and the same is resolved. He further said about the ratification items and asked to resolve the same items to which the members agreed. He said that they would meet on 19th of December after the last elections.

- (16) Shri Varinder Singh asked about the meeting of the committee for fee structure of P.U. Campus.

Some members said that the meeting should be held on 16th December.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever it is, should not become the part of the senate politics.

Routine and formal matters

48. The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(v)** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

- (i)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted permission to Chandigarh Pollution Control Committee (CPCC) to set up Continuous Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Station near parking area of Centre for Public Health, Sector-25, Panjab University, Chandigarh

NOTE: A copy of letter dated 30.10.2017, received from Member Secretary,

Chandigarh Pollution Control
Committee, Sector-19 B, Chandigarh is
enclosed (**Appendix-XXXI**).

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Academic Committee dated 14.11.2017 (**Appendix-XXXII**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the students who passed B.A. I/II year under Annual System w.e.f. the session 2002-03 till the commencement of Semester System i.e. 2015-16, to get admission in 3rd/5th semester in USOL for the current session i.e. 2017-18, as a special case.

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

- (iii) To ratify the orders of the Vice-Chancellor dated 07.07.2017 (**Appendix-XXXIII**), that the financial power of the Warden stands enhanced from Rs.15,000/- to Rs.25,000/- with regard to procurement of goods and services without inviting quotations, in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 28.05.2017 (Para 34) (**Appendix-XXXIII**).

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.09.2015 (Para 15) (**Appendix-XXXIII**) has approved wardens allowed the financial powers to approve expenditure up to Rs.15,000/- with respect to the procurement of Goods and Services without inviting any quotation. This limit is corresponding to the amount up to which the departments can purchase good/services without inviting bids.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 28.05.2017 (Para 34), amended Rule 27.6 of Panjab University Accounts Manual regarding limit for purchase of goods and services without inviting bids has now been enhanced from Rs.15000/- to Rs.25000/- (Rupees Twenty five Thousand only) on each occasion, on the basis of a certificate to be recorded by the Head of the Department in the following format:

“I, _____, am personally satisfied that these goods purchased are of the requisite quality and specification and have been purchased from a reliable supplier at lowest price.”

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, has sanctioned Rupees One crore as application processing fee for applying the status of “Institute of Eminence” to the University Grant Commission, out of “UIAMS (Exam) Fund”.

NOTE: A copy of letter dated 24.11.2017 is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIV**).

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Committee dated 10.10.2017 duly forwarded by the Director, Research Promotion Cell vide letter dated 16.10.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the pre Ph.D. requirements in order to qualify for enrolment that:

1. In the areas of inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary research wherein more than one disciplines are involved, there is a requirement of equivalence of the syllabi. It is desired that the Academic Committee of the Centre or Department along with concerned Supervisor, it is desired whether the candidate with a particular background/degree has sufficient knowledge to pursue Ph.D. in the field in which he/she is seeking enrolment. The candidate can always make up the deficiencies with his personal efforts, Supervisor's support and the Pre-Ph.D. course work with additional assignments for further grooming the candidate. Relatively new inter-disciplinary Centres/Departments have Faculty with background from traditional subjects, and enrolment of students with different background will help in the growth of these interdisciplinary subjects as well as that of the Faculty.
2. For inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary research, equivalence of PG course content is not of much relevance and rather incongruous to the spirit of research in the modern era of science. Therefore, as such equivalence of candidate's PG course syllabus with that of highly specialized PG course being run by a Centre should not be considered as prerequisite for doing Ph.D.

NOTE: 1. A copy of the minutes dated 10.10.2017 of the Committee is enclosed.

2. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.11.2017 as Ratification item (R-ix) and it was resolved that the information contained item R-(ix) be deferred.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the information contained in **Items R-(i) to R-(iv)** be ratified; and
- (ii) the information contained in **Item R-(v)** be deferred.

Routine and formal matters

49. The information contained in Items **I-(i)** to **I-(iv)** on the agenda was read out and noted, viz.

(i) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Dr. Indu Bala Associate Professor Department of Economics	01.05.1984	31.12.2017	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183-186 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007; and (ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Santosh Kumar Deputy Registrar General Branch	25.05.1976	31.12.2017	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Ms. Sudha Rani P.A. Department of Chemistry	04.10.1979	30.11.2017	
3.	Shri Ravinder Singh, Assistant Technical Officer (G-II) Department of Botany	07.03.1981	31.12.2017	

4.	Shri Manjit Singh Cheema Superintendent Dr. HSJI of Dental Sciences & Hospital	30.03.1982	30.11.2017	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
5.	Ms. Valsamma VJ Stenographer Department of Geology	25.01.1982	30.11.2017	
6.	Shri Parveen Kumar Arora Dental Assistant Dr. HSJI of Dental Sciences & Hospital	14.04.1976	30.11.2017	
7.	Shri Thakur Beldar P.U. Construction Office	02.04.1993	30.11.2017	
8.	Shri Shamsher Singh Senior Assistant Department of German	29.01.1980	30.11.2017	

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Board of Control in Chemistry dated 28.11.2017 (No.1) **(Appendix-XXXV)**, has condoned the shortage of lectures and permitted Ms. Kajal Barmotta a student of B.Sc. (Hons. School) 3rd year, to sit in the examination of B.Sc. (Hons. School) 5th semester, as a special case

(iv) To note letter dated 28.11.2017 **(Appendix-XXXVI)** received from Shri Wazir Singh Madotra, Advocate, regarding implementation of Interim order dated 21.11.2017 of the Hon'ble High Court rendered in CWP No.26520 of 2017 titled Moh. Kasim Versus Punjab University and others.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.08.2017 (Para 19) **(Appendix-XXXVI)** considered the recommendation dated 29.01.2016 of the Sub-Committee of Joint Consultative Committee (JCM) regarding regularization policy of Daily wage employees and resolved that a complete list of all categories of the employees to be covered under the policy and the financial implications be prepared and a Committee of the following persons be constituted for the purpose:

- (i) Professor Navdeep Goyal
- (ii) Professor Pam Rajput
- (iii) Shri Jarnail Singh

(iv) Dr. Dalip Kumar
(v) Shri Prabhjit Singh

2. An office note is enclosed
(Appendix-XXXVI).

(G.S. Chadha)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Tuesday, 19th December 2017** at **4.30 p.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

- | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|-----|----------------|
| 1. | Professor A.K. Grover | ... | (in the Chair) |
| | Vice Chancellor | | |
| 17. | Principal B.C. Josan | | |
| 18. | Dr. Dalip Kumar | | |
| 19. | Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal | | |
| 20. | Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu | | |
| 21. | Shri Jarnail Singh | | |
| 22. | Professor Mukesh Arora | | |
| 23. | Principal N.R. Sharma | | |
| 24. | Professor Navdeep Goyal | | |
| 25. | Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma | | |
| 26. | Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu | | |
| 27. | Dr. Subhash Sharma | | |
| 28. | Shri Varinder Singh | | |
| 29. | Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang | | |
| 30. | Col. (Retd.) G.S. Chadha | ... | (Secretary) |
| | Registrar | | |

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Shri Lakhmir Singh, DPI (Colleges), Punjab, Professor Pam Rajput and Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh could not attend the meeting

The left out items of the Syndicate meeting held on 10th December, 2017 along with some new items were taken up in the meeting.

In the meeting of the Senate held on 16.12.2017, it was decided to hold the next meeting on 07.01.2018. However, some of the Syndics requested that the meeting of the Senate be rescheduled.

It was, therefore, unanimously resolved that the meeting of the Senate be convened on 21.01.2018 instead of 07.01.2018.

Condolence resolution

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Shri Gurdip Singh, former Fellow, Panjab University and Mr. Pankaj son of Mr. Suresh, University Guest House and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

**E-mail dated
05.11.2017 of
Professor Rajesh Gill
regarding non-supply
of information**

10. Considered deferred item No.33 of the Syndicate meeting dated 19.11.2017 relating to the e-mail dated 05.11.2017 received from Professor Rajesh Gill, with regard to non supply of information as sought by her vide letters dated 24.07.2017, 19.09.2017 and 09.10.2017, respectively.

NOTE: 1. An office note is enclosed.

2. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 19.11.2017 (Para 33) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

The Vice Chancellor said that item No.10 pertains to an email which came on 5th of November, 2017, which was received from a sitting Senate member, namely, Professor Rajesh Gill, regarding non-supply of information as sought by her vide a letter dated 24 July, 19th September, 9th October etc. etc. The Vice Chancellor read out the letter dated 24th July addressed to the Registrar, which states as under:

“You are requested to supply following information to the undersigned Fellow at the earliest:

1. Total amount that has been credited to the Central pool account(s)/Registrar’s Account/s with effect from 1.1.2017 (1st Jan. 2017).
2. Particulars of the Bank Account/s i.e. Number, type of Account/s name of the bank/s etc. into which the amount/s has been credited.
3. Particulars of the Bank Accounts (type, name of the holder of the account as well as bank etc.) and Sources (i.e. name of provider/s) from which the above said amounts have been received.
4. Details of amounts – date wise, amount wise and individual provider wise of the amount/s credited in Registrar’s accounts (Central Pool account(s)).
5. The details of the amounts transferred from HOSTELS, hostel wise credited to central pool Registrar accounts, with following details i.e.:
 - (a) Type of account-wise – Fixed Deposits/Short term Deposits/Saving Account/Current accounts of the concerned hostel;
 - (b) Total amount, hostel wise, transferred from FDs/Sds and Saving/Current Accounts wise.
 - (c) Whether FD/SDs have been prematurely encashed.
 - (d) Whether interests on FD/SDs were credited in saving/current accounts or was added in the renewed FD/SD.
 - (e) Loss of bank interest incurred (separately for each F.D.) in case FD/SDs have been prematurely encashed.
 - (f) Date/s of transfer from FD/SD into Saving/Current accounts as the case may be.

- 5.1 Details of balance amounts typing with individual hostels with type of accounts (amount wise i.e. FD/SD/Saving/Current, etc.)
6. Details of other sources from which the funds have been transferred to central pool/Registrar Accounts, with details of the form, i.e. FD/SD/SBI/Current account in which these are lying (Bank wise/account wise) and the amount (separately for each source).
7. Total amount in the recipient account (all type of accounts), before the transfer and after, with dates.

You are requested to supply this information to undersigned Fellow without any delay. This may be treated as MOST URGENT.”

Then another email is sent by that Fellow on 19th September to the Registrar, which states as under:
“You are requested to supply the following information to the undersigned Fellow at the earliest:

1. Number of e-rickshaws plying on PU Campus since the signing of MoU and any increase/decrease thereof;
2. Registration Nos. of these e-rickshaws
3. Total electricity consumption and charges thereof incurred on e-rickshaws plying on PU campus w.e.f. the date of contract till date;
4. Payments made by the contractor operating e-rickshaws on PU Campus towards electricity charges till date;
5. Pending charges of electricity to be paid by contractor;
6. Penalty levied if any for non-payment of electricity bills;
7. Balance Sheet of the contractor for 2016-17 showing revenue and expenditure on the rickshaws plying on PU Campus;
8. Deficit/Profit made by contractor on e-rickshaws from 2016 till date;
9. Income generated by PU from the plying of e-rickshaws;
10. Copies of letters/representations submitted by the contractor to Registrar/other PU authorities regarding the non-payment of electricity bills;
11. Constitution of any Committees formed on enhancing/reducing the transport charges for e-

rickshaws, along with the Minutes of all such meetings.

This information may be supplied to undersigned at the earliest.”

Then, another letter addressed to the Registrar dated 9th October, 2017 is received which states as under:

“Subject: Specific information to the undersigned

It is requested that copies of following documents may please be immediately supplied to the undersigned Fellow:

1. Copies of all letters issued since 1.4.2017 till date, by Registrar/P.U. Authorities to PUCASH, MHRD, NCW, Hon'ble Chancellor, U.T. Police, regarding the complaint of sexual harassment at work place against Professor Arun Grover VC Panjab University.
2. Copies of note sheets, Files from which these letters were issued, along with orders/notings recorded therein;
3. Copies of all correspondence received by Registrar/PU authorities since 1.4.2017 from PUCASH, MHRD, NCW, Hon'ble Chancellor, U.T. Police regarding the regarding the complaint of sexual harassment at work place against Professor Arun Grover VC Panjab University.

