

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Sunday, 25th June 2017 at 10.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

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

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Principal N.R. Sharma, Professor Pam Rajput, Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Shri Lakhmir Singh, Director Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

**Vice-Chancellor's
Statement**

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

1. Smt. Kirron Kher, Member of Parliament, UT, Chandigarh and Fellow, Panjab University released Prof. Balwant Gargi Stamp on May 31, 2017 in the presence of Shri P.K. Swain, Chief Postmaster General (Punjab, and Chandigarh) at PU Campus.
2. Prof. Suveera Gill of University Business School, PU, was assigned to look after the work of Chief Vigilance Officer in lieu of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, who had been appointed as Dean of University Instruction by the Syndicate. It will come up as an agenda item.
3. Prof. Sukhbir Kaur, Chairperson, Department of Zoology, PU, has received Fellowship Award/Scroll from Zoological Society of India at a recently held Annual Congress at Barrackpore, West Bengal from June 9-11, 2017. She has also been elected as President of the Indian Society of Parasitology (ISP). Normally, the annual meeting happens at the campus.
4. Enactus SSBUI CET team of Panjab University was declared as one of the top 4 finalists out of 160 teams nationwide during ENACTUS NATIONALS-2017 held at Mumbai on 17th June, 2017. The team also won the 2nd runners up prize of Rs. 75000/- as Mahindra Rise Grant. The team's faculty advisor, Prof. Seema Kapoor won the Best Faculty Advisor award for the professional and

personal development of Enactus students for the fourth consecutive year.

5. A team of five students from UIET under the mentorship of Mr. Arun Kumar Dhawan (Programming Assistant) & Mr. Satish Sharma (Jr. Technician) and Team Leader Ms. Manisha Singh (student), participated in the Smart India Hackathon 2017 organized by Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India. The team had submitted a total of 12 ideas, 4 of these were selected for the grand finale. The UIET Team developed Android App for the Department of Biotechnology, and won a cash prize of Rs. 10,000/-. Hon'ble Prime Minister of India also interacted with the teams online during the Hackathon.
6. Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, former F.D.O., PU, has been nominated as a member of Juvenile Justice Board of UT, Chandigarh for a period of three years.
7. Under the MoU signed between the PU and the University of Wurzburg (UW), Germany, Prof. Upinder Sawhney has gone to Wurzburg to teach a course on the 'Development process of Indian economy'. She will be there for a period of 6 months.
8. Three PU staff members, viz., Shri Navtej Singh (SAIF/CIL), Dr. Arun Bansal IQAC) and Dr Anupreet Mavi (UIAMS) have been selected by Punjab Biodiversity Board for the 1st Census of State Animal "Blackbuck" at Abohar Wildlife Sanctuary in collaboration with Department of Forest & Wildlife Preservation, Punjab.
9. Mr. Sarwar Beg, a UGC Senior Research Fellow at University Instt. of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), PU, has been bestowed with 'Sun Pharma Science Scholar Award' by Sun Pharma Science Foundation for his research work on cardiovascular drugs. The award was conferred upon him by Shri J. P. Nadda, Union Minister of Health, Government of India. The award carries an engraved plaque and a cash prize of Rs.50,000.
10. In view of recent developments concerning financial matters of our University, the 'Think Tank' for financial requirements is proposed to be re-constituted as follows:
 - i) Prof. A.K. Grover (Chairman)
Vice Chancellor
 - ii) Prof. Meenakshi Malhotra, DUI
 - iii) Prof. A.K. Bhandari
 - iv) Prof. Rajiv Lochan
 - v) Shri Satya Pal Jain
 - vi) Prof. D.V.S. Jain
 - vii) Prof. Shelly Walia
 - viii) Shri Subhash Sharma
 - ix) Prof. Keshav Malhotra
 - x) Prof. Ronki Ram
 - xi) Prof. Navdeep Goyal
 - xii) Prof. Sanjay Kaushik
 - xiii) PUTA President

- xiv) Col. G.S. Chadha, Registrar
- xv) Shri Vikram Nayyar, FDO
Secretary to Vice Chancellor (Convener)

11. There is an urgent need to induct/seek approval from MHRD/UGC for the following officers in the University: Some letters have been received which have been sent to the members by e-mail as a part of the information where we can seek to fill the positions which are vacant. We are seeking approval for:
- i) Chief of University Security
 - ii) Fire Officer (new position to be created)
 - iii) Medical Officers (there is only one regular Medical Officer and most of the posts are vacant, against some of them temporary arrangements stand made at present)
 - iv) Deputy Registrars
 - v) Associate and full Professors in the reserved category (SC and ST), which are vacant. We have passed a resolution in the Senate to fill up these posts.
 - vi) Assistant Professor positions against which appointments stand made at present on yearly renewal basis in various PU institutes and departments. We have a large number of faculty which is continuing on yearly basis with the approval of the Syndicate. But it is better to think of regularising them by way of advertisement.
12. A common Committee including representatives from the Colleges, campus, Syndics, Senators, DPI Colleges is proposed to be constituted.

While referring to statement at Sr. No.12, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that all kinds of fee should be rationalised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the other charges would also be included in it.

While referring to statement at Sr. No.11, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for about more than a year, no positions have been filled up. There are some Departments from which the teachers after completing the age of 65 years are retiring due to which it is becoming difficult to run the courses.

The Vice-Chancellor said that those teachers who have completed 65 years of age during the last three years, since the time they passed a resolution in 2013 regarding 65 years. Those teachers who were 63 years of age at that time, they were allowed to continue up to the age of 65 years. Those who had completed the age of 65 years after 2014, at least those positions should be filled up.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that some Chairs have also not been filled up.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the information was requisitioned from the Departments but the information has not been provided.

Professor Mukesh Arora requested that this information be requisitioned.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the position of Dean College Development Council should also be included in the list of posts to be filled up.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the post of Dean College Development Council is already advertised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is already advertised and would be included in the list.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that for the post of Dean College Development Council interview has to be conducted.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that advertisement for DCDC is to be given again.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it is to be advertised again because the criterion has been changed in the UGC 4th amendment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have already shortlisted the candidates and the permission be granted and the details would be worked out.

Principal B.C. Josan congratulated the Vice-Chancellor and his team for making efforts in getting the grants from Punjab Government as well as UGC.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it is a beginning on the part of the Punjab Government as well as MHRD.

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested the appreciation of the Syndicate be conveyed to the Punjab Government as well as UGC. This was also supported by Shri Jarnail Singh and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal.

While referring to statement at Sr. No.10, Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that in the proposed Think Tank, at least one representative each from the Colleges of Chandigarh and Punjab should also be included as their inputs also matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the efforts being made by the Vice-Chancellor are very good and all the Syndicate members appreciate it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if there was no court case, then this result would not have been there. In the last letter that has come day before yesterday, the MHRD has written to the UGC that the case going in the Supreme Court be resolved. There are enough indications that the UGC would not pursue the case in the Supreme Court.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the appreciation of the Syndicate be conveyed and such opportunity should be provided so that the matters are solved amicably.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the MHRD Minister was met by a team of the Professors of the University and he has, in principle, accepted to visit the Panjab University in the first week of September. He (Vice-Chancellor) has met the Secretary to the Minister who has noted it and he would get back. He would continuously follow it up so that the Minister visits in the first week of September. Let they hope that the matter would be sorted out which seems from the tone of the letter from the MHRD, though no copy has been received in the University, only those copies have been received in the University which are not addressed to the University. One of those letters is addressed to the UGC and the other to the Punjab Government but the tone of the letter is positive for the University. There is an acceptance that Panjab University as a national institute funded by the Central Government needs to be sustained. There is at least a talk, an acknowledgement that Panjab University has a deficit and the Government has given some algorithm and how to work out it. He was persuading the DPI Punjab and UT to come to the meeting but could not succeed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the DPI is busy in making a presentation on the Skill Development.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let they hope that the things start moving and he is keeping the MHRD counsel Shri Satya Pal Jain informed of all the letters received from MHRD.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that both the Chief Minister and the Education Minister of Punjab are meaningful people, are positive and the University should continuously approach them and they are ready to help.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are few things which are placed as table agenda. The members should go through the same as the meeting progresses. These relate to choice of Faculties, MoU, amendment in Accounts Manual, papers concerning SPN College, Mukerian, Fire Safety Manual, three letters from Delhi out of which two to the UGC written by MHRD and one of Punjab Government.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that 6-7 Fellows had met the Education Minister, Punjab along with the documents provided by the Registrar. She had assured that she would talk with the Finance Minister regarding the grants for Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that finally, they have to deal with the Education Minister and she is also an ex-officio member of the Senate. He would once again seek a meeting with her as she is the correct person to meet.

RESOLVED: That –

1. felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Prof. Sukhbir Kaur, Chairperson, Department of Zoology, PU, on having received Fellowship Award/Scroll from Zoological Society of India and on having

been elected as President of the Indian Society of Parasitology (ISP);

- (ii) Prof. Seema Kapoor, Faculty Advisor, Enactus SSBUI CET Team on having won the Best Faculty Advisor;
 - (iii) Enactus SSBUI CET team of Panjab University on having been declared as one of the top 4 finalists out of 160 teams nationwide during ENACTUS NATIONALS-2017 and also on having won the 2nd runners up prize of Rs. 75000/- as Mahindra Rise Grant;
 - (iv) team of students from UIET under the mentorship of Mr. Arun Kumar Dhawan (Programming Assistant) & Mr. Satish Sharma (Jr. Technician) and Team Leader Ms. Manisha Singh (student) on having won a cash prize of Rs. 10,000/- for developing Android App in the Smart India Hackathon 2017;
 - (v) Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, former F.D.O., PU, on having been nominated as a member of Juvenile Justice Board of UT, Chandigarh for a period of three years;
 - (vi) Shri Navtej Singh (SAIF/CIL), Dr. Arun Bansal IQAC) and Dr Anupreet Mavi (UIAMS) on having been selected by Punjab Biodiversity Board for the 1st Census of State Animal "Blackbuck" at Abohar Wildlife Sanctuary in collaboration with Department of Forest & Wildlife Preservation, Punjab;
 - (vii) Mr. Sarwar Beg, a UGC Senior Research Fellow at University Instt. of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), PU, on having been bestowed with 'Sun Pharma Science Scholar Award' by Sun Pharma Science Foundation for his research work on cardiovascular drugs;
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (1), (2) and (7) be noted;
 3. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (10) be noted and approved with the addition of one member each from the Colleges of Chandigarh and Punjab;
 4. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (11), be noted and approved with the addition of the post of Dean College Development Council;

5. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (12) be noted and approved with the inclusion of other charges also in addition to tuition as well as examination fee;
6. the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 28.05.2017, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

Issue of seniority of University teachers

2. Considered further the issue of seniority of teachers in the Departments/Institutions of the University.

NOTE: A copy of the order dated 03.06.2017, minutes of the Committee dated 14.06.2017 and decision the Syndicate meeting dated 28.05.2017 (Para 12) are enclosed (**Appendix-II**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is in continuation of an item of the last meeting. They had discussed the issue and had taken a conscious decision as to how to handle this. They were supposed to prepare a seniority list and the seniority list was again to be circulated to the teachers for their feedback and he was supposed to bring back the item. But he has done something more than this. As he started to look in to the file and the seniority list which earlier had been prepared, it was mentioned 'not confirmed'. When he started to look at the data, he noticed certain things. On the basis of that, he re-looked at the files which he had brought in a bag last time. From those files, he noticed certain things of which he was not conscious of when they discussed the matter in the last Syndicate meeting. To prepare the seniority list is a concern of the University, it is a concern of the governing body for long and they have not been able to clinch it for one reason or the other. Suddenly, the matter is in focus because there is an individual who has gone to the Court, certain directive has from the Court which they have not accepted but are challenging it, and there is an issue of doing things quickly otherwise there could be a contempt of the Court or they might be doing things which a large section of the University unhappy because of intervention by an individual. In that context, when he started to look at it, he was not aware that in the year 2008, there was a resolution proposed during the meeting of the Syndicate in December 2008 which says that when there is an issue of Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), a Professor promoted under CAS vis-a-vis a Professor appointed against open advertisement. If a candidate of CAS applies under open advertisement and in an open advertisement, a person is rejected and somebody else is selected, then whatever may be the conditions, the CAS person would be placed below in the seniority list. He was not aware of the circumstances in which such a decision had been taken by the Syndicate. This decision was taken by *suo moto* considering a resolution in the Syndicate meeting of December, 2008. The meeting of the Syndicate was held in the morning and the meeting of the Senate was scheduled at 2.00 p.m. The resolution *suo moto* passed by the Syndicate was placed before the Senate and it was approved in the Senate. What was the consequence of this resolution was that there was an interview scheduled on 9th January 2009 of an open advertisement position in the UBS. In that interview one of the persons who got selected is the one who has filed so many cases. Professor Deepak Kapur was the candidate who was selected and Dr. Anupama Bawa was a candidate who was not selected but she had been promoted as a Professor under CAS at 9.00 a.m. on 9th January

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

as also Dr. Manoj Sharma. Dr. Manoj Sharma was not a candidate for the open category. Dr. Anupama Bawa was a candidate for the open category. She went for the interview. He (Vice-Chancellor) asked one of the Deans of the Business Management & Commerce who was present in both the interviews and he admitted that when Dr. Anupama Bawa came for the interview, she was not interviewed at all. She was told that her promotion has been done under CAS. Only her signatures were obtained and she was sent back. The Syndicate has to approve all these things. When the next meeting of the Syndicate took place (in January, 2009), only open category selections were placed but the CAS promotions are not placed. In the open category, Professor Deepak Kapur got an appointment letter immediately after the Syndicate meeting but he did not join and asked for 3 months extension which was given to him. He came and joined on 1st April, 2009. In the meantime, in the subsequent meeting of the Syndicate more CAS promotions were placed. When they were approved, Dr. Anupama Bawa quickly joined. Her promotion was recommended on 9th January, 2009 before Professor Deepak Kapur's promotion was recommended. She even joined as a Professor before he joined. If this person has gone to the Court, she would also go to the Court. If she had been promoted and the appointment letter had been issued, then she would have joined before him and she would not have marked her attendance.

Now about Dr. Manoj Sharma. In his case there was some technical dispute and a mere technicality, due to which an enquiry was going on against him. After two years, all those technicalities were removed and he was made a Professor. There is a resolution of the Syndicate and Senate that he would get the benefit of promotion from the due date, i.e., from 2005.

He (Vice-Chancellor) was not aware of these details. Many of the members must be knowing it as many of them must have participated in such discussions, but he was not conscious of above details even though he had gone through the files. He has read all the discussions of the years 2012 to 2014 where Shri Ashok Goyal is discussing about. But it did not register on him when he (Shri Ashok Goyal) was saying all these things, who he was referring to and what were the circumstances to which he was referring to. Later on he found out whenever the matter came up for discussion in the Syndicate and Senate during the years 2014 and 2015, it was discussed. Some Committees were also formed. Shri Ashok Goyal also served as a Chairperson of the Committee. But nobody gave the output until recently. It is in that background that he took on his own without asking anyone of the members, he formed a Committee of Presidents, PUTA, present and the past, and asked them to examine all these things because they need to give a solution to the community. It is not a good thing that the University does not have a seniority list. Complaints in this regard are sent to the MHRD and the UGC that there is no seniority list in the University and the governing body is doing nothing. It is not a good advertisement of the governance of the University that in the matters which they are supposed to take decision, the Courts are intervening in those. The Centre and the Vice-President are asked to intervene in the matter. So, it is in that background, he wanted advice and study on those things on behalf of the University. Without asking all of the members in spite of the fact the direction given to him was to prepare the list and bring it back after being vetted by the Committee, he took that step. The outcome of that is a report which has been sent to all of the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

members. This report says two things in a manner which is different from what the Syndicate has resolved last time. The Syndicate had resolved that the directive of the UGC of 2010 would apply from the year 2010. That 2010 directive of the UGC says that when a person is eligible under CAS or a person under open category joins, these are the two important things. The UGC resolution does not talk of the confirmation of the person and there is no meaning of it. But the seniority on the basis of confirmation is mentioned in the Panjab University Calendar. In the earlier decisions of the Syndicate and Senate, confirmation has been given importance as if real date is the date of confirmation. The date of confirmation for the CAS is one year the Senates confirmation of the appointment even though the appointment letters are issued as soon as the Syndicate meeting is over and the Senate endorses it later. But suddenly the importance gets given to, as the appointing authority lies with the Senate, when the appointing authority approves, that date assumes an importance and one year from that also assumes the importance whereas the UGC directive of 2010 eliminates reference to any of those two things. They are duty bound to follow the UGC concept of 2010. From which date they should follow it. The Syndicate said that it should be followed from 2010 and before that the decision of 2005 would prevail. As per that decision, most of the people would not be affected, but in this very particular case it is a very kind of anomalous situation. It is a very unhappy situation. So with some thought and innovative way, they must resolve today that what they should do for the University and what should they do in this particular case which involves UBS, namely Professor Deepak Kapur, Professor Manoj Sharma and Professor Anupama Bawa. How to deal with the seniority of these three people as it is a kind of similarity?

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that there has been a dispute in the UBS.

The Vice-Chancellor said that keeping in view the similarity, first they should think about taking a decision for the University as a whole and thereafter whatever decision they take in their own wisdom about the UBS, let him know about it, he would apply that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the Committee was formed, he was a member of the Committee. Two meetings of the Committee were held. He could not attend one meeting as he was away to Delhi, but attended the other meeting. In fact, what was proposed last time in the Syndicate, that was also proposed by him as one of the solutions because they thought that the matter is lingering on for quite some time. They could find a way out so that the matter is resolved to about 90-99%.

The Vice-Chancellor requested to provide a solution by not compromising on the earlier resolutions of the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that two meetings of the Committee were held. Deliberations of the second meeting have been mentioned but not of the first one which he had attended. He would like to throw some light on that and also talk about one possible solution. In the first meeting because most of the people accepted, he was the Secretary of PUTA in the year 2000. All the others were Presidents, past and present, once they took a decision, the people were talking about that decision because it was known to the whole community and these members were also aware of the decision. The

same decision was also informed in the meeting. There were 1-2 serious objections to that. One particular objection was that when they talk about other universities like Jawaharlal Nehru University, some Central Universities, Punjabi University, how they have taken these UGC guidelines. Some of the Universities have adopted the UGC guidelines as such without mentioning anything. They have prepared the whole seniority list based upon that only. What was the problem earlier, they discussed that last time also. He again pointed out the same thing that the whole issue between the direct appointee and CAS or merit promotees, the problem came when there was a decision of the Court that direct appointees would be considered in that particular cadre and as far as CAS promotees are concerned, they would be considered in that cadre only in which they were appointed. If a person had been appointed as Lecturer, Reader or Professor, then that person would be considered in that cadre itself. By way of that the person directly appointed as Professors became senior. The University resolved because there was lot of problem. Accordingly, the University modified its rule for Chairpersonship that if somebody is appointed as Professor by way of direct appointment or by way of promotion, the Chairperson would be appointed by way of length of service in that cadre. Since the CAS promotions were effective from the back date, generally they were considered as such and in the case of direct appointee when they were appointed as such, they were considered. The seniority clause was removed for appointment as Chairperson. The problem came in the year 2005 when Professor Rajesh Gill, who was a direct appointee, went to the Court. In that the issue involved was that along with Professor Rajesh Gill, Dr. Manjit Singh appeared in that interview but was not selected. Later on, he became Professor under CAS from the back date. So Professor Rajesh Gill went to Court, the Court decided that in this particular case Professor Rajesh Gill would be considered as senior and she would become the Chairperson. The University implemented that Court decision as such.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that when Professor Rajesh Gill approached the Court in the case of Dr. Manjit Singh, unfortunately the University did not contest that case. When Professor Rajesh Gill got the stay, she continued as Chairperson.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is right. As far as all other departments are concerned, there was no problem. Whatever rules were made by the University, the same were followed and the Chairpersons were appointed accordingly because in the case of Chairpersons, there was no issue. The problem came now when Professor Deepak Kapur, who was appointed as direct. Dr. Anupama Bawa also appeared. Whatever the Vice-Chancellor has told, that might have happened. Then another thing was that she went to the Court. The Court, keeping in view the earlier decision, delivered the same decision. There are two things in that decision, one was that the Court has said that as far as financial benefits are concerned, those could be given from the back date. But as far as the Chairpersonship is concerned, Professor Deepak Kapur would be considered senior to those appointed under CAS. Obviously, when they talk about this kind of a decision, in implementing this kind of a decision for whole of the University, it is going to be a problem. The University rightly went to Court. The University contested that, but it was not accepted by the High Court. The SLP was filed and the Supreme Court also maintained the status quo. As on today, the order that they have as far as High Court is concerned, if a