The above said information may please be supplied at the earliest, on an urgent basis”

Now, as per the report of F.D.O., the information supplied is as under:

Letter dated 24.7.2017)	(A) As per report of the FDO the information in respect of points 1 to 4 and 7 has already been supplied to Professor Rajesh Gill vide letter No.5541-42/FDO/F-114 dated 6.09.2017 (copy enclosed) (B) The reply regarding funds related to PU Hostels, has been supplied to Professor Rajesh Gill vide Ref. No. 17525/DSW dated 20.11.2017 (copy enclosed)
Letter dated 19.09.2017	The request of Professor Rajesh Gill was forwarded to D.R. (Estate) by the office of the Registrar on 20.9.2017 and D.R. (Estate) was also again requested on 7.11.2017 to provide the update/latest status, but the same is awaited.
Letter dated 9.10.2017	The said letter was forwarded to SLO on 10.10.2017 by the Registrar's Office to

	<p>seek the legal opinion. The SLO was again requested to provide update in this regard. The SLO has reported that the legal opinion from Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate and Retainer of Panjab University is awaited. An email has been sent on 11.10.2017 to Shri Girish Agnihotri by the SLO to expedite the matter.</p>
--	---

The Vice Chancellor said that some information relating to State Bank and Hostels have already been given to Professor Rajesh Gill in an excel sheet. The information relating to funds of hostels has also been provided to her. Whatever information was possible, it was given. But, is it reasonable that every Senate member ask for such information which has to be collated? Under the R.T.I. Act, one can only asks information which is there, otherwise the office has to do extra work. Does the governing body feel that every Senator should do the job of an auditor of the University and would advise how each paper has to be dealt with, then how the office work would run. There should be a limit as to how much of information can the member of the governing body seek on the pretext that the University is supposed to provide whatever information they need within a month. How much work force and mental resource could be put on work on the whims of a Senator. What is the purpose of it. What is it that they want to spread. Is it a thoroughly mis-figured, mis-governed corrupt, opaque State. There is no University in India, whose governing body meets every month and so many meetings are held, neither videography is done nor it is distributed to anyone in other universities. But here in this University, they can have videography of the whole meeting and minutes are uploaded on the website and the public can read these minutes. In spite of that, what more they would like to ask for. That is why he has put it before them. Let the Governing Body, which as per the Calendar, is the Government of the University, let it decide with what efficiency is the system suppose to deliver. How much work, the Administrative Officers of this University should be doing just to satisfy the whims of a Senate member of this University. He thinks that somebody needs to take a call, some thinking needs to be done on behalf of the government of the University as to whether these things could continue. Should they be only seeking information that comes under an R.T.I. or something which is considered reasonable. After my 5 ½ years of service in this University and 30 years as a member of another academic institution, he personally feels, this much of a detailed information cannot be made available by people who have other duties also to do. If someone ask for a specific information, he could get it. Once someone has asked for all the DVDs since he joined as Vice Chancellor in this University. How much information could be provided and what one has to do with it. If some meeting was held three years ago, is there any logic to ask for the DVD of that meeting. Minutes are finalized by circulating to the members and then approved. If the DVD is not given, then they start making complaints at various quarters. The Vice Chancellor is referred to as accused Vice Chancellor. How many years the word 'accused Vice Chancellor' would be used by a Senator, he asked? For how many years, the case of sexual harassment against the Vice Chancellor would remain pending? Do they have any duty towards him.? He, as a person, to whom they come and greet, and he, as an officer who

presides over these meetings. For how long this would go on? Does anyone of them has an answer to it? All of them know that the sexual harassment case is deliberately filed and patently false. How long this harassment would continue of an individual and an office? What is the use of having Syndicate and Senate elections when the officer that presides over those meetings that cannot be protected? How much of indignity should a Vice Chancellor of this University suffer and how much of indignity, the Officers of this University should suffer when such things are asked. Many of them are Principals, can a Halqa incharge or that area or a Sarpanch, on whose land the college is running, could ask for such information. Would you teach the student there or waste your whole time in supplying such information?

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor informed the members about a letter which he received yesterday from the National Commission for Scheduled Caste in respect of one Mr. Satyavir Singh who had been removed from the University service before he joined this University as Vice Chancellor. In the letter, it has been asked to give answers to some question. In case the reply is not sent within fourteen days, then they will call them to Delhi.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they should think over the issue and arrive at a solution. They could think as to what steps could be taken.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no problem in giving the information, the information which has to be sent would entail a lot of labour and expense not commensurate with the object in view. The Vice Chancellor read out the Regulation 22 at page 32, P.U. Cal. Vol. I with regard to supply of information to a Fellow which states as under:

“22. Any member of the Senate may write to the Registrar for the purpose of obtaining information on matter relating to the affairs of the University and the Registrar shall supply the required information within one month. If in the opinion of the Vice Chancellor, this would entail labour and expense not commensurate with the object in view, he may disallow it in which case the reason for such disallowance shall be communicated to the Fellow concerned.”

The Vice Chancellor said that he is inclined to invoke this clause and he wanted the opinion of the members that under this regulation, the University will not comply and give this information.

Dr. Dalip Kumar wanted to know whether the information has been asked for under R.T.I. Act.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is asked for just like a simple information being a Fellow of the University and President PUTA.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said it is not correct to ask for such a huge information which entails a lot of labour and expense. He further said that they have seen it that lot of information has been provided and it is not possible to provide information separately for each hostel.

The Vice Chancellor informed that a lot of information has already been provided to her. In spite of giving so much information, he is receiving letters from her daily about this. While seeking the permission of the members, he told them that he is inclined to invoke and not provide any information which he deems inappropriate. On being told by the Registrar that she would be supplied the information when the same would be received from the concerned office to which a letter has been written, the Vice Chancellor said to the Registrar that he is taking an excuse and by writing so he has bound himself to give the information. The Vice Chancellor said that he will not even write this sentence that he would supply the information after he gets it from the concerned officer. By writing so he (Registrar) has bound himself to provide the information. He said, such letters would not be written. The Chopras, Rajesh Gills and Satyavirs of this University are keeping this University on ransom. Do they have some duty towards the office of the Vice Chancellor? Who is the employer of the Vice Chancellor? It is the Senate and he just presides over the Senate. They are the Senate. They ought to protect the dignity of the employees of the University. The Senate members are not the employees of the University. But, is it not their duty that the dignity of the employer of the University has to be protected and he is allowed to work? Why he is not allowed to work?

Professor Mukesh Arora said, of course, it is their duty to protect him.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that they have made accusation against to the Vice Chancellor, Registrar and all the bodies of the University and called the Syndicate members his followers and obligatory etc.etc. He is not able to understand that when the whole system in their eyes is not good, is there any need to discuss such matters because there is no meaning to discuss these things here.

The Vice Chancellor said, no, it has a meaning. If these proceedings are sent to the Senate, then Senate has to take a call whether it is unbecoming of a Senator or not.

Principal N.R. Sharma further said if some appropriate information is asked for, it is okay, that can be provided. Principal N.R. Sharma asked as to what steps they could take to stop all such things.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already told them that he would not reply such letters.

Dr. Dalip Kumar, Professor Mukesh Arora and some other members suggested that he (Vice Chancellor) should reply only that letter which he would deem appropriate and which can serve the purpose in larger way.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could only do this. In order that the Senate is kept informed, when he would receive a letter, he would not reply it and present the letter to the Syndicate as an information item.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that only appropriate information could be supplied and to his mind, there is no need to discuss on this issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is necessary to discuss because they have to share the anxiety to which the entire office is being put to.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said only those letters should be replied which he (Vice Chancellor) deems fit to reply and he should not bring such things to the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said he has to bring it here because when his successor would come, she would start accusing him that the office has not given her the information which she has been asking for, for the last five years. So, he does not want to bind his successor. He should be able to clearly say that he does not know anything about it, the matter was dealt with by the Governing Body and that he shall not open it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they should see to privilege of the Fellows enshrined in regulation 22 at page 32 of P.U. Cal.Vol. I regarding information to be sought by them. He said asking such a huge information is unfortunate. However, he said that if they pass it here today, but after 6-7 years the Fellows may say as to why their fundamental right of seeking information has been curtailed.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the issue is that this clause is being misused by some persons.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if they take a decision on seeking information, even then that person would apply to get the information through R.T.I. Act after depositing Rs. 10/-.

The Vice Chancellor said that such a huge information could not be supplied in 10/- rupees. This is not an information available in the form of documents. In the R.T.I. Act, it is clear as to which information has to be supplied and the information is not required to be culled or collated. If somebody wants some information regarding accounts, he should come to the accounts branch and see the record.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the clause relating to supply of information to the Fellows is being misused.

Principal N.R. Sharma supported the view point of Shri Jarnail Singh and said that 'yes', it is totally being misused.

The Vice Chancellor asked if they can write to the Chancellor that such and such information is not being provided to him/her. He stated that he brought this for discussion. The proceedings of this meeting would be sent to the Prime Minister Office so that the Prime Minister's office should also know that the complaint which is being sent to his office is completely frivolous and that such complaints cannot be replied. The Registrar has written that the letter has been forwarded to the concerned office, this means that now that office would be in trouble to prepare such a huge information. The Vice Chancellor said that there should be some protection. When some letter is sent to Delhi, they send it to the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Jarnail Singh, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Shri Varinder Singh said that the Vice Chancellor should reply only those letters which he deems fit.

Shri Varinder Singh said that today she has sent such a letter, tomorrow someone else would ask for such a huge information. The information should be in some limit.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no bar on it. If one Senators has asked for such a huge information, the other can also ask for the same. There are 91 Senators and anyone can ask for such information. It is a disease.

Shri Varinder Singh said it is okay if some limited information is asked for, but to provide such a big information is difficult.

The Vice Chancellor said there are 91 fellows and if all of them start asking for information, it would generate a lot of work. He further said that first it was R.K. Singla, then Professor Chopra and now Professor Rajesh Gill and there may be some more.

The Vice Chancellor told the members that there was a teacher Mr. Devinder in Muktsar and he filed a case against the U.T. administration that the U.T. Administration is not transferring him to Chandigarh.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the Regulation 22 at page 32 of P.U. Cal. Vol.I should also be kept in mind that the reason for such disallowance shall be communicated to the Fellow.

The Vice Chancellor said that as per the Regulation 22, they have to give a reason for not supplying the information.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if huge information is asked for, it cannot be provided as in the present case. This can be given as a reason for not providing the information. If they receive such letter, he (Vice Chancellor) should bring it to the Syndicate/Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter should be brought back.

Shri Jarnail Singh and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said whatever he (Vice Chancellor) deems fit he should reply, otherwise it should be brought to the next meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be brought to the Syndicate for information that such and such points of the letter have been replied and the rest have not been replied. Whatever information could be given, that has been provided to her and they would not give her any more information. At least to deal with it, whatever information has been sent to her, it is placed before them, no more information is to be given to her for the questions that she has raised. At least they could do this as they have to send a message.

This was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That no further information is required to be provided to Professor Rajesh Gill invoking Regulation 22 of Chapter

II(A)(i) appearing at page 32 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-I since this would entail labour and expense not commensurate with the object in view and adequate information has already been supplied to the Fellow concerned by the office..

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the decision for providing/not providing the information asked for by the Fellows be taken by the Vice-Chancellor under the relevant Regulation and the issues on which the information is not to be provided be placed for information of the Syndicate.

**Status Report of the
Committee, regarding
Quality of
Construction over the
last 16 years**

12. Considered deferred item No.37 of the Syndicate meeting dated 19.11.2017 relating to the status Report of the committee, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.02.2017 (Para 12), to enquire into Quality of Construction over the last 16 years of the expansion of the Panjab University:

- NOTE:**
1. On the report of the Committee dated 8.9.2017, the Vice-Chancellor passed orders that obtain the PDF file along with annexure for making them available to the Senate members. Accordingly, the said file has been got prepared but yet to be sent to the Senate members.

As per orders of the Vice-Chancellor, the Chairperson of the committee was requested to provide a follow up report for meeting of the Syndicate so as to include this as an agenda item in Senate meeting of December 2017.

2. The main committee in its meeting dated 7.09.2017 constituted a sub-committee to inspect the completed projects of the University. The meeting of the said committee was held on 8.11.2017. The SVC has requested the Committee to send the minutes and the photos at the earliest, vide letter dated 14.11.2017. Latest update dated 29.11.2017 received from the SVC is enclosed.
3. The meeting of the sub-committee to inspect the three ongoing project of the University was fixed for 13.11.2017, but the same could not be held due to lack of quorum. The same Committee was met on 21.11.2017. As per report dated 29.11.2017 of the SVC, certain information has been sought from the Construction Office, P.U.
4. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 19.11.2017 (Para 37) and it was

resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

The Vice Chancellor said that this item relates to the status Report of the committee, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.02.2017 (Para 12), to enquire into Quality of Construction over the last 16 years of the expansion of the Panjab University. The Vice Chancellor said that this report is not complete and it is an interim report. There is some concern looking at the photographs attached to it. Lot of things are desired to be done regarding construction in some of the buildings of the University, wherever it has been pointed out.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that this reports contains about 100 pages and they could not get time to read this report due to elections of faculties etc. He suggested that another meeting of the Syndicate could be scheduled till 30th of December.

The Vice Chancellor read out some portion of the report in which it was stated that there is huge problem of leakage in all the buildings which were inspected. Problem is acute in the washrooms. Many cracks have been noted, aesthetics is missing, etc.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that since the report contains 100 pages, they should send it to the CVO to prepare a summary as they have done previously. They should devise the same way for this also and it will give better understanding of the issue. In order to clinch the issue at the earliest, they should have a summarized status report as was done in the earlier cases.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to who will prepare this status summary report. Does the present Syndicate could assume the responsibility of making this status report.

Many of the members endorsed the view of making a summary report as it would be easy to understand the things in a better way. It was suggested that Shri Jarnail Singh and Dr. Dalip Kumar along with Dr. Subhash Sharma should be entrusted this responsibility. This was agreed to by the members.

The Vice Chancellor said that the report contains 100 pages and the proposal is that a comprehensive summary of the report be made and it would be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he was a member of the Committee looking into the issue of enquiring into Quality of Construction over the last 16 years. He said that the buildings which they have inspected the lapses are very glaring.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu intervened to say that since Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma is a member of the Committee, he should also be included in the Committee constituted to prepare the status summary report. This was supported by many members.

Continuing, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there should be concrete and clear opinion on it as to who was the contractor and who were the officers involved in it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is, why they have brought it here. Some deterrent has to be kept in the system otherwise such things would be repeated again.

It was agreed to that the Committee would consist four persons consisting of Shri Jarnail Singh as Chairman of the Committee, Dr. Dalip Kumar, Dr. Subhash Sharma and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma.

RESOLVED: That a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Jarnail Singh, comprising of Dr. Dalip Kumar, Dr. Subhash Sharma and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma be constituted to prepare a summary status report to be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Fee Structure for Panjab University Teaching Departments and Regional Centres

32. Considered minutes dated 07.11.2017 (**Appendix-**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for working out a road map for rationalization and revision of fee structure, examination fee and all other charges, for P.U. Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres, for the session 2018-19, to achieve the task of augmenting the resources for Panjab University.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the meeting could not be held and they would sit again and find a way out to which the Vice Chancellor said, find a solution, they would then place it before the next Syndicate.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said they did try to solve out the fee issue of affiliated and constituent colleges where they have increased 5% fee. But the college people say that when they increase the fee for the University departments, they have different yardstick.

The Vice Chancellor said that if someone is doing B.A. from a Govt. College or from the Evening College, their fee should at least be the same.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the fee in the University is less as compared to the colleges. He suggested that if they have to enhance the fee, the percentage of increase should be at least the same.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that in the University the fee has been increase by 10% whereas it is only 5% in the colleges.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Controller of Examination to explain about this issue.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that yesterday a meeting was held with the Principal Secretary, Welfare, Govt. of Punjab, where the Registrars of all the Universities of Punjab were invited and the Registrar Col. Chadha asked him to attend this meeting. They took a data of fee from all the Registrars of the Universities i.e. Panjab University, Punjabi University, Guru Nanak Dev University, State Universities and Centrally funded Universities. The meeting was also attended by the Registrars of private Universities, i.e., Rayat and Bahra, Adesh Pratap, Akal University etc. The Principal Secretary collected the data of fee from all of them i.e. how much fee is being charged for B.A. in the Campus and off campus (affiliated colleges), fee of UIET, technical and non-technical

courses. The Higher Education Department of Punjab Government prepares a threshold value, the reason being the LPU charges for technical degree a fee of Rs. 2.13 lacs per year and Panjab University charges Rs. 83 thousands per year. They want to give benefit to the SC/ST category which they have to reimburse. The re-imbursement value is something different. They have circulated one separate letter that all Universities will have threshold value which should be the same. So, he said that the concern of Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu regarding college and University is after that.

The Vice Chancellor said that the fee from doing B.A. degree from Govt. College, Sector-11 or from the University should be the same. The Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Subhash Sharma to hold the meeting on the issue and then they would come back to it. They could also liaise with Punjab Government as they have also to hold the meeting. They can also liaise with Professor B.S. Ghuman also.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should rationalize the fee, then it would not remain their problem. This problem would then be across the State.

It was informed (by the F.D.O) that the Government wants to fix fee for the SC/ST candidates scholarship for which they are going to reimburse. So far as the fee for other candidates is concerned, that is the concern of the University. The government's concern is that they have to reimburse the fee of SC/ST students. So on the basis of different fee structure, they are going to give some thumb rule i.e. they would reimburse this amount that is not going to affect their decision so far as the fee structure is concerned.

The Vice Chancellor said that still this exercise has to be done and requested Dr. Subhash Sharma to take care of this issue.

RESOLVED: That the Syndicate reiterated its earlier decision taken in its meeting held on 10 December, 2017 and specially requested Dr. Subhash Sharma to help in sorting out the issue of rationalization of fee.

Report dated 27.11.2017 of the Committee to find facts, errors and irregularities in the examination

40. Considered

- (i) minutes/Report dated 27.11.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) of the Committee constituted, to find facts, errors and irregularities regarding examination, pointed out by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Fellow in the Syndicate meeting dated 25.06.2017.
- (ii) the report of the Standing Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor Rajat Sandhir on the complaint made by Dr. Amit Joshi, Fellow.

As the discussion on the item started, the Controller of Examinations went outside the meeting to which Dr. Dalip Kumar said, why he is going outside, the complaint is not against him.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that the Complaint is not against the Controller of Examinations, rather it is against the system.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, however, said that it would look better if the Controller of Examinations goes out so that frank and free discussion could take place.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is okay and they will call him later on.

Continuing, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that sometimes an unpleasant situation is created which would not look nice.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they will discuss each and everything in a patient manner.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is his duty and responsibility to protect his officers. To whatever extent possible, he would protect his officers and if he would need his help, he would call him.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the practice is this if the name of some person is there in the report, the officer used to go out of the meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said he does not want to give a chance to someone that he was in favouring somebody.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that since this issue is related to the Office of the Controller of Examinations, he did not think there is any harm if the C.O.E. goes out of the meeting. He would come later on.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would like to resolve this matter in this Syndicate. All the papers are given to them in a closed cover.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that all of them know how and in what background the Committee was formed. This Committee held 3-4 meetings and after having discussion, a report was prepared. The background of this is that when he raised this issue in the Syndicate, after that he sent a letter to the Vice Chancellor explaining as to what were the issues about which he had been talking about in the meeting. He had raised four issues in the letter and that letter was referred to the Bari Committee by him (Vice Chancellor). After holding an enquiry, the Bari Committee submitted its interim report. The Bari Committee Report, which investigated the four points raised by him in his letter, is not based on facts. Whatever the Bari Committee has said in its interim report, is away from the facts, totally repugnant and is not correct.

The Vice Chancellor asked, how he could say this. The Bari Committee has given the report on the basis of the facts given to them. The Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) says upto three points, whatever Bari Committee has done, that is right. Whatever the Bari Committee did not do correctly, as per his (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) opinion i.e. matter No. 4. The Bari Committee was not having those documents on which he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) has drawn the conclusion. So, how he can make a comment about the Bari Committee. He can prepare his own report, but, what is the necessity of saying that Bari Committee has not done this work rightly. The Vice Chancellor said that in his personal opinion, this is not acceptable to raise any objection on the previous Committee. The Bari Committee that he had appointed, one

of the Committee members protested to him that they were not having those documents. He has written a strong letter to me. Though, he does not doubt, what they have found out, but Professor Bari and Professor Chahal did not have access to these documents.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that whatever was given to them, they made their report on the basis of those documents and he accepted that they are not at fault. But whatever they have said is repugnant and away from the facts. He read out the points given in the report for which the documents are in the file. The first point is regarding environment education paper held on May 5, 2017. The report says that the point has been made on conduct of paper of Environment Education which was held on May 05, 2017. The matter reported is of general type as no name of college/examination centre has been given where the number of examinees exceeded the capacity of the centre to accommodate them.. In this, a clean chit has been given, that no college has reported, nothing of this sort happened, this was a general issue and mentioned what they would do in future. Whereas the fact is that Principal, Government College, Sector-11 has sent a letter before the examination that they would not be able to manage the huge number of students and they should be told as to what they should do. This letter dated May 4, 2017 was sent by the Principal of Govt. College, Sector-11. However, the report says that there is no letter from any quarter, no complaint and everything is okay. But the facts speak that a letter was received by the C.O.E. office. It was mentioned in the letter that about three thousand students would be appearing in this paper and it would be difficult for them to manage these students. However, in the report it has been said that nothing wrong has happened and clean chit was given. Therefore, he said that the first point is factually wrong. He said that he would not like to touch the second point as they have already said that it has already been reported in interim report-1.

Continuing, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the main thing is at point No. 4 which is relating to alleged leakage of secrecy of awards. This was a very serious issue. The two sub-examiners have given their written report in the C.O.E. office that the answer sheets which they evaluated were tempered with and requested that an enquiry be conducted as to who has done all this. These two teachers were called for by the Committee and they reiterated the same thing to the Committee. About the fourth point, the report says that it has been verified that the complaint attached as annexure-III with the note, has not been received by the C.O.E. Office. They say that they have seen and no such report/complaint has been received whereas they have themselves attached the documentary proof that the two teachers have made a complaint about it. That is why, he is saying that the report is not based on facts because the report/complaint of the teachers is with them, whereas they say that they have not received the report. He further said that the report says that, however, a hand-written complaint regarding answer books of B.A.-III, 5th Semester Geography paper code-0432 and examiners with identity numbers 10447 and 10448, which was received by the COE office, has already been investigated by a Senior Principal of the College. They say that a hand-written report has come, but when the Committee asked for about that hand written complaint, then they said that no hand-written complaint was received, however, it was another complaint. Earlier, they have undermined the issue. The Principal has reported that there is no tampering of the marks as the answer books were properly intact and

stitched on the left hand side where the identity of the candidate is mentioned. The enquiry report says that they have got enquired the matter from a senior Principal and the Principal has reported that there is no tampering of marks as the answer books were intact and properly stitched. Now, they can read the report of that enquiry officer. He has not said anywhere said that the answer books were intact and everything is alright. He is surprised, how it has been mentioned in the report by giving a reference of that enquiry officer that he has said that everything is alright. Principal Manjeet Brar who has enquired into the matter, has written to the Deputy Registrar (Secrecy) "With reference to your letter No. 2827/Secy. Dated 06003.2017 regarding review/scrutiny of the answer books B.A.-III, (5th Semester)(Dec. 2016) of Geography subject. Please find enclosed herewith, the 50 answer books of B.A.-III (5th Semester) (Dec. 2016) of Geography subject after review/scrutiny of answer books. Comments after review/scrutiny of 50 answer books. according to the Roll number is also enclosed hereby along with the remarks. This is for your information and necessary action please". So, in this report he has not written anywhere that the answer books are intact and everything is alright. However, the Bari Committee in its report says that everything was intact and everything is alright because the Enquiry Officer has said all this. However, they can see the report and it has not been mentioned anywhere about this. That is why he is saying that it is not based on facts. The complaint of the two teachers is also attached. In their statements which they got recorded, they have very clearly stated that whatever they have written in their complaint about the tampering, that might be got enquired into. The points raised by them were that the secrecy of evaluated Answer books is deliberately broken, University Roll Nos, might be elicited possibly by breaking the sealed Ribbon band on Left side of answer book and at some places, marks of certain codes might be altered without our knowledge. What was demanded by the complainants, i.e., regarding tampering, that was not referred to the enquiry officer. He was just asked to do review or scrutiny which he did and returned the answer books and said that it was right. Neither the complaint of the complainant was sent to the Enquiry Officer, nor it was mentioned in the letter. Thus the main and serious issue was not addressed and he was not asked to check the actual problem. The letter which was sent to the Enquiry Officer, the reference was given about the telephonic talk. He is surprised to see that if there is such a big issue and a written complaint is made by two teachers, he wanted to be guided, if such a complaint has ever come to him (Vice Chancellor) where the ribbon band is broken and the person who has done it has admitted his guilt. He would like to know if the issue was so serious, was a permission from the Vice Chancellor or some higher officer of the University not required to the effect as to who will be the enquiry officer and what would be the formation of the Committee. It does not normally happen that such things are just conveyed on phone to send the papers to someone. He said that to his mind if the issue was so big, it is must that some enquiry should be conducted, some file should be created and proper minutes should be recorded. But there was no such thing. The letter which was written to Principal Manjeet Brar, D.R. (Secrecy) in the letter says, as per telephonic talk or something like, they can see what he was asked to do. There is no mention as to who has formed the Committee or who has been appointed Enquiry Officer and who has taken this decision. The way, this issue has been treated shows that it was not taken seriously as it should have been taken. They first called for the two teachers who have complained and they explained their point of view

and the same has been written in the report. Then they called the examiner, his statement is attached with the report. He has clearly said that just to see the level of examination, he has done this, but his intention was not bad. But they told him that this was not a house test where he should do such things. So, he virtually has confessed that he had done it. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he has an objection on the way, the enquiry has been done. Had the things been done in a proper way in the initial stage, these would have come to fore only at the time.

The Vice Chancellor read out the letter which was sent by the Deputy Registrar (Secrecy) to Principal Manjeet Brar 6th March, 2017 which states as under:

“As discussed with Controller of Examinations today on phone, the answer book of B.A.III (5th Sem.) (Dec. 2016) of Geography subject is being sent to you to ensure that the evaluation was done as per University norms.

You are requested to kindly go through the answer books (No.50) randomly collected from the bundles of evaluated answer books of Geography of 5th Sem. Of B.A. III to ensure that everything is intact as well as evaluation.