Chairperson is to be appointed, it is a particular case and not for whole of the University, Professor Deepak Kapur is to be appointed. With the case of Professor Deepak Kapur, even the case is a different one, the seniority list is being linked. That is where they are entangled. The best solution, according to him, seems to be that, others could also talk about that, keeping in view that case as an individual case in which there is an interim order of the Court also, they could implement that order. But as far as the seniority and other things are concerned, looking at the things that this is being followed in other universities also, it should be implemented from the date when the new pay scales were implemented. They should de-link both the issues. They should accept the decision of the High Court regarding Chairpersonship and accept the seniority otherwise, then there could be some possibility that there would be no problem and the seniority list could be finalised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that they do not have any seniority after the year 2005. Either they had a seniority list up to the year 2010, the UGC decision would mean changing that past seniority list. They did not have any seniority list after the year 2005. Since they did not have a seniority list, it would be better if they prepare it according to the UGC guidelines. They could bring a resolution in the Syndicate that the rule of seniority by confirmation should also be changed. According to the UGC guidelines, there is no meaning of the confirmation.

Principal B.C. Josan pointed out that Professor Deepak Kapur is on leave. He requested that Professor Manoj Sharma should be appointed as the Chairperson.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they take up the case of Professor Deepak Kapur later. First could they accept it that they would follow the UGC guidelines regarding seniority w.e.f. 1.1.2006 to which the members said 'yes'. So, they accept this recommendation that they would implement the seniority w.e.f. 1.1.2006.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they might certain persons who have been appointed as Chairperson on the basis of seniority which had been in practical applicable from 1.1.2006 to 2010.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that the Chairpersons are not appointed on the basis of the seniority.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that they should take such a decision which could minimise the Court cases.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that when the seniority list was put on the website, the objections, if any, must have been raised by the teachers. If any objections had been received, have those been considered.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it is clearly mentioned that after looking into the issue thoroughly and taking into view the objections raised on account of the current seniority list, it meant that the list prepared in 2005.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the tentative list is that which Professor A.K. Bhandari had talked about 1.1.2009. They have two dates, one is 1.1.206 when the 6th Pay Commission was implemented

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

and the other is 1.1.2009 which Professor A.K. Bhandari has suggested because the criteria for promotion have changed before and after that date. The third is 2010. Now they have to decide whether the date should be 1.1.2006 or 1.1.2009 or 2010.

Dr. Dalip Kumar enquired whether they have any feedback of the objections raised to the tentative seniority list.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they wanted to know all the details, then they would have to wait for more time. At the moment, he did not remember the precise details of everything.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that what Dr. Dalip Kumar is saying is that if any objections had been received, whether the same had been discussed or not.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that when they are talking about 1.1.2006, there is no mention of the seniority of the UGC regulations that the seniority would be fixed. The UGC has talked about only the pay revision.

The Vice-Chancellor requested to pose a question to himself and reason it out as he is a part of the University system.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in his observation 1.1.2006 could not be the date of seniority. The date of 18.9.2010 could be taken into consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what decision they would take for the period from the year 2005 till 2010.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it could be applied from the year 2006.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since they did not have the seniority list of that period, what could they apply to it.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that what would happen to the people promoted between 2006 to 2010.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the first meeting was held, all these issues came up in that meeting. In the minutes, it should have been mentioned that this was the problem and this is the final solution. Otherwise, it is right.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are all aware about it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should de-link both the issues. They could take a decision on the seniority issue. With that, the other issue would remain pending due to which the seniority could be challenged, therefore, they should resolve the other issue also.

The Vice-Chancellor requested that they should not take a decision which is violative of the Senate decision taken earlier.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was also discussed. The issue seems that the UGC did not make anything clear about the seniority. Even if the UGC asked for implementation from the year

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

2010, it was related with the pay-scales which were revised from the year 2006.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if there is any anomalous situation, they could address that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could prepare a seniority list. They are not taking a decision in the case of Chairperson as it was a decision of the Court. The decision of the Court is also in consonance with the decision of 2008.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if they appoint Professor Deepak Kapur as the Chairperson, by doing so, the Court decision would also be respected. Professor Deepak Kapur vs Professor Manoj Sharma issue stands resolved as Professor Deepak Kapur is proceeding on leave. Since the time left for retirement of Professor Manoj Sharma is not much, Professor Manoj Sharma could be appointed as the Chairperson. Whenever Professor Deepak Kapur returns from the leave, he would join as Chairperson.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is okay with it.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the seniority list prepared by the Committee accepted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as on today, he has not received any leave application of Professor Deepak Kapur.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he has applied the leave.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are taking a decision that Professor Deepak Kapur would be the Chairperson and if he is on leave, then Professor Manoj Sharma would be the Chairperson.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that the leave application of Professor Deepak Kapur be obtained to which a couple of members said that it would be provided.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are taking a decision that Professor Deepak Kapur would be the Chairperson and if he is on leave, then Professor Manoj Sharma would be the Chairperson and the next Chairperson would be Professor Deepak Kapur.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now they have resolved an issue which was pending for the last many years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested that the resolved part of the item be prepared today itself so that the orders are issued immediately.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the office to prepare the resolved part after the lunch which is that the Syndicate accepts the recommendation that the UGC guidelines would prevail from 1.1.2006 and the decision of the Court, as the matter is sub-judice, as it stands today, as per that Professor Deepak Kapur is entitled to be the Chairperson. However, if Professor Deepak Kapur, for whatever reason, is on leave, then Professor Manoj Sharma would be designated as the Chairperson.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

RESOLVED: That the UGC guidelines regarding preparation of seniority list of teachers would prevail w.e.f. 01.01.2006. The decision of the Court as it stands today, the matter is sub-judice, as per that Professor Deepak Kapur is entitled to be the Chairperson of the University Business School. However, if Professor Deepak Kapur, for whatever reason, is on leave, then Professor Manoj Sharma would be designated as the Chairperson.

Conferment of the title of Professor Emeritus

3. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 01.06.2017 (**Appendix-III**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the title of Professor Emeritus be conferred on the following distinguished teachers of Panjab University:

1. Professor B.S. Brar ...Political Science
(Re-employment upto 20.08.2017)
Department of Political Science,
Panjab University
P.U. #733, Sector 11-B
Chandigarh
2. Professor Sudesh Kaur Khanduja ...Mathematics
Retd. Prof. Department of Mathematics
Panjab University
H.No. 1297, Sector 37-B
Chandigarh-160036
3. Professor B.M. Deb, FNA, FTWAS (Retd.) ...Chemistry
INSA Senior Scientist,
Visva Bharti University
6 A.J.C. Bose Road
Kolkata-700017
4. Professor Suman Bala Beri ...Physics
Retd. Prof. Department of Physics
Panjab University
Chandigarh
5. Professor Rani Balbir Kaur ...Indian Theatre
Retd. Professor
Department of Indian Theatre
359, Sector-9 D
Chandigarh

NOTE: 1. Regulation 3 at page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 reads as under:

“3.The Senate, may, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, confer the title of ‘Professor Emeritus’ on any distinguished teacher of the University on, or after his retirement in recognition of his scholarship and conspicuous service to the University, provided that no such title shall be conferred unless the connection of the teacher with the University shall have extended over a period of not less than ten years. A Professor Emeritus shall for all purpose of courtesy and on ceremonial occasions be upon the same footing as a Fellow of the University but

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

he shall not as such be entitled to membership of any University body or authority.”

2. *Curriculum Vitae* of above Professors are enclosed **(Appendix-III)**.

The Vice-Chancellor said that five senior academicians have been recommended for Emeritus Professorship. The Syndicate had accepted the recommendation of Emeritus Professorship on Professor B.S. Brar when he had completed the age of 60 years. But it was stated at that time that the Emeritus Professorship be conferred only after the re-employment period comes to an end and it was said that it should be brought again. Professor Brar would retire on 20th of August and he would be conferred Emeritus Professorship.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired as to what is the term of Emeritus Professorship.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that at the moment, the term is not fixed. According to the provisions of the Calendar, a person once designated Emeritus Professor, he/she is there for life. In the PGI, the term is 10 years where it was earlier for life. Many times, the people say that the term of Emeritus Professorship should also be fixed like a term of 10 years. But till date, no term has been fixed.

Some of the members suggested that a term should be fixed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they permit him, he would form a Committee of Syndics. They should not do it on an ad hoc basis, form a Sub-Committee from amongst themselves.

The members requested the Vice-Chancellor to form a Committee on his own.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would form a Committee of Syndics which would submit its recommendations to him. He would add some members from the Senate and PUTA President.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said before the conferment of the Emeritus Professorship, a decision on the term should be taken.