You are requested to kindly call this office to collect the answer books after review/ scrutiny”.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said, as stated by Dr. Rabinder Nath that the main issue was the intactness of secrecy. Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he has also attended some of the meetings of the Committee. He received the draft minutes of 27th November meeting and the suggestion which were made, they sent it back at the same address, but he did not get any reply. No meeting was held afterwards. Then he wrote a letter on 14th December with a copy to the Chairman of the Committee, but he did not get any reply either from the Chairman or from the Office. Whatever has happened, it happened actually, he had said, it should also be incorporated. As Dr. Rabinder Nath has said regarding two papers i.e. Geography and Political Science, whatever has been found out by this Committee, the same has been found out by the Bari Committee. He said that they should place this thing that Bari Committee is not deviating on this issue. It is also the finding of this report. He read out the version which at that time (30th November) he has mentioned. It states that, some observations have been made and the same be incorporated before final approval. It is further suggested that the draft be made available to other members, specially to Dr. Subhash Sharma ji as he has not attended the meetings of the Committee held on 27th November or the meeting held earlier to it. He wrote this because from the email, he was under the impression that these minutes have been sent to him only. But he did not get anything in reference to the meetings held on 30th November or 14th December. As regards the secrecy of the Geography paper, there is one word in the letter of 6th March, which the D.R. (Secrecy) has sent. The word used in that letter is ‘intact’. There the meaning of that word ‘intact’ was that she (Principal Manjeet Brar) is also responsible to confirm whether the intactness of the issue is there or not. He thinks, this word must be there in the letter as he had also told Principal B.C. Josan that they should take care of this word. The office had

mentioned very clearly about the intactness of the answer book. He requested the Vice Chancellor to read out the letter sent to Principal Manjeet Brar, as he is not having of copy of the same.

However, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma intervened to say that the 'intact' word is there. He stated that the said letter is very crucial, but he could not find out that letter.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they should take up this issue step by step to know as to how all this started. He further informed that the story had started from the month of March as the complaint was received in February.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if he has confessed his fault, then the case should be reported to the police.

The Vice Chancellor, at this stage, read out the letter written by D.R.(Secrecy) to Principal Manjeet Brar which states "You are requested to kindly go through the answer books (50 Number), randomly collected from the bundle of the evaluated answer sheets of Geography of 5th Semester to ensure that everything is intact as well as evaluation".

Dr. Dalip Kumar while explaining about the meaning of 'intactness' here is that breach of secrecy should come up right from that level. Intact does not mean to return the 50 answer sheets sent to him. Intact here means was that whatever Dr. K.P.S. Shante has confessed, that should also be a part of that recommendation. But in the report it is said that marks should have been 42 instead of 40 or 26 instead of 28. The issue was not as to how many marks have been awarded to a candidate. Evaluation was not the issue but of intactness of secrecy. There is no mention of intactness in the letter dated 6.3.2017 sent to Dr. Manjeet Brar. Continuing, Dr. Dalip Kumar said whatever was the actual issue, Dr. Shante has admitted all that. So he would not say that the Bari Committee perception was away, but, what were the circumstances at that time, that is important. Which documents were given to the Committee, they do not know. There are certain issues which actually match with the findings of this report and that should also be the part of this report. Continuing, he said that he was not replied of the mail which he had sent. From this mail, it seems that this mail has not been sent to other members, why this mail was sent to him only and why not to other members of the Committee. He has a proof for this. Why it has been sent to him only when there are four other members of the Committee.

Principal B.C. Josan said that he has also received the mail to which Dr. Dalip Kumar said then why he has not given a reply to him. Principal Josan said that he has verbally given the answer on telephone.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that he (Principal Josan) has said that the suggestions will be incorporated, but in the report it has not been done. The reply to him should have come from the D.R. (General). At one place it is said that the Committee also observed that due attention has not been given to the complaint. He had said that the para containing the name of Centre Incharge and Computer Operator should be removed, otherwise they have to call them also. He said that the suggestions, either additions or deletions, which he had made that should also be made a part of this report. Two paras

of Bari Committee Report and this Committee report do match. These are initially his suggestions, but he has not got any reply of the mail that he had sent.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if he (Dr. K.P.S. Shante) has confessed, they its report should be lodged with the police and the police will enquire everything. He said that when a student was caught with a mobile in the examination centre of DAV College, the University did not hold any enquiry rather he was handed over to the police. The head examiner has already retired and if they hold an enquiry, what punishment they could give to him. It would not make much difference if they award him some punishment. It may be there that he might have been pressurized by someone to confess. They do not have the capacity to hold an enquiry because they do not know with whom he has talked on phone and for what time. But, the police would get out all these things. To his mind, if some allegation is there on a retired person, the case should be given to the police.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that in the letter written by D.R. (Secrecy), it has been written about the evaluation and intactness or answer books. But if they read the operative part, it states, 'You are requested to kindly call this office to collect the answer books after scrutiny and review'. So, it means that she has been asked to do scrutiny and review only. In response to this letter, Principal Manjeet Brar sent the answer books after review/scrutiny. When she sent the answer books after review/scrutiny, the office should ask her that she was asked to check the intactness of the answer books. The fact is that she has not been asked to check the intactness of the answer books because in the operative part she has been asked to do scrutiny and review. A big crime has been committed and the office should say that she should enquire into what the two persons have given in writing. Rather, they should give this case to someone else to enquire it properly. This is the point.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that wrong papers were also opened and it has happened in many of the papers. In the environment papers, the number of students was much more, but somehow, they were adjusted. But if wrong papers are sent, this is a big issue. He further said that it is very serious if a sealed envelope of answer books is opened and decoded and then made a list. It is a very big crime. The examiner, after randomly checking the papers, handed over the same to the person in-charge and the same was sealed. When the envelope was sealed, then, how it could be opened afterwards. He said that it could not be opened one decoded without connivance. It was not done for one paper, rather there were 200 copies. This is a very big question mark on their examination system. He requested to save the system, if they can. They could find many such like frauds. If this matter is enquired into properly, everything would come out. This is a very big thing if the seals of answer books envelope are broken after these are evaluated and submitted by the examiner. He reminded about an incident which happened in 1978. In that incident answer sheets were recovered from the railway station which was reported by many news papers. In fact a gang was operating which used to sit at the railway station. They took out the envelopes, broke their seals and changed the papers. When the University came to know of it, then it started making four centres at different places such Hoshiarpur, Ludhiana etc. From then they started picking up the papers through buses to deliver at the different locations. He said that the same history is

being repeated. He requested to do something if they want to save the system. He said that the Controller of Examinations is having much work and requested that someone else should be appointed Dean College Development Council so that he could take care of the examination work properly.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will do it. He is hoping to get nod from the Board of Finance.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested to advertise the post of Dean College Development Council to which the Vice Chancellor said that the post has already been advertised.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they should give charge of this post to someone.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that there are many differences amongst themselves and he does not want that there should be any dispute on the issue as to whom this post belongs to, i.e. whether to the colleges or to the University. He suggested that the post should be filled on regular basis. There is no guarantee that if someone else is given additional charge, he would run the work smoothly and added that this would not happen.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the approvals are delayed for quite a good time.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are two issues, one is whatever the Committee has found and that is based on facts, confessions etc. The second is that there could have been the same report without any reference to Professor Bari and Professor Chahal.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that cannot be there because the whole objection is on the Bari Committee Report. He challenged that all the points of Bari Committee are wrong. He further said that he did not raise any aspersion on them as whatever has been placed before them, they gave their report accordingly and they are not at fault. They should enquire what was placed before them.

The Vice Chancellor said that if some documents have not been placed before them, it is a separate thing, but, they should not say that they did not work competently. They are casting aspersion on a former Registrar and a Vice Chancellor. They cannot go beyond what has been placed before them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma has stated that is correct. But he further said that the word 'Interim Report' has been used. When they talk about interim report, it is clear that whatever facts have been placed before them, they gave their report on the basis of those documents and the report is interim. Before the finalization of the report, this thing is mentioned here in this report. When some report comes here, that goes to Press. The Press people, unfortunately, removed the word 'interim'. They (Prof. Bari and Prof. Chahal) are very senior people and it becomes very difficult for the University to protect them. They were given some work and the work is still not completed. Somehow, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma has received more facts. In the Syndicate, they had decided to form a parallel committee. So he decided that they should delete Paragraph D from the report or it should be modified.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that whatever has been examined by the Committee, it has been done on the basis of the Interim Report and the same facts were examined and analyzed. Whatever was the findings of the Bari Committee, they were to give their report on the basis of that Report and they have given their comments only on the basis of that report. In their report they said that there was no written complaint, but the fact is that hand written complaint was there. That was factually wrong. Then the report says that the Inquiry Officer has written that everything was intact, where the Inquiry Officer has never said that everything was intact. So, whatever, they have written, that is written on the basis of the Bari Committee Report. But this thing is clear that whatever has been placed before the Bari Committee, whatever file was given to them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said they have to modify it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he has already written about this, but he is sorry to point out that even after sending two mails, nothing has been mentioned in the report. As far as he knows, when they sit in the evaluation centre, the answer sheets are supplied to them as per norms. After the answer sheets are evaluated and then sealed, it never happens that after the bundle is packed, it cannot come in the custody of someone else. It has not happened so far.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the bundle of answer books does not remain with the head examiner.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the bundle of answer books did not come back to the head examiner to do anything he wants. This has not happened like this. It is very true and it can be verified also. Suppose, a bundle of 30 answer books is given to him, the other aspect could be that he may be a head examiner. There are two issues i.e. one is that he is acting as an evaluator and the other and the second is that he is acting as head examiner. The head examiner gives 20 copies randomly to see whether the marking is correct or not. The question is if a bundle of 30 sealed answer books is sent to the Centre in-charge, it never happens that the sealed bundle would again be given to him. But if it has happened, he thinks, this is the most unfortunate. How one can demand the bundle of answer books after it is submitted to the Centre in-charge. Therefore, he requested that it should be verified. At one time it was tried to call the Centre In-charge, but he could not be called as he was not feeling well. It was also talked about to call the Computer Centre In-charge, but that also could not be done. This type of example, if it is there, that after evaluation and finalization of each and everything, if one is receiving that bundle for his convenience i.e. for decoding everything, he thinks that that fact should also be verified.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that what Dr. Dalip Kumar is saying, that cannot be done. He informed that 10% answer books are got evaluated i.e. out of a bundle of 30, only three answer books would be got evaluated randomly from the head examiner. The head examiner is required to check whether the evaluation has been properly or not and after that the answer books and never given to the sub-examiner. The answer books are sent to the Centre In-charge.

The Vice Chancellor said that they gave some matter to Professor Bari and Professor Chahal to investigate. It has four parts and some material was placed before them. On the basis of that

material they gave the interim report at point No. one, two and three. They have also given their comments on the fourth point, which is related to their enquiry from the Principal etc. They have submitted the report, but when he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) writes that the interim report submitted by the Bari Committee has not properly examined the issue related to examination. Out of the four points, three are exactly the same as he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) is saying. It means there is no complaint in three points out of the four i.e. they have not overlooked anything. Then how he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) could make the opening sentence that they have not examined the issues.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they are not saying this. What they are saying is, how the papers were opened and decoded. He asked to Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that if the seals of bundles were broken.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma while replying to him said that the seals of bundles were broken and the numbers were noted after breaking the seals of answer books.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that this is a very serious issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is right what Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma is saying, but that cannot be put on record.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said whatever interim report has been sent to them, they have examined it. If that report is left, then for what they would enquiring, what they would analyzing and to who they should accuse.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal wanted to know whether Dr. Shante was a head examiner or sub-examiner to which Dr. Rabinder Nath said that he was Head examiner.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if he was Head Examiner, then he was not authorized to evaluate more than 20% answer books until the examiner has left.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he cannot be an examiner for 200 copies which was also endorsed by Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he would like to bring to the knowledge of the Vice Chancellor that some time the gum is not applied properly to close the envelopes. By saying so, he is not favouring neither the Controller of Examinations nor the examiner.

Dr. Subhash Sharma the question is why he has noted the marks for 200 papers.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma showed the sheet where the roll numbers of and the marks awarded to 200 student were noted. He further said that the examiner has admitted that it is his handwriting and he has done it.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said he could be a sub-examiner and not the head examiner.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said there were two sub-examiner and one head examiner. This was enquired from the Secrecy branch.

No third person was involved in it. When the head examiner has admitted that he has done all this, then why they should say something to the sub-examiners. Rather the sub-examiners have made a written complaint.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is what are the inputs that were not placed before the Bari Committee.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said, yes, this is the point. Whatever was placed before the Bari Committee, they have given their report on the basis of that material. He further said that proper facts were not placed before them. He said that he wrote a letter on 5th August and that letter was referred on 9th August to the Bari Committee. A meeting was convened on that basis of that letter on 22nd August and the report was also submitted on the same day. Whatever was placed before them, they made a report on the basis of those documents. So, he does not accuse them and in the whole report, there is no personal opinion of anyone of them. Whatever is being done, that is being done on facts and documents. They have placed their report before the Syndicate and it is now for them to see as to what has to be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not saying whatever they have done is unworthy. Rather it is necessary for the University to know where are the mistakes. His only concern is that they could have just not written para (D) of the report.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the Bari Committee has given the report on the basis of the files placed before them. Now it needs to be seen as to which files were placed before them. He informed that letters from the colleges were received that they do not have arrangement to accommodate such huge number of students, but the report says that no complaint was there. He said that he could show the letter of the Principal which was received in the office of the Controller of Examinations. So the point of the Committee that no complaint was there is automatically nullified.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu that he (Dr. K.P.S. Shante) is a brilliant teacher and it is his bad luck that he has to face this type of stigma. He had been involved in conducting various quiz competitions of the University for ten years. As per the facts, he is guilty. He suggested that instead of pulling the issue, they should debar him for three years from doing evaluation. He said that Dr. K.P.S. Shante is not his relative. He said that he does not feel that any other person conducting the examination or Controller of Examination or anybody else should be held guilty. They should just debar him (Dr. K.P.S. Shante).