Principal I.S. Sandhu that that the conferment of Emeritus Professorship on the persons is accepted but the Committee would decide the term.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it meant that the persons are designated as Emeritus Professors but a Committee would decide the term. But the term is to be approved by the Senate. If the Emeritus Professorship is conferred, it would be according to the present guidelines.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it could be approved with a rider that the terms and conditions approved by the Senate would be applicable.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it meant that the Emeritus Professorship be not conferred till then.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the conferment is approved, the term is to be decided by the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if it is approved, does it need ratification by the Senate.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it needs ratification as they could only recommend it to the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee of the Syndics would be which would suggest the term and the recommendations would be placed before the next Syndicate. The meeting of the Senate is scheduled to be held after the meeting of the Board of Finance which is planned for 1st August, 2017. Thereafter the meeting of the Syndicate would be held and then the Senate as the revised estimates have to be submitted before 30th September.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that in the first instance, the item along with the term for the Emeritus Professorship be placed in the next meeting and only then the persons could join in anticipation of approval of Senate and the item could be placed before the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said the conferment of Emeritus Professorship be approved. But since Principal I.S. Sandhu is saying that the term is to be restricted, the resolved part is that the Vice-Chancellor is authorised to form a Committee. Whatever suggestions are given by the Committee, he would place the same before the Syndicate in its next meeting. By the time, the matter goes to the Senate, there would be a recommendation on this as also on the term. The Committee to be constituted would be given 30 days time.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that Professor Chaman Lal has sent an e-mail to the members which the Vice-Chancellor must also have received saying that the name of Dr. B.B. Bhattacharya, who has retired as a Professor from the University and is nearly 80 years old, has been recommended by the Faculty of Design and Fine Arts for Emeritus Professorship. He requested to look into it also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would put it again to the Committee. He said that Professor S.K. Khanduja, retired at the age of 60 years and served at IISER, Mohali for 5 years. There are very few teachers of the University who have got recognition. Professor B.M. Deb was invited from IIT, Mumbai and he was a Bhatnagar awardee at that time. He retired from Panjab University and went to Kolkata and at the moment is associated with IISER, Kolkata. He came and gave a colloquium last year. He has written a book which is being widely celebrated, which traces the heritage of India's science and civilisation, etc. Professor Suman Bala Beri is a Professor of Physics. Once the DST had collected the data as to who is the most cited scientist in the country. Because of her long association with High Energy Physics experiments, she is the most cited scientist in the country. She retired some years ago and after that she became an Emeritus Professor of the UGC for 3 years. She has written a letter that her association is continuing. If she is an Emeritus Professor of the University, she carries the by-line of the University as well. There has not been a woman Professor except Professor R.J. Hans Gill, woman scientist, who has been an Emeritus Professor. Professor Khanduja would be the second one. Rani Balbir Kaur has been a

faculty member with Professor Balwant Gargi. She is one of the founding faculty members of the Department of Indian Theatre. Last year, she was given the Sangeet and Natak Academy award. She also staged a play during Balwant Gargi centenary celebrations.

Dr. Dalip Kumar read a line from the recommendation made in the case of Professor Suman Bala Beri that “her participation will be an important asset for Panjab University for training young scientists and for keeping the University on the forefront of modern science”. In this regard, he requested that, as they are having 62 Emeritus Professors as he has seen from one of the Annual Reports, the Emeritus Professors could play a role model for the students. So, an inaugural address for the first year students should be delivered by these Emeritus Professors.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would make a request in this regard. He had even suggested that the Emeritus Professors should join all the seminars organised by the research scholars of the Department so that they could get the benefit of their presence. He would formally renew this request.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested that Dean office be requested to circulate the list of Emeritus Professors along with the subjects to the Colleges as the Colleges are having research centres and it would greatly help them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would make a request to Emeritus Professors that whenever a Research Centre invites them, they should respond to their invitation. They would set aside some small sum of money for payment of TA/DA.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested that it should be added in the profile of Emeritus Professors that they should at least give one visit to the Research Centres.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would do it.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the title of Professor Emeritus be conferred on the following distinguished teachers of Panjab University:

1. Professor B.S. Brar ...Political Science
(Re-employment upto 20.08.2017)
Department of Political Science,
Panjab University
P.U. #733, Sector 11-B
Chandigarh
2. Professor Sudesh Kaur Khanduja ...Mathematics
Retd. Prof. Department of Mathematics
Panjab University
H.No. 1297, Sector 37-B
Chandigarh-160036
3. Professor B.M. Deb, FNA, FTWAS (Retd.) ...Chemistry
INSA Senior Scientist,
Visva Bharti University
6 A.J.C. Bose Road
Kolkata-700017

4. Professor Suman Bala Beri ...Physics
Retd. Prof. Department of Physics
Panjab University
Chandigarh
5. Professor Rani Balbir Kaur ...Indian Theatre
Retd. Professor, Department of Indian Theatre
359, Sector-9 D
Chandigarh

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised, on behalf of the Syndicate, to form a Committee including the President, PUTA to determine the limit on the tenure of Professor Emeritus. The said limit, if eventually approved, would also apply to the above stated academicians whose names have been recommended for Emeritus Professorship. The Committee is enjoined to give the report before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Request of Dr. Komal Marwaha for extension in study leave with pay

4. Considered request dated 25.11.2016 (**Appendix-IV**) of Dr. Komal Marwaha, Associate Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, for extension in study leave with pay, for one more year w.e.f. 29.07.2017, under Regulation 11 (1) appearing at page 140 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 for pursuing doctorate (Ph.D.) in Physiology at MUM, Iowa, Fairfield, USA.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.08.2015 (Para 8) (**Appendix-IV**) considered the minutes dated 13.07.2015 & 03.08.2015 of the Committee to look into the Leave Cases of the teachers and granted study leave to the incumbent for two years, w.e.f. the date she is relieved from the Institute, under Regulation 11(1) at pages 140-143 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 to pursue doctorate (Ph.D.) in Physiology at MUM, Fairfield, Iowa, USA. She was allowed to proceed on study leave for two years w.e.f. 29.07.2015 (A.N.) to 28.07.2017.
 2. As per orders of the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Komal Marwaha has been requested through Principal-cum-Professor, Dr. HSJ Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital vide letter No.4396/Estt.I dated 15.06.2017 (**Appendix-IV**) to intimate the expected time/period required for completing her Ph.D. work.
 3. Regulation 11 (1) appearing at page 140 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 reproduced as under:
 - (i) xxx xxx xxx

(ii) Study Leave shall be granted on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee for a period of not exceeding two years, save in very exceptional cases in which the Syndicate is satisfied that extension in Study Leave is unavoidable on academic grounds and necessary in the interest of the University. In such cases the extension in study leave shall not exceed one year.

(iii) xxx xxx xxx

4. An office note is enclosed
(Appendix-IV).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that everything is right because she is pursuing Ph.D. and it should be allowed. If they see page Sr. No.10 at 113 of the agenda, whether it is concealment or otherwise, where the emoluments offered (if any) is written as N.A. It could not be N.A., there must be some emoluments, she should clarify the same as to what is getting.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it must have been mentioned in the academic reports being submitted after every 6 months.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the amount of fellowship should have been mentioned. The leave with/without pay is based upon on the amount of emoluments offered otherwise it could lead her to trouble later on.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if the emoluments are mentioned, then the leave could be granted without pay and if the emoluments are not mentioned, then the leave could be granted with pay.

The Vice-Chancellor said the leave with pay could not be given. The leave with pay could be given only for two years.

Shri Varinder Singh said that in the case of MDS, a 3-year course where regular classes are held, the leave is granted for 3 years. But in the case of Ph.D. where fellowship amount is being paid, the leave could not be granted with pay.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even Professor Deepak Kapur was not given leave with pay for more than two years. So, the resolved part is that leave is granted without pay and Dr. Komal Marwaha is requested to inform the University whether she is getting any fellowship amount and also inform how much time she would take to complete the Ph.D.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that she must also inform the University what is the value of the scholarship

RESOLVED: That Dr. Komal Marwaha, Associate Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, be granted extension in study leave without pay, for one more year

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

w.e.f. 29.07.2017, under Regulation 11 (1) appearing at page 140 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 for pursuing doctorate (Ph.D.) in Physiology at MUM, Iowa, Fairfield, USA. She be directed to inform about any fellowship being received by her and how much more time is required to complete the Ph.D.

Items No. 5 and 30 were taken up together.

Report of PUCASH

5. Considered report dated 31.05.2017 (**Appendix-V**) of the Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH) regarding complaint of student of B.Sc. 3rd year (Tourism Management), UIHTM, P.U. against faculty member of Department of Public Administration.

NOTE: A copy of the decision of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 (Para 21) is enclosed (**Appendix-V**).

Letter from Shri Anshuman Gaur, OSD to Chancellor

30. Considered letter No. VPS/15/1/2017 dated 08.06.2017 (**Appendix-VI**) received from Shri Anshuman Gaur sending therewith letter dated 30.05.2017 of Shri Komal Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration, P.U.

NOTE: There is an item (No.5) on the Instant Syndicate Agenda to consider the report 31.05.2017 of PUCASH.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Items C-5 and C-30 are connected. The Item C-30 is a very unfortunate development. He was hurt to read the tone, the language and the purpose of the letter. Finally after accusing everybody, the person says that "I request your goodself to recommend as for this thing to remove Vice-Chancellor who flagrantly acted in a highly unlawful and biased manner against me".

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it is very wrong to write such a letter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this should be out-rightly rejected.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the reply should be given on the basis of earlier cases.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that the matter should be tagged with the earlier cases.

Shri Varinder Singh requested that in some other case they had taken a decision to cancel the registration of the girl that is very wrong. The FIR has been registered and the police is investigating the matter. He requested to discuss that case also with the present case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there should be no connection and no clubbing of the items.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they condemn it and they created a new cadre of high rank Professor in this particular presentation. The letter says high rank Professor. According to him, there is no nomenclature of high rank Professor in the University.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Shri Varinder Singh said that the letter written by the person is very wrong. When the incident happened, that person was drunk heavily.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Syndicate should feel that such a person should not roam about in the campus. As and when that person is found drinking in the campus, he should be condemned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person should be evicted the campus and a notice should be given.