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he should be debarred from any examination work.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is not their work to debar him for three years or so, see the nature of the crime, see what has happened, how the issue has been dealt with. When they have given this in writing, could any enquiry be conducted without the permission of the Vice Chancellor. This is his first question. Secondly, the letter which was sent to Principal Manjeet Brar was sent on telephonic conversation. So, this was taken as a casual letter and non-seriously. Principal Brar was just asked for review and scrutiny. They should ask her that the letter was not sent for what

she has done or they should send this letter to someone else. This became issue after seven months when he raised this, otherwise there was no issue. He felt hurt to point out that the Bari Committee Report says that everything was intact as the Inquiry Officer is saying so., whereas the Inquiry Officer has never talked about it. His question is on the way this case was dealt. He said that he should be debarred for life. He said if the Vice Chancellor says that he has to defend his officer, he would like to say that they have also the right to point out the facts. He further said that Professor Bari is their friend and they have no ill will against him or the Controller of Examinations. They have just brought the facts before Vice Chancellor and he has made a Committee and the Committee has reviewed everything with honesty and nothing wrong has been sent. Their intention was alright. Whatever they have to do, they have to do it on the basis of the interim report of Bari Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was not necessary to comment on the interim report and he disagrees with him (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma).

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said everybody has his own view. Whatever they have seen was not based on facts. Does it mean that they should not say anything. The interim report is the property of the Syndicate and they are examining it. They have not made any personal attack on anyone.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they should reject the interim report. If they are giving some sentence, it could be given only after rejecting that report because they could not give any punishment on that report.

The Vice Chancellor said, how they can reject that report when the three points are the same.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said this is not correct. The first point is wrong because the letter sent by the Principal is there on the file for which they have given clean chit by saying that there is no letter. In point number two, there are two paper which have been repeated, that is right and they have written it. The main issue due to which they are agitated is that a big fraud has taken place, the teachers have given in writing, they have been asking them again and again that why the University is not taking any action. It is the honesty of that person and he admitted that he has done it, otherwise it would have been very difficult to know about this. Their concern was due to the unprecedented fraud that took place in the University. Inquiry officer has not ever said that everything was alright and the Committee has given clean chit.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the view point of Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma should be noted and the resolve part should be decided.

Dr. Dalip Kumar that the observations which he sent he has very clearly written that Professor S.S. Bari and Professor S.S. Chahal Committee report was away from the facts, but point number 2 and 3 are not away from the facts.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they should talk on this point that the report was away from the facts. He pointed out that Subhash ji and everybody in the meeting was unanimous on it. They

respect all the officers, but they should not push it behind the curtain.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he has said that they should take the letter from the D.R. (Secrecy) to see as to what she has written.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the last point (D) of the report is away from the facts.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there seems to be unanimity that the report is away from the facts and the punishment be imposed.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that this is the fact.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that according to him, there are two important questions. They all are unanimous that the crime is of serious nature which is intentional and not unintentional. One important question is as to what facts were placed before the Committee on the basis of which it has submitted its report and the second is why those facts were placed and why not the complete facts were placed. The third question is who placed those facts and why the complete facts were not placed. If a Committee visits the Panjab University and it is not provided with the complete facts, what report it could give. Why the complete facts were not provided to the Committee? Whether it was intentional or unintentional or it was done with a casual approach that whatever is available be provided to the Committee. Since the facts were provided to the Committee with a casual approach, the report was also submitted in a similar way. It could be a possibility. As has been pointed out by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, this was the approach of the Committee. But there is no question on the integrity of the Committee. From the report he understands that the approach of the Committee was casual and the Committee did not take it seriously. Secondly, the facts were not placed before the Committee intentionally just to put the matter under the carpet. There must be some person who did not provide the full facts or wrong facts were given or who was the person who concealed the facts. Why the complete facts and the complaints were not placed before Professor Bari Committee. What is the intention behind not providing the complete facts by the office? He said that the person, who has committed the crime, should be debarred for life. If such a crime occurs in future, the same could also be put under the carpet. It might also be possible that some such matters must have been put under the carpet. If a complaint is received, no action is taken on that. The enquiry has been conducted in a casual way that no serious crime has been committed. They should keep all these things in mind and find out as to who were the persons in the office who were responsible for all this. Otherwise such occurrences could occur again and again. It is an issue of the prestige of the University. He has never heard of any fault in the examination system of Panjab University. However, such things do happen in other universities. But Panjab University still has a prestige in the society that the examination system is very good and there could be not be any ifs and buts. If any such issue is brought out, they should take it very seriously. All the persons who had not placed the complete facts should be identified. The office persons knew about what they are placing before the Committee. The office persons said that no complaint was received on the basis of which the Committee wrote that nothing wrong has happened. There was no fault of Professor Bari Committee.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that to his mind perhaps the report of the enquiry officer has not been shown to the Bari Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the teacher should be punished and as said by Dr. Subhash Sharma, the matter of not placing the complete and correct facts be got investigated.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they should catch hold of the persons who have done it. Today it is the involvement of Dr. Shante, tomorrow there could be someone else. They should take preventive measures otherwise the system would spoil.

Dr. N.R. Sharma said that the mistake of the system should not be attached to a person. If the mistake of the system is put on the person he comes under stress. He further said that if they look at the report, a person who points out the irregularities and deficiencies, as per his knowledge, he cannot become a member of that Committee. Thirdly, there are about two hundred colleges attached to this University and there may be a complaint from some college. A person is holding dual charge and instead of giving him appreciation, they are finding faults. To his mind, the problem is in the system and they should meet it out and they should not hold long discussion on it.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that there is no intention in any of the minds of the person sitting to blame on a person. This was also supported by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if there is something like this, then the system would spoil and then they can speak much more. This University has not only Controller, it has Joint Controller also. There is lot of examination work. They cannot afford that there examination system may fail. He suggested that he (Controller of Examination) should be given a Joint Controller. They have no objection in giving dual charge to him (Controller of Examinations), but the examination system should not affect. The number of examinations have increased many fold with the introduction of semester system. This has put a lot of burden on the officers as well as on the employees. So, he requested to save this examination system. Examination system is more important for the University and not the persons..

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is the sixth year of the Vice Chancellor. Before, his coming to the University, half of the Senate used to waste a lot of time in discussing the examination system. But now the things have improved a lot and many changes have been made.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma asked, should he withdraw his complaint?

Continuing, Professor Mukesh Arora said that much improvement has been there in the examination system. Now the Senate may have discussed the examination issues only about 9-10 times, that is why he is saying that there is much improvement in the examination system. They can be checked the proceedings. No doubt, the shortcomings are still there, which needs to be sorted out. If Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma has pointed out some deficiency in the system, only due to that the discussion is being held here. Even

today, in the colleges all the teachers are deployed on duty on the day of environment paper, because some of the candidates who had not even applied, they do come to appear in the examination. Such students are allowed to appear in the examination by charging the requisite fee. Sometimes the mistake is committed by the college as they do not inform the University. As stated by Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu, sometimes the gum is not applied properly, he has also noticed that sometimes teachers used to see the papers because of the habit of a human being. So, he said, whosoever has done it, he should be debarred from the University work for life. But if the fault is detected somewhere else, the person responsible should also be punished. It is their last meeting and it is for the first time that some discussion is taking place on the examination system. Is a good to know the loopholes and efforts should be made as to how these loopholes could be plugged. They should also praise who is doing his work well. He said when someone gets power, his working capacity increases very much.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that nobody has raised any objection on point four which is the main factor of the report. He asked, have they ever did something as discussed on the examination reforms. Mistakes were happened in the past, happening today and these would people would keep on doing these in future also, nobody can stop it. But they should be supportive and facilitate the things. Media has also covered many reforms such as online submission of forms etc. To his mind, it also matters for the projection of the University. It is not only for the one particular individual. It appears many times. He can quote an example that there is a document of MHRD in which they have mentioned two important issues of Panjab University that they adding a very rich research culture in the form of CRIKC and associated things. They have also quoted that the evaluation system of Panjab University with respect to Ph.D. is highlighted as 120 days. They are saying it always that it could be done in 180 days or in 6 months or it can be done in one year, but it is the target that they are evaluating the Ph.D. thesis in 120 days. It is passed by the Syndicate/Senate. So, he thinks that their effort should be as to how they facilitate the office. How they can facilitate for further improvement in achieving the excellence. He thinks that they should work for that and during this full year i.e. from January to December, he has enjoyed lot of academic deliberations of different dimensions. He was of the opinion that this will enrich his different ways of achieving further knowledge in the way of higher education. He has no hesitation in saying that whatever the point four is concerned, which is of a serious concern for them that should be plugged. They should have their suggestions as to how this could be plugged. But, to his knowledge, the important things is that in one semester they are evaluating round about 20 lacs answer sheets and they are setting about 11 thousand question papers. So, it is important that for such a huge task, they should devise new mechanism for achieving not only the targets but to achieve them in a time-bound manner.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that when they were to talk about the report, he had said that there are many more things to which he (Vice Chancellor) has said to leave those things. He further said that he has also adopted the same approach otherwise there was enough to speak. This is totally wrong that they are attacking any office. They are just talking about the report. Whatever Dr. Subhash ji has said that is alright. They should take into account

the seriousness of point four and also see as to what material was given to that Committee. They did not say anything about any individual, they have just talked on facts. As regards the comments of the Vice Chancellor that as to why he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sahrma) is speaking about the Bari Committee, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said they observed that the report is away from the facts and they have said.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee was formed because in the Syndicate a serious lacuna was pointed out. The Committee was asked to accord urgency to the matter and so it gave an interim report. That interim report is presented. In terms of the second report it turns out that the interim report had not probed those issues or had not unearthed those things which the final report brings. Now the issue is whether some facts were not placed or could not be placed before the Committee or whether it was intentionally done because there was intent to protect somebody. He said that he is just been very frank and open. What did they do when the interim report came in. It says that considered the interim report of the Committee constituted by the vice Chancellor to find the facts and errors which occurred during the conduct of examination for the session 2016-17. The issue related to Environment paper and Geography papers were also included in it. The Syndicate at its meeting had noted the interim report already submitted on this account as an item and resolved that the Interim Report-II of the Committee constituted to find facts and errors which occurred during the conduct of examination for the session 2016-17, be accepted and action as per rules be initiated, against the guilty persons. But they were not satisfied. Dr. Rabinder Nath who had pointed out some malpractice felt that some points were not covered. The Syndicate decision further says that on being being pointed out by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma about some irregularities in the other examinations also, the Vice Chancellor be authorized to form a Committee of Syndics to enquire into the matter. It says some irregularities in other examinations as some irregularities were covered and some, in his (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) opinion were left. That is why this Committee was formed. The Committee has investigated the matter. They have access to some documents i.e. the lists where marks of the candidates were written, but these were not available with the office.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal intervened to say that these documents were given by the complainants in the C.O.E. Office.

The Vice Chancellor asked Controller of Examinations whether the said documents i.e. the marks statements, were available with the office and were they placed before the Bari Committee.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that the complaint which was received on 20th February was immediately sent to D.R.(Secrecy) on 21st April about which Dr. Rabinder Nath, perhaps, is mentioning. There was no material attached to it. The handwritten was given to him without any signature without any diary number and without any complaint. It was given to him by one of the college colleague of Mr. Shante. It was a Photostat copy. After two days, that person again came which is not mentioned in the report of Dr. Rabinder Nath Ji. The person who gave him that paper and some guest faculty came and told him that the evaluation in their college is being done wrongly. He went with them to the

evaluation centre and stopped the evaluation and told them that this will not be carried out. He told him that earlier also the evaluation was done wrongly. Then he asked the Secrecy Branch that the bundles which have already been evaluated, take out some papers randomly and send these to some very senior teacher. It was not a probe neither an investigation. It was to help the office to let him know where things have gone wrong. The person who has done, he had been head of the department and she is now Principal of a College and she had been the department where Mr. Shante and Mr. Surinder has worked. Being in that College for 20 years, he knew some bitterness among few teachers and Mr. Surinder and Shante which he did not like to put on record. They asked him to debar Mr. Shante. By the time the evaluation was going on. There was no evaluation, the moment he came to know of it. That was immediately dealt with and taken by him and that paper was sent to the Principal to give his report. By the time, the examinations were over and issue was raised. Professor Bari and Professor Chahal came to him. Professor Bari had been the Registrar and Controller of Examinations. He understood how the papers are being checked and he did not need to tell him in detail. He asked me as to what is the complaint. The complaint was in the Secrecy Branch. They had brought the report also. That was given by the Secrecy Branch. He gave it to Professor Bari. They did not ask me further. He showed him the handwritten matter, but that was not part of the registered complaint made to the office. They should understand what was the complaint. The complaint was in the printed form, but that handwritten complaint was not part of the complaint. It was never in the record. Now it has come along with the report. Where is the signature of the complainant? Who has put the signature? He does say that it was confessed by Mr. Shante, but nowhere it is mentioned as to where from these have been taken. It can be some planted story to defame the office. He stands for the dignity of his office. Nowhere they have asked the evaluation in-charge to come. Nowhere they have gone to the Computer Centre to see, what was original score and what was the revised score. Why he was not called in the meeting? He has requested in the Syndicate that the Controller of Examinations should be called. Why he was not called? Is it not a personal attack on the C.O.E.? It is personal and he condemns for this thing.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said, don't say condemn, if he (C.O.E.) condemns, he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) also condemns. That is why, he has said that they should first finish discussion on the issue and then call the Controller of Examinations.