Shri Varinder Singh said that whatever he came to know is that some boys were standing near the house and that person was drunk and started abusing and thereafter the matter got heated up and there was scuffling. When some boys went to know as to what happened, that person could not even talk and was over-drunk.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired whether could they remove the person from the residential accommodation as per law, then it should be recommended.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that a chance could be given and such a harsh decision should not be taken. His actions should be condemned.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that instead of taking any decision, since the matter has to go to the Senate, this matter should also be tagged with the earlier one. If the Senate accepts that decision, it would be automatically covered under that.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that if both the cases are clubbed, that person could pressurise in the earlier case. Therefore, they should prepare two separate cases. They could recommend that even after imposition of major penalty, the person has not mended his ways and is involved in wrongdoings.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then it is recommended that major penalty as per service rules be imposed. He should be removed from service and now they are saying that he should also be asked to vacate the house.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it (house vacation) would be automatic when the decision is implemented.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be automatic only if it is approved by the Senate. But they could give him a notice for vacating the house.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that a notice should be given.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the person could be transferred to the Regional Centres or the Constituent Colleges.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they should try a reformatory justice and his right to life should be given so that it might not be that the person might commit the suicide. He is an alcoholic and there is no doubt that he has done so many wrongdoings. But if

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

they could take some reformative measures, if the person apologises to all the concerned, a chance could be given.

Shri Jarnail Singh and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it is for the Senate to take a final decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the major penalty that they have recommended is removal whereas the dismissal means that the person could not apply anywhere else. They have already recommended removal and not dismissal. They have already done a service to him by not recommending dismissal. They have recommended the removal and what the person does is that he writes this kind of a thing to the President. Where is it that he has any remorse?

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the person is doing so only to save himself.

Shri Varinder Singh said that abusing is also covered under sexual harassment otherwise he had not done anything wrong with the girl. Actually, that area is a secluded one and the boys and girls sit in their parked cars. A mature person could call the police but the person started abusing and fighting with them. Otherwise the person had not any intention to harass the girl. There is nothing like that.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the intention of the person was to prevent the nuisance being created in the University.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he is not favouring but telling the truth.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as Shri Varinder Singh is saying, the residents also have a grudge that the cars are parked in the area.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that the security staff should be asked to take action in this regard.

It was informed that the security could prevent the nuisance but it is not empowered.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if they could not punish the students, but they could scare away them.

It was informed that when the no vehicle zone policy is implemented, it would have some impact on such things.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the person is a drunkard and has become very weak person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the resolved part is that the penalty of removal remains. In view of the sentiments expressed by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, they are not making it dismissal and they are also giving him a notice that he should vacate the house. But the Senate has to confirm these decisions.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they have already penalised the person in an earlier meeting of the Syndicate. If the person apologises

and is to be helped, it could only be done by the Senate but not by the Syndicate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the decision about the accommodation should be taken.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the person could even write more such letters.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he himself, Shri Jarnail Singh and Shri Varinder Singh could go and make the person understand.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as per rules, the Vice-Chancellor is empowered to seek the vacation of the house. They would seek the vacation of the house in view of such things.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that it should be tagged with the earlier complaints and taken together to the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first is removal and now they are attaching eviction and they out-rightly condemn the letter that the person has written. Otherwise, it has become a mockery. Do they remember Dr. Neelam Paul? On 14th August, the Chairman of the UGC was to come to the University. She filed a complaint on 11th August against the Panjab University. He formed an Enquiry Committee. Whatever report was submitted by the Enquiry Committee, the same was sent to the Chancellor up to December, 2014. The Chancellor asked to give a copy of that to Dr. Neelam Paul. All the copies were given to her. She wrote another complaint to the Chancellor in which he (VC) is accused and has been called as incompetent and his wife is also called incompetent. She (Dr. Neelam Paul) abuses all. The matter was handed over to another Committee. The Committee said that as per rules, there should be an action against her. The report of the Committee was still not given to her, she issued a legal notice to the Chancellor. In the first week of March, 2015 the NAAC Committee was visiting Panjab University. They see the sequence. When the Committee was to visit Panjab University, legal notice was served. By 5th March, the Committee had not returned, a legal notice is received. The Syndicate meeting was to be held on 8th March and the legal notice was placed before it. Then an Enquiry Committee was formed under the Chairmanship of Justice Anand. When the report was placed before the Senate, no action was taken against her. After a very long discussion in the Senate, the Senate decided that she would express regret to all the concerned. She never sent any regret to him (Vice-Chancellor), to any member of the governing body. She sent only one line regret, which is regret for the namesake only, to the Chancellor and she got away. Had she regretted to the Vice-Chancellor against whom she had said all kind of things. The University Committee has said that as per law action should be taken against her. But nothing is done and she has got away. There is not even a red mark put in her file that she has behaved in an unbecoming manner as a teacher. This is what the recommendation was. A person commits forgery, tell lies, everything is like this and one is continuing without any reprimand from the system. There is no reprimand. She was merely asked to express a regret and she got away because they do not enforce anything. That is why the people become bold. The people are very bold.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it is wrong if she does not accept the Senate sentiments. Therefore, the recommendations of the Committee should be acted upon.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would place before the members it in the next meeting of the Syndicate and they could just have a relook at it two years down the line. Here is a defiance at every point.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) report dated 31.05.2017 of the Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH) regarding complaint of student of B.Sc. 3rd year (Tourism Management), UIHTM, P.U. against faculty member of Department of Public Administration be accepted. As major penalty of removal from service of the same faculty member in another case of sexual harassment by the same faculty member was recommended by the Syndicate, the Syndicate reiterates its earlier decision of removal from service of the faculty member in present case also and recommends this case be tagged with the earlier case;
- (ii) the tone, the language and the intent of the letter written by Dr. Komal Singh, Department of Public Administration to the Chancellor be condemned; and
- (iii) notice for vacating the residential accommodation allotted on the campus be issued to Dr. Komal Singh, Department of Public Administration.

Summary of reports submitted by Chief Vigilance Officer

6. Considered the summary of the reports submitted by the Chief Vigilance Officer, P.U. on various matters

NOTE: 1. The Senate in its meeting dated 26.03.2017 (Para I-33) had read out the recommendations of the Syndicate dated 21.04.2017 (Para 48 (i)) regarding summary report submitted by CVO, P.U. and resolved that the Sub-item (I-33) be placed for consideration in future.

2. A copy of the letter No. 160/CVO/D dated 31.05.2017 was enclosed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had submitted all the vigilance reports as an information item in the Syndicate and Senate. There was a long discussion in the Senate and it was said that it should be put up for consideration of the Syndicate. So, all the reports are there with the members. If they wished to consider the same now, they could consider or if they wished to form a small Committee of Syndics which would go into the detailed reports and then they want to come back with something like what is to be done and what is not to be done, he is okay with it. But, according to him, it is their duty that they should attend to it in a little detailed manner so that the people could not say that there is no vigilance going on in this University.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there are 33 summary reports. It would be appreciated if the Vice-Chancellor could form a sub-Committee so that they could have the output from the Committee and they could discuss the same in the next meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the members give him the authorisation to form a Committee, he needed the help of the members

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised, on behalf of the Syndicate, to form a Committee of Syndics to study the reports in detail and submit its report.

Complaint of faculty member

7. Considered suggestions (**Appendix-VII**) to settle the complaint made by one faculty member of Panjab University against another faculty member.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this matter is again a very unfortunate happening.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the matter should not have been brought here as it is a domestic affair of the faculty members.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not a domestic affair. So much a time of the University has already been spent in order to resolve this matter. A person is staying at the campus. It is a privilege accorded to a person. When it is a privilege accorded to a person and the teachers are supposed to be the role model for rest of the residents of this campus. He had also talked to the President, PUTA who has tried to resolve the matter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the main problem seems that there is a quarrel among these two faculty members over the issue, generally a common area, that who should have the rights of roof. There are some common facilities on the roof. Obviously, the access to these services should be available to all the persons. The University formed a Committee which took a very good decision that a lock with three keys be put on the door and the keys be provided to three families living in that block so that whenever any resident wanted to access the roof for common services, they could access. The person (Shri Ranvir Singh) resident of the top floor did not agree to that. It is an unfortunate thing that the decision taken by a Committee of the University should have been accepted but the same has not been accepted. If they see the other houses of the same type (T-II), there is no door on the roof of the top floor house. There is no problem in accessing the services to anyone. This kind of thing has happened for the first time. He suggested that either both these persons should accept the suggestion of the Committee and also provide the key to the third resident also. They could ask all the three residents whether they agree to the suggestion of having a key with each resident, if not, then they should remove the door of the roof as the other houses also do not have the doors.

Shri Varinder Singh said that in Chandigarh, the registration of the houses is done floor-wise and the top floor resident has the roof rights but for repair/maintenance of common service like water, the other resident of the same house are not stopped from doing so. But

the residents of the lower floors could not utilise the roof. The houses on the campus are the properties of the University and not of any individual. He suggested that a Committee of senior members be formed to resolve the matter amicably between the two neighbours.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all such efforts have been made and how much time they could devote to it. he said that a directive has to go to the persons.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the matter could not be resolved, let the persons go to the police and the University would not be party in it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the people are creating nuisance in the campus, they have a right to ask to quit and go. There has to be some deterrent and threat that if one has to live in the University, certain compliances have to be there.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that either both the persons should compromise or both of them could be asked to vacate the houses.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that both the occupants could be asked to exchange the house between them.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that as suggested by Dr. Subhash Sharma, if the persons do not accept the decision taken by the University, both of them should be asked to vacate the house.

The Vice-Chancellor said that practical solution is that since the services on the top floor are accessible to everyone, everyone should have the keys. The top floor resident could utilise the roof and if any resident of the other floors wanted to access the common services, they could open the door and inform the top floor resident. If he is not available for a few hours, then they could open the lock on their own. They could find out the practical ways but the same should also be accepted by the persons.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as pointed out by Shri Varinder Singh, the practice is that the top floor resident has the roof rights. The same practice must also be prevailing in the campus. If a resident of the other floor has broken open the lock and the resident of the top floor is defending his rights. The occupants of the ground and first floor are compensated as they are having open spaces. The occupant of the top floor has only the roof which he could utilise. If they evict them, it would be too much. Regarding having three keys, he suggested that it would be better to hand over one key to the XEN office for maintenance of services otherwise the matter would not be solved. He suggested that the roof right of the top floor occupant should not be snatched away from him. If they impose anything on that person, that is not right.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if the occupant of first floor wanted to utilise the roof, he could be asked to get the allotment of top floor and the top floor occupant could be asked to get the first floor.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that as suggested by Shri Varinder Singh and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, the occupant of the top floor

has the roof rights. The key could be handed over to the XEN office for maintenance of services but the occupants of other floors could not be allowed to utilise the roof. The utilisation of the roof by the other occupants is totally wrong.

The Vice-Chancellor said that while handing over the keys to the occupants of other floors, they could give clear instructions not to use the top floor, but could access the services with the permission of the occupant of top floor. If the person is not available for a day, then the lock could be opened by them on their own and a person from the XEN office would accompany. The second option could be that since new houses are being constructed, they should be allotted houses apart from each other.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the allotment of a house is done on the basis of seniority and it could be a possibility that they might not be allotted the new houses.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the alternative suggested by the Vice-Chancellor is the best one that both the persons should be shifted to the vacant house of the same type.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is not possible.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the other residents do not have any problem. Therefore, the solution is that whenever the occupants of the other floors wanted to have the access to services, they could access the roof with the company of a person from the XEN office.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the solution could be that the keys be provided to all the three occupants but the occupants of ground and first floors would not access the roof without the permission of the occupant of top floor. If there is an emergency and the occupant of the top floor does not grant the permission, the 4th key would be reserved with the XEN office and the Chief of University Security would depute a security personnel to open the lock and access the services.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it should be implemented only for this particular case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this decision would be only for this particular case. The 4th key would be reserved with the XEN office. If the top floor occupant does not allow the access for services to the other occupants, then the matter would be reported to the Security Officer. They could even keep the 4th key with the Security Officer in a sealed envelope. This pertains only to this particular case.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if the keys are provided to all the occupants, there is no need of permission.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that only two keys should be prepared, one to remain with the top floor occupant and the other one with the XEN office.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that this is the best solution and a principle stand.

The Vice-Chancellor said, alright. The resolved part is that the Syndicate expresses anguish that such a matter had to come to the Syndicate and the Syndicate is not supposed to spend valuable time in resolving such matters which the teaching faculty must settle on its own. However, to resolve the matter, a duplicate would be made and would be kept in a sealed envelope with the Security Officer. In case the top floor person refuses to give access to the ground and first floor because of an emergency on the roof and something has to be accessed, then the Security Officer would be approached and a security guard would accompany the person and the thing would be opened again first by informing the person. This is specific to this particular care and does not apply to other residents who are living amicably

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the Syndicate expressed its anguish and displeasure over such matters reaching Syndicate which is not supposed to spend its valuable time in resolving the matters which the teaching faculty must settle on its own;
- (ii) the occupant of the top floor will have the possession of the key to the roof. However, the occupants of other floors would have the access to the roof only for the maintenance of common facilities with the permission of the occupant of top floor. Two keys of the roof lock be prepared, one of which to remain in the custody of the occupant of the top floor and the other with the office of the Chief of University Security. In case, the occupant of the top floor refuses the access for maintenance of common facilities, the Chief of University Security would depute the security personnel for the purpose. This decision would not apply to other residents living in similar flats amicably.

Minutes dated 19.06.2012 of Committee of Syndics to look into the enquiry report submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba

8. Considered minutes dated 19.06.2012 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee of the Syndics, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in pursuance of the decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 29.02.2012 (Para 15) (**Appendix-VIII**) to look into the Enquiry Report submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba, Enquiry Officer along with office note dated 11.05.2017 (**Appendix-VIII**) prepared by Shri V.K. Sibal, Fellow, in respect of enquiry report against Shri P.K. Ghai.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.09.2012 & 6.10.2012 (Para 21) (**Appendix-VIII**) considered the minutes dated 19.06.2012 and decided that the matter be examined and a note be prepared by Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, who would be provided all kind of help including relevant record by the Law Officer. Thereafter the matter be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.10.2015 (Para 15) (**Appendix-VIII**) had authorized the Vice-Chancellor to appoint

someone in place of Late Shri G.K. Chatrath to prepare a note as decided by the Syndicate dated 08.09.2012/06.10.2012 (Para 21). Accordingly Shri V.K. Sibal, Fellow was appointed by the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he hoped that the members had a chance to go through the item. Again, this is very unfortunate that the matters have lingered on for long and they are seen not to be taking cognisance. The confidence of the community in the governing body of the University and also the confidence of the Syndicate members that they are attending to their work with a degree of concern and degree of certain output, it would be more satisfying that leaving aside their families they devote a Sunday to this every month. If there is an output, then the time is worth spending otherwise the time of the members who also come from far off places, is going in just attending the meetings. The people should value.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is a delay in this case as it relates to the year 1991. The enquiry was started in the year 1995. One of the persons is retiring on 31st August. In the first instance, an enquiry should be conducted as to why there is delay in it. Even some of the papers are not complete. Enquiry should be conducted as to on whose part the delay occurred. The Enquiry Committee has found 3 persons guilty in the matter and one of the persons is going to retire.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is the involvement of 2-3 persons in it. The involvement is that there is a Government concern from where the bitumen was being supplied to the University. The concern provided the bitumen to the transport company. While transporting, the company must have left 12 drums. The fault of the employees is that they did not follow up the supply of those 12 drums. This is the main finding of the Committee. Due to not proper follow-up, those 12 drums virtually missed somewhere in the way. Perhaps the transport company thought that the cost of the bitumen was less than what had to be incurred on the transportation. It is a fact. Due to which the loss occurred and the Committee found three persons guilty for it. The University had to incur a loss of about Rs.10,000/- because the employees accounted for those drums even the same were not supplied. It is a big fault.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that now there is only person who is going to retire. They could ask that person to deposit the amount of Rs.10,000/- and the retirement benefits be released.

Shri Jarnail Singh, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the current rate of drums be charged.

The Vice-Chancellor said that three persons have been found guilty and why the whole penalty should be imposed on only person.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the amount prevailing at that time be asked to deposit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the other persons have also retired.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if they ask for the whole amount, the person could plead that it should be distributed equally among all the persons. They could tell the person that it is a decision of the Syndicate that the case be filed and the amount prevailing at that time be deposited.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that if the enquiry was going on, how the retirement benefits were released to the other persons.

The Vice-Chancellor suggested that there is a minimal penalty of what was lost. The maximum penalty is current rate. Since he (employee) is not the only person involved, in view of this the minimum penalty, i.e., Rs.10,000/-.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that there was involvement of three persons and two persons have already retired and taken the retirement benefit.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if this person is punished, he would say that why the other persons have not been punished.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should be seen closing the matter in a manner which appears justifiable.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that with this the matter would be wound up

RESOLVED: That the enquiry report submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba be accepted. Syndicate noted that three persons were pronounced guilty, however, penalty can be imposed only one of them namely, Shri P.K. Ghai, in the present circumstances. Shri P.K. Ghai is directed to deposit an amount of Rs.10,382/- in the University account being the then cost of 12 drums of bitumen and with this the case be closed.

**Letter dated 31.05.2017
from Chairperson,
Department of Evening
Studies-MDRC in respect
of Professor Vijay K.
Chopra**

9. Considered letter dated 31.05.2017 (**Appendix-IX**) of Chairperson, DES MDRC in respect of Professor Vijay K. Chopra.

NOTE: 1. The Senate in its meeting dated 09.10.2016 (Para III) (**Appendix-IX**) considered and approved the recommendations of the Syndicate dated 01.05.2016 (Para 3) and the decision be made effective from the date of the minutes of this meeting are finally approved after circulation to the members.

The minutes were approved as final on 30.01.2017, after circulation.

2. Copies of decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 12.2.2017 (Para 1) and 25.2.2017 (Para 17) are enclosed (**Appendix-IX**)

The Vice Chancellor said that, this again was a matter which had gone far beyond.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he had stopped reading his (Professor Vijay K. Chopra) complaints.

The Vice Chancellor said that that, matter was very serious. That matter was the test of the Governing Body, whether the Governing Body can measure up to an individual who was not an individual, who was symbol of forces which were out to ruin the University. What was he (Professor. Vijay K. Chopra) doing, he symbolizes the weakness of the University. Now, the people who are elected representative often come under the pressure of their constituency, which elected him. So, the people who were opportunistic like Professor Vijay K. Chopra, they start influencing individual members of the Governing Body by reaching out to those constituencies and somehow get away by one technicality or the other. When they awarded him (Professor Chopra) the penalty of curtailing his employment, they looked at everything that the person was doing. He was not academically active; he was not doing anything which a teacher was expected to do. Actually gentleman never did anything so long as he was in the regular service of the University. That gentleman was in the regular service of the University until the year 2013 and he did not perform his duty. If there was one person who did not deserve re-employment, that was Professor Vijay K. Chopra. If anyone looks at his record and they had looked at his record that was why Syndicate had recommended to compile the details of his whole career. He got has collated all and that should be sent everywhere whose he (Professor Chopra) had been sending document to defame the University. He has been defaming, an Institution which is a National Institution, one of the oldest national Institutions and he is getting away. Professor. Vijay K. Chopra has to be dealt with and if the Governing Body of the University does not rise to protect the Institution, then who will protect the Institution. So, they had curtailed his re-employment (Professor. Vijay K. Chopra) w.e.f. Jan 31st 2017 his reemployment was curtailed with effect from the date that the Senate minutes were confirmed. It was recommended that he (Professor Vijay K. Chopra) should not be given further extension. It took one year even to implement that decision because after recommending the decision, that decision went into Syndicate and so many meeting of Senate were conducted. There were people in the Senate who tried to protect him (Professor. Vijay K. Chopra). Some of the people who rose to protect him had been members of the Governing Body for the 30-40 years. People who had been very responsible, people who had run the Government of the country, if persons of such stature were trying to protect that person (Professor Vijay K. Chopra), a person who has that kind of a past, what was the message they were sending across. Very wrong message and that person was taking advantage. The fact that he was getting himself protected by such eminent names of the society, it gives him credibility when he lodges complaint to the President of the country, to the Vice-President of the country, to the MHRD Minister. There must be something in what he was saying, that's why so many people were protecting him and wanted to give him relief. So, that with great difficulty they got rid of him. He goes on to manipulate all the courts by misrepresenting facts his case was not like the case of all others who were asking for the retirement age up to be 65. All those people were not retired. He belongs to a different category. The (Panjab University's) pleaded and got his (Professor. Vijay K. Chopra) case separated from all others. Then his (Professor Vijay K. Chopra's) case now stands separated; his case is no longer like others. Recently, he (Professor Vijay K. Chopra) has got another judgement. If University

wants, then he (Professor Vijay K. Chopra) can be given teaching, arrangement that is all the case now. That means University may reconsider his (Professor. Vijay K. Chopra's) case. Who can reconsider his case, only the Government of the University can reconsider his (Professor. Vijay K. Chopra's) case. So, Syndicate can reconsider that decision and the Senate can accept that reconsidered decision. So, he (Vice Chancellor) has brought his (Professor Vijay K. Chopra's) case there (Syndicate) because that guy says that he may be restored. When the matter goes to the Department, the Department Chair does not consult the Vice Chancellor, Department Chair sends it to the Office asking for what to do. The matter comes to the Office of the Dean of University Instruction, he (Dean of University Instruction) does not consult him (Vice Chancellor), he (Dean of University Instruction) sends the matter to the FDO. The file starts moving/forward from the lower level. He (Vice-Chancellor) became aware that that matter was going on only when on in the month of June. He (Vice-Chancellor) got one bunch of papers, in that he found a letter written on 31st of May. Then he started tracing that and he figured that out that the letter of 31st of May was moving from one place to another place in the Office, without his knowledge at all. Then he asked the Chairman of the Department of Evening Studies that why he (Chairman) had done that. He said that the decisions of the Senate and Syndicate were taken in March, he (Chairman) had not received the copies of those. He asked the Deputy Registrar, Establishment Branch that why the matters relating to him (Professor Vijay K. Chopra) had not gone to him, the Chairman of the Department of Evening Studies. He said that he had made a note and that file had been lost somewhere on the way. So, the Chairman of Department of Evening Studies says that he knows that he had been asked not to give him (Professor. Vijay K. Chopra) classes. He (Chairman) had been informed that after 31st January his (Professor. Vijay K. Chopra) services had been terminated. He (Chairman) knows everything, but he takes refuge under technicalities that he had not received this and that. Against how many people, how many inquiries can he (Vice Chancellor) initiate What is going on? How office notes move here and there. So, in that background he had brought this item. In the meanwhile he had found that in the Handbook of information of the University, which was released on 6th June, he had not seen the draft of the Handbook carefully, signature was done by him, that was a big Handbook, the day he released that he was just browsing through that, suddenly he saw that Professor Vijay K Chopra in the re-employment list. He did not want to make a scene when the book was being released, he remained quiet there and let the matter rest. He contacted Professor Singla and asked him to delete his (Professor Vijay K. Chopra's) name from the soft copy and then he confirmed from the Press that how many copies had been got printed. He found out that only 300 copies were printed, but if there would had been 30, 000 copies then that would have been a problem. He asked them (Press) to bring whitener and he got his (Professor. Vijay K. Chopra's) name deleted by putting whitener on that and issued order that his name be removed from the soft copy. That order was not implemented. He received a letter that legal opinion be sought for that. He said that he will not take legal opinion, legal opinion for what?

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that who asked for getting legal opinion.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that don't ask him, let's not name the person.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that if the decision was made then why legal opinion after that.

The Vice Chancellor said that whether the decision was made or not, that paper did not reach to the Chairman (of Deptt. of Evening Studies).

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there is no fault of Professor R.K. Singla as sometimes the decisions are not conveyed. Important decisions should be conveyed within 1-2 days as just now they have taken a decision on an issue related with the UBS. Only then the matters could be resolved and could not wait for the minutes which takes about a month or so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Singla finally did it. When it was done, this fellow sent a series of mails, one of which was received on 8th June, then again on 9th June, but nothing happened. There is a letter of 24th June in which there is a complete history which had been sent to all. Then Professor Chopra went to Professor Singla and also the Deputy Registrar and threatened them. He threatened Professor Singla. To frighten Professor Singla, he sent a letter addressed to Professor Singla that he has carried out the illegal orders of the Vice-Chancellor and for carrying out this illegal order, he is individually responsible and he would take him to the Court. The morale of Professor Singla was affected, due to which his blood pressure started fluctuating. His family admitted him, but was discharged from the hospital because all the biochemical parameters were okay. But his morale is sinking. He goes from one hospital to another. When they could not find anything physiological wrong with him, they referred him to a psychiatrist. He had to undergo that also. So much of the medicines were pumped into him to control the condition. When Professor Meenakshi Malhotra went to his home, only then he (Vice-Chancellor) came to know about it and got really alarmed. Then he went to meet Professor Singla along with Professor Meenakshi Malhotra and talked to him. The family is also under so much of a stress which they could not imagine. The amount of damage this individual (Professor Chopra) is causing to senior functionaries of the University and if they are not seen to be standing and countering this thing, it is not a small thing. Professor Chopra came to know that he (Vice-Chancellor) has met Professor Singla and trying to console him, therefore, he sends an e-mail to all the Syndics individually.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is also a threat to all of them that they would also be taken to the Court.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that let they accept the challenge and take cautious steps.

The Vice-Chancellor read out from the letter "please also note that in the eventuality of any contrary adverse decision not in consonance with the said orders of the High Court, the undersigned shall be constrained to arrange you (the Hon'ble members) in your personal capacity in the appropriate court proceedings arising therefrom at your cost, consequence and responsibility. Please be informed the next date of hearing is 20th July 2017". Professor

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Chopra goes and vehemently argues. So if the members ask him (Vice-Chancellor), he is also prepared personally on their behalf to argue and fix this person. To this, some of the members said that it is okay.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that some aggressive person should be associated.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested the Vice-Chancellor to circulate the court order to which the Vice-Chancellor said that it has already been circulated.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that whatever is the decision of the High Court, they would honour that. If it is a challenge, let them accept and decide.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever court orders Professor Chopra has sent, from that it does not seem that there is a stay.

The Vice-Chancellor read out the order "listed on 20th July and the University shall be at liberty to avail the services of the appellant for teaching work also". Now the resolved part is that the Syndicate resolves that they do not want his services to which the members agreed. His services were curtailed on 31st January which they reiterate and the Syndicate wholeheartedly condemns his actions and in particular his actions which amount to threatening the officers of the University, including the governing body, with threat that he would take them for contempt of court (COC). He has no business whatsoever to threaten anybody in their personal capacity when people are performing duties on behalf of the University and particularly with the knowledge and sanction of the governing body of the University.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that in the item, 'retired' should have been mentioned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was not written because earlier 'retired' was used and he (Professor Chopra) started challenging the same that when the Court is giving him re-employment, how he could be a retired person.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma enquired as to when he is going to complete the age of 65 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is going to complete the age of 65 years on 31st March, 2018. This is what a senior person had said to him one day that release the payments of Professor Chopra and let him go.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the payments should not be released.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Chopra has done misappropriation with the Punjab Financial Corporation. He has sent mails to the Advisor, the DGP. If they authorise him, he would send the documented 250 pages to the Advisor, who is an ex-officio member of the Senate and request him that administrative action

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

should be taken against such errant person whose actions amount to threatening the serving officers of the University.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested that whatever the Vice-Chancellor is saying, a Committee be formed on this issue.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired whether Professor Chopra's entry could not be banned.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Committee is to be formed to follow up the cases.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that names of Professor Mohammad Khalid, Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him talk to Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma when he comes.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested that the other members for the Committee could be appointed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him talk to Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested the name of Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi as Chairperson of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first he would have to talk to him. Professor Chopra had taken a loan from the Punjab Financial Corporation and the PFC had appealed to the University.

Dr. Dalip Kumar and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma would not refuse it.

The Vice-Chancellor said Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, a Syndicate member, has to chair the Committee.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma should be made the Chairperson of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor requested to Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to shoulder this responsibility.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he has no objection, but sarcastically remarked that Professor Chopra has so much love with him.

Principal I.S. Sandhu, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and a few members supported Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma as Chairperson.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Chopra could say that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma is personally against him. They should make Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma as Chairperson of the Committee, but first let him talk to him.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma would not refuse it and should be made the Chairperson.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

The Vice-Chancellor said that first, he has to talk to him.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma then suggested the name of Shri Jarnail Singh.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he has no time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first let Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma come and he would talk to him as also to Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, who has been a police officer.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they authorise the Vice-Chancellor in this matter and said that Professor Mohammad Khalid should also be associated with the Committee.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that Professor Mohammad Khalid is a good choice and should be made a member.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Syndicate member should be the Chairperson of the Committee.

At this stage, on the request of Shri Varinder Singh, Item No.C-23 was taken up for consideration and the discussion on Item No.C-9 again continued after consideration of Item No.C-17.