The Vice Chancellor said if he (Dr. K.P.S.Shante) has broken the secrecy, this is an unethical thing. Secondly, if he has tampered the marks, has he done it to benefit someone, he asked.

It was stated by some members that no marks have been changed, however Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said the marks have been changed and the marks have been increased.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said there could be difference of 2-3 marks, which is not a big thing.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said when the answer books are checked by another examiners, some change in the marks could be there. Dr. Sandhu also pointed out that one more name has also

cropped up in this matter i.e. the person who has given the Controller of Examinations the papers i.e. the lists.

It was clarified (by the Controller of Examinations) that it was a Photostat copy which was not a part of the report, however, it was shown to Professor Bari.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it is right that it was not a part of the report. But he has given it separately, so it should be seen why he is giving those documents.

Principal B.C. Josan said that a Committee was formed by the Vice Chancellor which consists of four members. This Committee held about 7-8 meetings. He had been consulting Dr. Dalip Kumar also. The email about which Dr. Dalip Kumar is talking about, he has already asked the Deputy Registrar that whatever Dr. Dalip Kumar has said, it should be incorporated. When the whole issue was being discussed, he has said that the Controller of Examinations should also be invited as it would be helpful to them. But, when Dr. Shante came and confessed everything, then they felt that the Controller of Examinations has no role in it. While clarifying this he further said that when he has no involvement in it, then why the Controller of Examinations should be called.

Dr. Dalip Kumar, however, said that he has requested Principal B.C. Josan to call the Controller of Examinations, but he did not call him.

Continuing, Principal Josan said that the Controller of Examinations was ready to come, but all of them said that when the issue i.e. the fourth point, has already be sorted out, then there is no need to call the Controller of Examinations. To his mind the office has no fault in it, but all that has happened, he feels that the Controller of Examinations has less staff and that should be provided to him.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has got nothing that it happened due to shortage of staff.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said no one should have in his mind that it has been done to defame the office. It is nothing like that. A complaint was made and the accused person has admitted that he has done all this. There is nothing to say that something has been planted to defame the office. The issue is that they should see at what level the lapses have occurred and those should be corrected. Nobody is questioning the integrity of the office. Nobody is blaming the office. They all are heading some office and mistakes are committed there, but they are not responsible for all those mistakes. The main thing is that if a mistake has occurred, that should be corrected. In this case, the person who has committed the mistake, he has admitted it, he should be punished. Now they should think that such a lapse may not occur in future. They are not against anybody and he requested that this should not taken personally.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that reforms are always required and they should be done to improve the system.

The Vice Chancellor said that now they should decide the operative part. He asked, do they delete the sentence relating to Professor Bari and Professor Chahal.

All the members agreed to delete this sentence.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it does not look nice and Dr. Rabinder Nath Ji would also agree to it that Professor Bari ji has done according to the material placed before them.

The Vice Chancellor said now finally it is arrived at that this sentence is taken back and the report is accepted and those persons who have confessed that knowingly and unknowingly they have committed an unacceptable act because the examination is very-very sacrosanct. So, keeping in view the sanctity of the examination system, even if something has been done inadvertently, it is unacceptable. So, they should be debarred forever.

This was agreed to.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the person should be debarred from all the University assignments.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the teacher should be debarred for lifetime for all the work relating to the University.

Most of the members agreed to it.

The Vice-Chancellor while pointing out another similar case said that as 11 students of Government College, Sector-11 Chandigarh were failed by Dr. Neelam Paul out of vendetta. They took strong action to debar her. The present case is even more unethical.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he is in favor that the person should be debarred. Now that teacher has retired. If the teacher has committed a mistake on the asking of someone or under some pressure and if they debar him from any work of the University, it would not make much difference to him because the teacher has already retired.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the integrity of the University could not be compromised.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that perhaps such type of things are being projected in such a way whether there is any motive or not, but if someone had handed over some documents to the authorities and he had admitted that the documents belonged to him, it does not matter whether the same are signed or not. The persons who have pointed out the lapse have rendered a good service to the University. Let they leave aside whether the documents were signed or not but if the accused person has admitted his mistake, then there is no question of the documents being signed or unsigned. He agreed to remove the remarks made by the Committee related to Professor S.S. Bari from the report. But as pointed out by Dr. Subhash Sharma, it should also be got examined whether proper material was provided to Bari Committee.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that the officers should be very cautious while dealing with such issues so that this should not happen in future.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that let it be left to the Controller of Examinations to find out who has committed the mistake.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that the CCTV camera should be installed in the evaluation centre so that it could be known as to what is going on in the evaluation centre.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the CCTV cameras could not be installed in an evaluation centre.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have discussed everything threadbare and understand ifs and buts and everything has been recorded. They have expressed grave concern and seriousness that the examination is sacrosanct and they have to protect it. They welcome the person who has made the complaint and let them investigate the matter with thoroughness. Today the matter is better than earlier.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that a letter of appreciation should be sent to the person who has pointed out the deficiency.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would call up the person.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired whether another report related with the examination would be discussed separately or along with this item itself.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that now they are discussing item C-40 and that report is a separate one.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there were complaints related with the examination and that is why the papers have been provided to the members. There was a long discussion on it and in the background of that there was a complaint against the Controller of Examinations. So, he put all the complaints relating to the Controller of Examinations together and it is in that context that the material has been provided to the members. The Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor Rajat Sandhir is looking into it and he has also talked to Shri Varinder Singh and the Controller of Examinations.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the papers provided to the members has been given the title of 'papers concerning to Item C-40'.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is explaining that the Item C-40 is related with the examination and they could take it as another item.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that technically, these papers could not be attached with this item.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he had studied the report. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu did not appear before the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even today also he has received an e-mail which has been combined with the papers for Item C-40 because at one time there were lots of complaints regarding the functioning of the office of Controller of Examinations. Some of those complaints were made by Shri Varinder Singh, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma followed by more complaints by two other Senators. When

there are three different kinds of complaints from the members of the Senate pertaining to the same office of Controller of Examinations, he put all of those complaints to a Statutory Committee.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they have to resolve the issue. Since he was summoned by the Committee, he appeared before it as a member of the Senate. Since Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu has not appeared before the Committee, they, on behalf of the Syndicate, could request him to appear before the Committee and resolve the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever the members say is being videographed and written. When there is a heated argument between a Syndicate member and an officer of the University and it is already recorded and there are serious allegations made, he has to get it dealt with. To deal with it, the only instrument that is available to him is the Statutory Committee whose job is that when there are complaints against the officers of the University, the matter should be investigated. So, when the matter went to the Committee, one of the complainants who alleges something and says that he withdraws the complaint, the Controller of Examinations accepts and the complainant does not want to pursue. But if the person against whom the complaint has been made and says that he has been accused at a public forum and it is in the record of the Syndicate and if in future someone points out the matter, so it has to be resolved. To resolve the matter, the matter goes to the Statutory Committee which has resolved the matter. Now, there are other complaints by two Senators who are going to be the members of the Syndicate, in the meetings of which Controller of Examinations has to be present. There would be a dispute which is unsettled. So that matter has also to be settled. What Shri Varinder Singh is saying that the matter should be settled before the Syndicate meets in January, 2018. In the e-mail sent by Dr. Amit Joshi, the name of Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu is also mentioned. If Dr. Sidhu appears before the Committee and resolves the matter, then the matter is closed. Then, he (Vice-Chancellor) need not take the matter to the next Syndicate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that these papers should not be made part of C-40.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma endorsed whatever Shri Varinder Singh has said. Professor Rajat Sandhir has reported that since the witness has not appeared before the Committee, how they could prepare the report. He suggested that they should request the complainants to appear before the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Amit Joshi is e-mailing to him time and again.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the complainant is Dr. Amit Joshi and Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu is a witness in this case. Dr. Sidhu has not appeared before the Committee, he should appear and resolve the matter.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that 9 e-mails (dated 18.8.17, 15.9.17, 18.10.17, 23.10.17, 14.11.17, 5.12.17, 8.12.17, etc.) have been sent by the Committee to Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu to appear before the Committee. They should request him to appear before the Committee and these papers should not form part of Item C-40.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired whether they have to discuss about the report or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he received some material and he has sent the same to the members.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in the documents supplied to them, it is written as 'papers relating to Item C-40'. As far as he understands, this case would be like that of Shri Munish Verma as the Principal of a College at Fazilka had got appointed a Centre Superintendent by doing wrong attestation. In the present case also, a school teacher had been appointed as Centre Superintendent. Actually, the teachers at the Centre had made a complaint that a school teacher had been appointed as Centre Superintendent. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu had gone there on the complaint and Dr. Amit Joshi had accompanied him. Then there was some discussion between Dr. Amit Joshi and the Controller of Examinations. Actually, the matter related with Dr. Sidhu but now it has become the issue of Dr. Joshi. If a Centre Superintendent had been appointed wrongly and they had asked to remove him, but he was not removed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Amit Joshi is e-mailing to him time and again.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the Controller of Examinations had told Dr. Amit Joshi that the FIR would be filed against the Senator. A telephone call was made that an FIR would be filed against the person. Then the person was asked to make a complaint in order to avoid a case against him. Then the complaint was made. This is the actual situation. The matter related with a wrong appointment of a school teacher as Centre Superintendent but the Controller of Examinations had said that he would not remove the Centre Superintendent. Due to which there was some dispute between Dr. Amit Joshi and the Controller of Examinations.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to who had recommended the name of a school teacher for appointment as a Centre Superintendent.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that this is the important issue.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that whatever had happened at Fazilka, the same thing happened in this case also.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that in the case of Fazilka, the Conduct Branch was being held responsible, but he had stated that the Principal who has recommended the form is at fault and should be punished.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that since Dr. Preet Mohinder who is the Principal of the College at Garhshankar has recommended the form, how the Controller of Examinations office could reject the form.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as the Vice-Chancellor, he visits the Colleges and had also gone to the College headed by Dr. Preet Mohinder. He has been a honourable member of the Senate. They should find out as to what were the compulsions. Whether he

did it under compulsion or it happened inadvertently on behalf of his office because somebody might have put up the form.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it needed to be enquired as to how it happened.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that now the issue is whether the name was recommended as a member of the faculty of the College or as a teacher. If by chance some faculty member is not available for some reasons, there is some school nearby and some outside person is to be appointed as Centre Superintendent and if the Principal recommends the name as a special case, then the University has to see whether the person is to be appointed or not. If the name of the person has been recommended as a College teacher, then it is wrong.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the name has recommended as a College teacher. There is no difference between the earlier case of Shri Munish Verma and the present one. They should go to the root cause of the matter. If a member of the governing body makes some mistake, why he/she should be let off.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it has to be seen whether the complaint was correct or not and what were the corrective steps taken. He suggested that the matter should be completely enquired.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would make the facts known to Professor Rajat Sandhir about the proceedings of today's meetings. He would ask him that even if Dr. Sidhu does not come, Professor Sandhir would look into this aspect.

Dr. Dalip Kumar and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu should appear before the Committee. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that since Dr. Sidhu is a member of the governing body and visits so many places on behalf of the University, could he not spare a little time of 10 minutes to appear before the Committee and the enquiry would be completed. On behalf of the Syndicate, they could send a request to Dr. Sidhu to appear before the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could urge Dr. Sidhu to meet the Committee. They would not comment and explore as to why he did not appear before the Committee till date. He has to be a member of the Syndicate and participate in the Syndicate meeting where the Controller of Examinations is an integral part. They could find a new Dean College Development Council but not a new Controller of Examinations. He would like this matter to be resolved for which a request be made to Dr. Sidhu. He would make efforts to get it resolved and run the meetings of the Syndicate smoothly.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as the Vice-Chancellor is saying that Dr. Amit Joshi is sending the e-mails who has a feeling that if he has written something, he should get answer to that. He requested that as a member of the House, reply should be given to the members. He requested to resolve the matter before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if possible, he is helping the Syndicate that, Committees have been formed on Items No. C-13 and C-32, these issues should be resolved by this very Syndicate itself by

holding a meeting on 30th or 31st December, 2017 otherwise if the report of the Committees are submitted to the next Syndicate, there might arise some problems.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if such matters are resolved, then there is no need to bring the same to the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the meeting could be held on 30th December, 2017.

However, a few of the members said that if the requirement of the quorum is not fulfilled, then the meeting might not be held.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) report dated 27.11.2017 of the Committee constituted to find facts, errors and irregularities in examination pointed out by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Fellow be accepted. However, the para (D) pertaining to comments on interim report-II submitted by the Committee consisting of Professor S.S. Bari and Professor S.S. Chahal be treated as removed from the report;
- (ii) Dr. K.P.S. Shante, who has himself admitted his fault for breaching the sanctity of the examination system, be debarred from undertaking any assignment of the University for future;
- (iii) the Syndicate expressed its concern over such incidents and to plug the loopholes, the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to form a Committee to suggest necessary steps so that such incidents ought not occur in future; and
- (iv) the appointment of Centre Superintendent in Khalsa College, Mahilpur which was alleged to be against the rules be examined by the Standing Committee along with the complaint made by Dr. Amit Joshi. Dr. Inderpal Sidhu be urged to participate in the meeting of Standing Committee so that the Committee can submit the final report to the Vice Chancellor.

Roster for the posts of Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors

13. Considered minutes dated 09.11.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor and as per decision of the Standing Committee dated 09.05.2017, with regard to the task of roster preparation for the posts of Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.08.2017 (Para 35) has resolved that minutes dated 16.08.2017 along with annexure-I, II and III of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, as per decision of the Standing Committee dated 09.05.2017, regarding task of roster preparation for the post of Assistant

Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, be uploaded on website.

2. Accordingly, the revised/updated post based roster for teaching posts (as per DOPT guidelines- Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors) was uploaded on P.U. website vide circular No. 6319-6419/Estt.I dated 12.09.2017, issued to the Chairperson/Head/Director of all the University Teaching Departments/ Institutes and all coordinators of the Institute of Emerging area in Science & Technology & Social Science, P.U. with a request to go through the roster concerned and send the observation if any, to the D.R. (Estt.) within ten working days from the date of the issue of the said circular.

(Appendix A, B & C of the minutes of the Committee dated 09.11.2017, available in the separate volume)

RESOLVED: That Professor Navdeep Goyal will discuss the roster for teaching positions with the Chairperson of the Standing Committee and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to look into the issue and take a decision on behalf of the Syndicate.

Nomination of two eminent jurists on the Research Degree Committee in Law

41. Considered recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the following two eminent jurists, be nominated, on the Research Degree Committee in Law for two years i.e. 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2019, under Regulation 2 at page 408, P.U., Calendar, Volume-II, 2007:

1. Justice S.S. Saron (Retd.)
2. Justice S.D. Anand (Retd.)

NOTE: 1. Regulation 2 at page 408, P.U., Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, reads as under:

“2. A Research Degree Committee in Law shall be appointed by the Syndicate consisting of (i) the Dean of the Law Faculty (ii) two eminent Jurists nominated by the Syndicate and (iii) Chairperson/ Head of the Department of Laws. The term of the Committee will be for a period of two years and the appointment of the members shall be made in time, so that the Committee can function from January following. Any vacancy occurring during the course of the term, shall be filled by the Syndicate for the remaining term of the Committee.”

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.10.2015 (Para 16) **(Appendix-XXXVIII)** has authorised the Vice-Chancellor to nominate two eminent jurist on the Research Degree Committee in Law for two years i.e.

01.01.2016 to 31.12.2017 under Regulation 2 at page 408, P.U., Calendar, Volume-II, 2007.

3. An office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XXXVIII)**.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor for nomination of the following two eminent jurists on the Research Degree Committee in Law for two years i.e. 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2019, under Regulation 2 at page 408, P.U., Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, be approved:

1. Justice S.S. Saron (Retd.)
2. Justice S.D. Anand (Retd.)

Report dated 06.12.2017 of the Committee to visit Panipat and explore better options regarding utilization/disposal of the two properties

43. Considered report dated 06.12.2017 (**Appendix-XXXIX**) of the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate, to visit Panipat and explore better options regarding utilization/ disposal of the two properties i.e. two Industrial plots Nos. E 68 of size 2427 Sq. Yard and E 69 of size 1382 Sq. Yard, donated by Shri Devan Som Nath Arora in the year 1960.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.08.2017 (29) (**Appendix-XXXIX**) considered the issue with regard to with regard to utilization/disposal of the property i.e. two industrial plots Nos. E 68 of size 2427 Sq. Yard and E 69 of size 1382 Sq. Yard, located at Panipat and resolved that Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Registrar and few other Syndicate members be requested to visit the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Panipat and explore better options regarding utilization/ disposal of the two properties of Panjab University situated there.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they had visited the site at Panipat and came to know that the donor had 28 acres of land at village Urlana and 5½ acres at Harthali Khurd which was disposed off in the year 1970. As regards the plot at Panipat with SBI, endowment fund has been created in the name of Shri Som Nath Arora for providing scholarship to the students. In the 'Will', it has been mentioned that the returns from the property would be used for paying scholarships to the students but could not be used for constructing a hostel. Now, there are only two plots left at Panipat and he suggested that the boundary wall of the plots be constructed. Thereafter, they could think of what to do with these plots. He suggested some options which may include either to construct a warehouse for rent purposes or some institute of the University or the plots could be auctioned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the after auctioning the plots, the amount could be utilized for paying scholarships to the girl students of Haryana.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the scholarships could be provided not only to Haryana students but also to all the poor students of Panjab University. He informed that they already

have an endowment in the name of Late Dewan Som Nath Stipend and at present they are paying a stipend of Rs. 400/- p.m. to 25 students for 10 months in a year.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that a warehouse could be constructed and the income generated could be utilized for the payment of scholarships.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could not be a viable proposal.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could earn more interest if the plot is sold and the income so generated could be utilized for the payment of scholarship.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the plots be sold and the students be paid scholarship out of the proceeds. They could take the help of a Senate member who is an expert in financial matters.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested to keep the documents pointed out by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal in safe custody for future use.

RESOLVED: That the two plots of the University situated at Panipat be merged and boundary wall around it be constructed with a proper gate and signboard notifying property of Panjab University to avoid encroachment and necessary steps be initiated to dispose off the same through public auction and the revenue so generated be put in a separate fund to be created by the University and the interest so accrued be utilized to pay scholarships to the poor students.

Appointment of Dr. Jagmohan Singh Raju, IAS as Visiting Professor in Department of Public Administration

44. Considered letter dated 06.11.2017 of Dr. Jagmohan Singh Raju, IAS, Additional Chief Secretary, Government of Tamilnadu, duly recommended by the Academic and Administrative Committee and forwarded by the Chairperson, P.U. vide letter 1890/PA/17 dated 30.11.2017, for his appointment as Visiting Professor.

- NOTE:** 1. The Vice Chancellor has observed that Computer, A.C. etc. can be provided. We are committed a room for retired faculty in every building.
2. C.V. of Dr. Jagmohan Singh Raju, IAS, Additional Chief Secretary, Government of Tamilnadu is enclosed (**Appendix-XL**).

RESOLVED: That as recommended by the Academic and Administrative Committee of the Department of Public Administration (**Appendix-XL**), Dr. Jagmohan Singh Raju, IAS, Additional Chief Secretary, Government of Tamilnadu, be appointed as Visiting Professor in the Department of Public Administration.

Appointment of Chair Professors

46. Considered minutes dated 05.12.2017 (**Appendix-XLI**) of the committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.11.2017 (Para 12) (**Appendix-XLI**) for providing the details of the Chairs and the names of the Senior Professors to be considered for appointment as Chair Professors.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 05.12.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.11.2017 (Para 12) (**Appendix-XLI**) for appointment as Chair Professors, **as per Appendix-**, be approved.

Appointment of Professor Rajat Sandhir, Department of Biochemistry as Associate Director, Research Promotion Cell

47. Considered recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that Professor Rajat Sandhir, Department of Biochemistry be appointed as Associate Director, Research Promotion Cell in place of Professor V.R. Sinha, Department of UIPS

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.11.2017 (Para 39) (**Appendix-XLII**) considered that minutes dated 16.11.2017 of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for appointment of Director, Associate Director (RPC) and resolved that Professor V.R. Sinha, Department of UIPS be appointed as Associate Director. Accordingly, the appointment letter have been issued vide office order dated 30.11.2017 (**Appendix-XLII**).
 2. The Dean of University Instruction vide her letter dated 8.12.2017 (**Appendix-XLII**) has written that Professor V.R. Sinha, UIPS has not accepted the post of Associate Director (RPC). Therefore, it is proposed that Professor S.K. Tomar, Department of Mathematics may be appointed as Associate Director in place of Professor V.R. Sinha.
 3. The Vice-Chancellor has observed that:
 - (i) Accept the plea of Professor V.R. Sinha.
 - (ii) I have inquired from, the next person in seniority who had applied for RPC Directorship, Professor S.K. Tomar, whether he would accept to be considered for Associate Director (RPC). He has declined.
 - (iii) I have spoken to Professor Rajat Sandhir thereafter. He is willing to be considered as Associate Director (RPC). Let his name be put for Associate Director (RPC)

RESOLVED: That Professor Rajat Sandhir, Department of Biochemistry be appointed as Associate Director, Research Promotion Cell in place of Professor V.R. Sinha, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the appointment letter be issued to him, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**Resolution proposed
by Shri Deepak
Kaushik**

48. Considered the Resolution (**Appendix-XLIII**) proposed by Shri Deepak Kaushik, Fellow, reproduced as under:

“(i) Amendment in Syndicate decision dated 1/15/28/29/5/2016 (Para 52) in consonance with the recommendation of JCM dated 29.12.2015 relating to the posts of Deputy Registrars, i.e. 50% by promotion and 50% by selection and (ii) earmarking 25% of the open selection posts of Deputy Registrars for selection from amongst internal candidates.”

EXPLANATION:

The JCM, in its meeting held on 29.12.2015, had recommended the change in ratio for filling up the posts of the Deputy Registrars from 75:25 to 50:50 through selection/promotion. But the Syndicate in its meeting held in May, 2016 modified the recommendations of the JCM and instead of approving 50% of total posts of Deputy Registrars as promotional posts, resolved that 25% out of the promotion posts be filled up through selection but only from amongst the internal candidates.

From the above, it is quite evident that 50% of the posts shall not be available for internal promotion (based on seniority above) whereas the demand of employees was for 50% internal promotion and accordingly this demand was agreed upon by the JCM, the minutes of which were duly approved by the Vice-Chancellor.

In the light of above, the decision of the Syndicate may be reviewed and modified in accordance with the recommendation of the JCM earmarking 50% posts of Deputy Registrars for promotion and 25% of the open selection posts be earmarked for internal selection only on seniority from amongst the internal candidates.”

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 01/15/28 & 29.05.2016 (Para 52) (**Appendix-XLIII**) has approved the recommendations of JCM dated 29.12.2015 with the modification that the ratio of filling up the posts of Deputy Registrars by open selection and seniority-cum-merit be 50:50. 25% of the 50% of the promotional posts be filled through seniority-cum-merit and the remaining 25% through selection but only from amongst the internal candidates.

RESOLVED: That a Committee comprising of Dr. Subhash Sharma, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Shri Prabhjit Singh and Shri Deepak Kaushik be formed to look into the resolution proposed by Shri Deepak Kaushik.

Legal opinion

49. Considered letter No.PFC/JAC/2017/361 dated 27.10.2017 (**Appendix-XLIV**) received from Punjab Financial Corporation, Jalandhar, regarding Loan account: M/s Chopra Industrial Corporation, Jalandhar, a partnership concern of Shri Vijay Kumar Chopra S/o Shri Prem Nath Chopra along with legal opinion received

from Shri Arvind Seth, Advocate, and Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate, pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 10.12.2017 (Para 8) (**Appendix-XLIV**).

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.6.2017 (Para 9) (**Appendix-XLIV**) considered the letter dated 31.05.2017 from Chairperson, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC in respect of Professor Vijay K. Chopra and resolved that a Committee including Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. Mohammad Khalid be constituted to follow up the cases of misappropriation of funds of Punjab Financial Corporation by Professor Vijay K. Chopra.

The report dated 15.09.2017 of the above said Committee was considered by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 23) (**Appendix-XLIV**) and resolved that legal opinion be sought as to what kind of action could be initiated against Professor V.K. Chopra.

2. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 19.11.2017 (Para 25) (**Appendix-XLIV**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 10.12.2017 (Para 8) has resolved that:-
 - (i) the Legal Opinion in the case be expedited; and
 - (ii) the Dean College Development Council be requested to provide the record relating to the visit of Dr. V.K. Chopra as a DPI nominee to the RSD College, Ferozepur and other places, if any, to be placed before the Syndicate in the meeting scheduled on 19th December, 2017.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that they should take up this item in the next meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said it is okay and they should see whatever has been received.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have received the legal opinion to which some members said, whatever has been received it is okay.

RESOLVED: That letter No. PFC/JAC/2017/361 dated 27.10.2017 received from Punjab Financial Corporation, Jalandhar, regarding Loan account: M/s Chopra Industrial Corporation, Jalandhar, a partnership concern of Shri Vijay Kumar Chopra S/o

Shri Prem Nath Chopra along with legal opinion received from Shri Arvind Seth, Advocate, and Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate, **as per Appendix**, be accepted.

Minutes dated 29.11.2017 of the Committee to examine and recommend the changes, if any, in existing Panjab University Ph.D. Guidelines

50. Considered minutes dated 29.11.2017 (**Appendix-XLV**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine and recommend the changes, if any, in existing Panjab University Ph.D. Guidelines in accordance with the UGC Minimum Standards and Procedure for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 29.11.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine and recommend the changes, if any, in existing Panjab University Ph.D. Guidelines in accordance with the UGC Minimum Standards and Procedure for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree, **as per Appendix-**, be referred back to Committee.