When the Vice-Chancellor announced Item No.C-10 to be taken up for consideration, after having considered Item No. C-17, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma enquired about the resolution on Item No.9.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him reiterate. The Syndicate reconfirms that Professor Chopra's re-employment in Panjab University has ended on 31st January, 2017. The Syndicate decides not to take the services of Professor Chopra for any teaching thereafter. The Court has said such a thing in its order. The Syndicate out-rightly condemns Professor Chopra's action since his re-employment was curtailed on 31st January, 2017. His actions amount to threatening or coercing the senior officers of the University in performing their duties. This act of threatening to initiate contempt of court proceedings against officers and the members of the Syndicate at a personal level is strongly condemned. His act of writing to the senior functionaries in the country including Advisor to the Administrator and the DGP to initiate proceedings against the University is also out-rightly condemned. The Syndicate authorised the Vice-Chancellor to communicate all the misdemeanours of Professor Chopra to initiate action against him as per law in view of recent threats to the officers of the University. All the communications which he has sent during the last 15 days would also be attached with it. He has also written on 14th May, the day when there was a fire. Even before the flames were doused, he had written a letter to the Vice-President of India on 14th May itself at 1.00 p.m.' where he addresses H.E. M.KHALID ANSARI JI as Chancellor. Then he regrets that it has been wrongly written and corrects it. In that letter also, he is attributing as if the fire has been deliberately engineered and it is to protect the acts of corruption and the concealment of the income by the University in hostels and so on. It is the same concealment of income for which he had supplied information and they have recorded it, the same information he got through the RTIs and handed over to NSUI. He gave the same thing

to the ABVP and got initiated a Fact Finding Committee enquiry against the University. The University has replied to all those fact finding things and the Central Government has taken cognizance of the way that they do their financial transactions. If the Central Government was dissatisfied with what they are doing, why would the Central Government agree to sustain the University because there is a letter of 19th June which says that the Government has taken cognizance of it. The other general financial rules that they have to follow, they are committed to do. They just could not do the things that the central institutions are supposed to do. When the Centre has explicitly stated that the salary of all the teachers shall be paid, it is a very big thing and accepted that 1378 is the teaching strength of the University and drawing the salary of persons equivalent to 1150. There is no central institution in the country where given a strength, 80% of the teachers are being paid. They might not have more than 50% regular teachers against the 1378 posts as they have appointed faculty on yearly contractual basis, re-employed the teachers against the vacant positions as their positions have not been declared vacant and also the guest faculty against the vacant posts. Against 169 vacant posts of teachers, they have appointed 200 teachers as guest faculty and the payment is being made for this. The Centre has agreed and given in writing that it would bear the salary of 80% of the accepted sanctioned strength on behalf of the University. Such a good situation does not prevail in any other institution. It is so only in some of the newly created central institutions which are fully paid by the Centre, because the number of sanctioned posts of faculty in those institutions ranges from 50 to 80. Those universities which are of the size of Panjab University which have a strength of more than 1000, they could see there as to how many of the teachers are being paid. Those institutions have also to obtain the permission from the Government, whenever they want to fill up the positions. Panjab University has also to follow the same conditions. So, Centre's confidence in the affairs of the University stands explicitly given to the University. In that background, this man (Professor Chopra) going and saying that mismanagement is going on in this University, misappropriation of funds is going on. Could a given Vice-Chancellor do any misappropriation? If there is a misappropriation, it is a misappropriation which has a sanction of the Board of Finance having the representatives of the Syndicate, Senate, Punjab Government, U.T. Administration, MHRD and UGC. How everything on behalf of the University is so compromised that there is a conspiracy going on to make wrong projections to the Centre to extract money from them to spend on the matters which are of wrong kind. There is nothing like that. On the one hand, there is a fire incident and this man says as if it has been done deliberately. When he (Vice-Chancellor) went to meet Justice Narang, the Chairman of the Fact Finding Committee, he was sitting with a set of questions. Why, because in the newspapers it was given by Professor Chopra that all this is engineered. Justice Narang asked that who could benefit from this fire in the accounts branch of the University. It was at his instance that this clause was put in the fact finding to figure out that is there anyone who could benefit from this fire in the accounts branch. What is it, it is which could not be recalled, could not be reconstructed. If most of it could be reconstructed, then even if somebody has engineered this thing and if everything gets reconstructed, then that purpose is defeated even if the fire had been put on deliberately. Justice Narang is actually looking into all such aspects. This gentleman tries to raise issues as if it has deliberately been done on behalf of the University, on behalf of the individuals in the University, may be the

Syndicate, Senate of the University, officers of the University who are involved in things against whom the Syndicate has asked for an enquiry. He did not want to speculate, but the Syndicate takes cognisance of everything that is brought to its attention. Syndicate and Senate members and some of the colleagues said that let they look into it as to why the construction quality of the recent buildings is poor, there is a Committee which is looking into it. There is also a concern whether adequate attention is being given to the vigilance reports which stand generated on behalf of the University. Everything has been presented to the Syndicate and a Committee has also been formed. His personal view as he has spent 5 years in the University, according to him, no other organisation in the country has a governing body which meets with that degree of regularity and where the members of the governing body have that much a freedom to speak the way that they wish because none of the members is appointed by the Vice-Chancellor who conducts the meeting. The members have their own strength on the basis of which they are members of the governing body. The members are not dependent on the Vice-Chancellor or the Chancellor or the management of the College to which one belongs. Prima facie, no governing body could be more democratic and vigilant than this one. Everything in the University is functioning properly. Earlier, they did not have a Chief Vigilance Officer (CVO), but now they have appointed me. They are trying to train everybody. There is no diktat from the Central Government or State Government that this much should be the fee. The Punjab Government just decides the tuition fee only. The U.T. Administration also does the same. All the other charges are decided by the members who are more connected with the Colleges or the Departments of the University or someone nominated by the Chancellor. A member nominated by the Chancellor is also not dependent on the Chancellor. Even thereafter, if somebody says that frauds are being committed in the University, according to him, it is very-very unfortunate and extremely irresponsible. In the background of it, on behalf of the Syndicate, he would submit all these documents to the Advisor along with the minutes of the deliberations which have happened since January along with today's minutes and ask him to take action against Professor Chopra as per law. If any action is deemed to be taken against the University as per law, the Advisor could also initiate that as per law. But if an individual is hell bent upon defaming a public institution, some action also needs to be taken against that person. Nobody could act irresponsibly.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that while Professor Chopra was in service in the Department of Evening Studies, had filed defamation case against the Chairperson of the Department and during a period of 4 years did not appear in the court even once to pursue that case. It was just to harass the Chairperson. Then the case was dismissed. This itself is like a stricture against him.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to provide all such documents so that he could send the same to the Advisor.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that when he raised this issue in the Senate in the year 2002 that Professor Chopra is drawing salary, while staying at Jalandhar, a Committee was formed. When the discussion of the meeting was reported in the newspapers, on the basis of that, Professor Chopra levelled personal allegations against him (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) and the Chairperson.

The Vice-Chancellor said that nobody protected them.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there was no need to protect.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Syndicate should have defended.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that such things have become a habit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has become a habit as nobody protects.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that Professor Chopra had been continuously writing to the Chancellor, HRD Minister that in the Department of Evening Studies, something wrong is happening and a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) was filed in the High Court that it is not functioning as per UGC norms and it should be totally disbanded. It is a separate matter that the High Court dismissed the PIL. Professor Chopra has been consistently and persistently doing such things and it is not a new thing. There are such other incidents also continuing.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to provide all these details and he would personally meet the Advisor and bring all these things to his notice.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that what Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma is talking about the incident of 2002, the proceedings of that meeting must also be available.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that all those documents are there with the item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a strong message has to go that any threat of defamation against any teacher of the University, against any officer of the University, the University would treat it as a defamation against it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that all this happened due to pointing out in the Senate which a Senator is doing so while performing his duty and a defamation case is filed against that person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University would defend each and every officer, each and every member, present or past, of the governing body. They could even take a legal opinion whether they could sue Professor Chopra in the Court.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that this could also be looked into as this person is an incorrigible man.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they authorise him, he would take a legal opinion on the material that is to be sent to the Advisor whether the University could file a defamation case against that person or not.

This was agreed to by the members.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there is not even a good thing in this person either as a teacher or as a person or as an employee which they could accept as he is a fraudulent in almost everything.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this person is hand in glove with an RTI activist and that RTI activist with a former Senator. There is a group of such persons. He is not the only person.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as the Vice-Chancellor had said, such persons have been accorded legitimacy and respectability by some higher-ups.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is what has to be exposed and brought in the public view that the time, energy and money of a national institution are being wasted. Whatever he (Vice-Chancellor) has stated, the members would realise that he has not done anything wrong.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as the Vice-Chancellor is taking a principled stand that whatever Professor Chopra has done is wrong and is damaging the University and he has no business as he is no more serving the University. He is just damaging the University.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the Syndicate reaffirms that re-employment of Professor Vijay K. Chopra stands curtailed w.e.f. 31.01.2017;
- (ii) the University should not avail the services of Professor Vijay K. Chopra for any further teaching assignment as per liberty accorded to the University by the High Court;
- (iii) the continuing misdemeanours of Professor Vijay K. Chopra are out-rightly condemned, particularly which amount to threatening or coercing the officers and Senate/Syndicate members of the University, who are performing their duties, under the direction and supervision of competent authority;
- (iv) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to communicate to the Advisor to the Administrator, U.T. Chandigarh all the misdemeanours of Professor Vijay K. Chopra along with relevant papers;
- (v) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to seek legal opinion on filing a defamation and/or misappropriation case against Professor Vijay K. Chopra; and
- (vi) 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 Vice-Chancellor be authorised to nominate the Chairperson of the Committee amongst them.

Issue regarding additional amount to be paid to Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate

10. To decide an additional amount to be paid to Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate and Legal Retainer of Panjab University per hearing after the first three dates, for defending the University in SLP (C) 7202 of 2017 UGC Vs Panjab University as Shri Girish Agnihotri, has to represent the University on each date of hearing before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and has to make alternative arrangements in respect of the Court cases listed in the High Court of Punjab and Haryana. He has also to make necessary arrangements for boarding and lodging at New Delhi to attend the hearing in the said SLP.

- NOTE:** 1. The legal fee of Rs.2,20,000/-, will be paid to Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate and Legal Retainer of Panjab University.
2. An office note along with decision of the Senate dated 20.12.2011 (Para XLIII) is enclosed (**Appendix-X**).

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to take the decision on the additional amount to be paid to Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate and Legal Retainer of