Case of Ms. Gurbani Kaur C Sekhon for permission to appear provisionally for the examination of LL.B.

51. Considered request dated 14.12.2017 and 15.12.2017 (**Appendix-XLVI**) of Ms. Gurbani Kaur C Sekhon, Roll No.561/15, LL.B 3 year, with regard to permit her to appear provisionally for the examination, already held on 19.11.2017, as she could not appear for the same due to riots in Sirsa.

NOTE: 1. Clause D (ii) appearing at page 55 of Hand Book of Information 2017, is reproduced as below:

“In case of inability to attend classes due to natural calamities/ riots/law and order problem, number of lectures delivered during the period of absence of the students (maximum upto 5 working days) will be condoned.”

2. The Vice-Chancellor has observed as under:

(i) “Let it be informed for all. We have already conceded three days to all students.

(ii) “Where is the proof that she was in sirsa. The student is trying to hoodwink the PU authorities. I am not sympathetic to her. Let it go to the Syndicate.”

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should allow the candidate as per her request. As per the rules already framed there is provision that in case of inability to attend classes due to natural calamities/riots/law and order problem during the period of absence of the students (maximum up to 5 working days) will be condoned.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has no objection to it, they can do it, but there are many other things written in the regulations regarding five days. They gave the benefit in some other cases up to

3 days only, why she should be given five days. The candidate has said that she was in Hissar. So, she should submit a proof to this effect. If she submits a proof, he could then allow her the benefit of 5 working days.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested to accept the request of the candidate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not a decision maker. It is not correct what the candidate is doing.

However some other members also endorsed the view point of Professor Navdeep Goyal.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have given the benefit of three days only to the students, but he would do it if she gives a proof to the effect

Dr. Dalip Kumar asked, would she be given the benefit of 5 days if she gives a proof?

The Vice Chancellor said he would give her the benefit of 5 days if she gives the proof.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they authorize the Vice Chancellor whether he would like to do it or not.

The Vice Chancellor said, give him the proof, he will then do it, otherwise she would get into a trouble. Some other student may come to him to question that if he had also been given the benefit, he (student) would have become eligible. He has not got any appeal from the student for grant of benefit of 5 working days. He has been asking a proof for the appeal which he has received.

Some members said that she would submit the proof.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision in the matter if the candidate submits a documentary proof that she was in Sirsa for 5 days during the days of riots.

Item No. C-52 was taken up for consideration after Item No. C-53.

Utilisation of services of Dr. Muneeshwar Joshi to assist the Fact Finding Committee on fire incident

53. Considered recommendations of the fact finding Committee dated 13.12.2017 (**Appendix-XLVII**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, P.U., to look into the fire incident, that the services of Dr. Muneeshwar Joshi, D.R. (Accounts), be made available upto 31.01.2018, for completion of the report, as he is going to retire on 31.12.2017 from University Services, after attaining the age of superannuation.

NOTE: 1. The above Committee has observed that Dr. Joshi has been maintaining the record, such as minutes of the meetings held from the beginning and the documents taken on record & marked & also the communications addressed to

various quarters & the replies so received, which would require to be consulted from time to time for preparation of Final Report, which is in final stage.

2. His reemployment shall take effect from 02.01.2018 i.e. after one day's break on 01.01.2018 and he be paid salary @ last pay drawn in the present pay scale minus pension rounded off to nearest lower 100, to be calculated on the basis of current rates, out of the budget head "Temporary Establishment / Contractual Services/ Hiring Services/ Out sourcing/ Casual workers".

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Muneeshwar Joshi has been requested to help the Justice Narang Committee. Dr. Muneeshwar Joshi said that he would help the Committee, but he does not want to accept any honorarium. He has been requested to provide his services for a month.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that he is an employee of this University and he should be given some honorarium.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Muneeshwar Joshi) is not willing to accept any honorarium and if he is given any honorarium, he would not work.

Some members were of the opinion that they should not hurt his feelings and requested that he should be given the extension till 31st of March, otherwise it would need to be extended again.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would not like to set a precedent of this kind. If he does that, many more people would come to him. The Vice Chancellor said that he wants to respect his feelings and he does not want to hurt his dignity in any way.

RESOLVED: That recommendations of the fact finding Committee dated 13.12.2017, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, P.U., to look into the fire incident, that the services of Dr. Muneeshwar Joshi, D.R. (Accounts), be made available upto 31.01.2018, for completion of the report, as he is going to retire on 31.12.2017 from University service, after attaining the age of superannuation, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the offer of Dr. Muneeshwar Joshi for providing his services without any remuneration be accepted.

Recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor on the request of Shri Sahil Gurcharan Singh, student of LL.B. 1st semester

52. Considered recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that Shri Sahil Gurcharan Singh, student of LL.B. 1st semester, Roll No. 283/17, Section D, Department of Laws, be permitted to seek admission in 1st semester of next year, without appearing for another entrance test.

NOTE: 1. Request dated 15.12.2017 of Shri Sahil G Singh is enclosed (**Appendix-XLVIII**).

2. The Vice-Chancellor has observed that “I trust that Syndicate will accept this recommendation as a very rare case”.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is a student of LL.B. 1st semester who due to some reasons could not appear in the examination. Now he has requested that if he may be allowed to sit in the examination, his admission would be cancelled. If he has been a student of 3rd Semester, there would not have been any problem. The Vice Chancellor asked, if they can permit him to take admission in the Ist semester next year without entrance examination.

On being asked by the members it was informed (by the Registrar) that he is a student of Ist Semester and he could not appear in the examination because of shortage of attendance as his mother was suffering from cancer.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that different courses has different regulations. Somewhere it is allowed and somewhere it is not allowed.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that in this case it is not allowed.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that at some places, the regulations are silent and to his mind, the rules are silent in this case. He further said that if the rules are silent, then they can do either way and, therefore, they should permit him to take admission in the Ist semester next year without entrance examination. This was endorsed by the members also.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the Syndicate permit, then it would be done, but the problem is that next year one seat less would be filled next year.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the seat would be additional.

The Vice Chancellor asked if the Bar Council of India would allow this. They could adjust him if some seat remains vacant.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has taken admission in the last year. He reiterated that if the rules are silent, they can do either way and in this case the rules are perhaps silent. He said that they should check the regulation in this regard.

Some members said that the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to take a decision as he deems fit.

The other members also requested that the candidate should be permitted to take admission in the next year without entrance test.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that to his mind, they had been allowing the failure students and they should allow him to appear in one paper to which the Registrar said he cannot appear in the second semester as his lectures are short.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, after checking the Calendar Volume-II, said that there is no regulation which bars him. In large number of cases they consider such candidate as fail candidates and make their admission. This will be an additional seat and it will not affect the new admissions. So, this is what they are approving to which the Vice Chancellor said okay.

RESOLVED: That recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor to permit Shri Sahil Gurcharan Singh, student of LL.B. 1st semester, Roll No. 283/17, Section D, Department of Laws, to seek admission in LL.B. 1st semester next year, without appearing in entrance test, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

The items for ratification from Sr. No. R-(i) to R-(v) were taken up in the meeting held on 10th December, 2017 under Para No. 48. Items No. R-(i) to R-(iv) were ratified, however Item R-(v) was deferred which has been taken up in this meeting (19th December, 2017) under Para 54. All the items for ratification, i.e. R-(i) to R-(v) under Para 48 of Syndicate meeting dated 10th December 2017 be treated as part of Para 54 (19th December, 2017).

Routine and formal matters

54. The information contained in Item **R-(v)** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Committee dated 10.10.2017 duly forwarded by the Director, Research Promotion Cell vide letter dated 16.10.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the pre Ph.D. requirements in order to qualify for enrolment that:

1. In the areas of inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary research wherein more than one disciplines are involved, there is a requirement of equivalence of the syllabi. It is desired that the Academic Committee of the Centre or Department along with concerned Supervisor, it is desired whether the candidate with a particular background/degree has sufficient knowledge to pursue Ph.D. in the field in which he/she is seeking enrolment. The candidate can always make up the deficiencies with his personal efforts, Supervisor's support and the Pre-Ph.D. course work with additional assignments for further grooming the candidate. Relatively new inter-disciplinary Centres/Departments have Faculty with background from traditional subjects, and enrolment of students with different background will help in the growth of these interdisciplinary subjects as well as that of the Faculty.
2. For inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary research, equivalence of PG course content is not of much relevance and rather incongruous to the spirit of research in the modern era of science. Therefore, as such equivalence of candidate's PG course syllabus with that of highly specialized

PG course being run by a Centre should not be considered as prerequisite for doing Ph.D.

- NOTE:** 1. A copy of the minutes dated 10.10.2017 of the Committee is enclosed.
2. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.11.2017 as Ratification item (R-ix) and it was resolved that the information contained item R-(ix) be deferred

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Items R-(v)** be referred to the Committee already constituted to look into the pre Ph.D. requirements in order to qualify for enrolment and the name of Principal I.S. Sandhu be also included in the Committee.

The items for information from Sr. No. I-(i) to I-(iv) were taken up in the meeting held on 10th December, 2017 under Para No. 49 and noted. Items No. I-(v) & I-(vi) (new items) have been taken up in this meeting (19th December, 2017) under Para 55. The items for information, i.e. I-(i) to I-(iv) under Para 49 of Syndicate meeting dated 10th December 2017 be treated as part of Para 55 (19th December, 2017).

Routine and formal matters

55. The information contained in Items **I-(v)** and **I-(vi)** on the agenda was read out and noted, viz.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor has approved the following recommendations dated 12.12.2017 (**Appendix-XLIX**) of Dean of University Instruction and Professor Navdeep Goyal, Syndics & Fellow that:

1. the students will be allowed lectures of one day on account of Blood Donation Camp.
2. no prior permission is required for participating in Student Council events by Chairperson/DSW. It shall be considered as permitted.
3. condonation benefits of the next semester shall be provided in the current semester for those lectures which are to be given by the Vice-Chancellor i.e. 10 lectures with an undertaking that they will not claim this benefit in the next semester. Such a request ought not become further precedence.
4. students who could not attend classes due to riots on account of Baba Ram Rahim agitation, will be given condonation for 3 days.
5. for providing condonation on account of Blood Donation Camp and riots, the standard criteria of 5 lectures per day be given by respective departments.

The case may be got prepared by the Department for approval of the Vice-Chancellor.

NOTE: A circular has been issued by the DUI vide No. 9755-9845/DUI/DS dated 13.12.2017 (**Appendix-XLIX**).

- (vi). The Vice-Chancellor has allowed a special chance for holding the counselling of migration to LL.B. 3rd semester, Department of Laws, before the beginning of the 4th semester, for special circumstances.

NOTE: A copy of letter dated 15.12.2017 of COE regarding migration to 3rd semester in the Department of Laws is enclosed (**Appendix-L**).

General Discussion

- (1) Principal I.S. Sandhu said that earlier Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu had raised the issue of screening of applications under CAS promotion in the Colleges. He said that for screening the applications, a nominee of Dean College Development Council and a subject expert are required and there is no need to send the names for approval of the Vice-Chancellor as the Dean College Development Council is authorized to forward the names. He further said that this would also reduce the burden of the Vice-Chancellor to a great extent and would also speed up the matters.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

- (2) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that in the last meeting he had raised the issue of the students who could not submit the examination fee in time. He requested to provide a special chance to such candidates.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that the cases which had been received in the office had been submitted to the Vice-Chancellor for approval.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in the last meeting he had raised the point as to who is authorized to waive off the late fee but he could not get any information about that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal) had said that the University is losing income on this account which was a source of income. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal had said that it should be examined whether the relief is not being given unnecessarily. The Vice-Chancellor said that it could be considered case by case. Whatever Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal had said is right.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there are so many poor students who could not take admission in the Colleges appear as private candidates. The late fee is as high as Rs.11,000/- which is very difficult for them to pay. However, sometimes the candidates living in rural do not get the information about the submission of the forms in time.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that the late fee, which is on the higher side, could be reduced.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that a Committee could be formed including the Controller of Examinations to examine such cases of hardship.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it would be difficult for the Committee if any of the Committee members is from a faraway place.

Shri Varinder Singh said that sometimes the fault also lies with the office.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that if they waive off the late fee, there would be a great loss of crores of rupees to the University exchequer.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that the late fee should be nominal as the late fee of Rs.22,000/- is too much.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Subhash Sharma to prepare a proposal in this regard.

Shri Jarnail Singh and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the earlier cases should also be reviewed.

- (3) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that in the last meeting he had raised the issue of data regarding Provident Fund and Gratuity Fund but the same has not been provided.

It was informed (by the Dean College Development Council) that they have got data from 95 Colleges regarding gratuity and from 100 Colleges regarding PF.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Dean College Development Council to e-mail all this information to the members and requested the members to send their comments.

- (4) Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that the soft copy of the agenda should be sent to the members by e-mail so that the members could read the agenda even if they are outstation.

It was agreed to (by the Registrar).

- (5) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that since the officers are there in the meeting to help the authorities

Syndicate Proceedings dated 10th / 19th December, 2017

they should not be made a part of dialogue when some issue concerning that officer is discussed otherwise it could create unpleasant situation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be taken care of.

(G.S. Chadha)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR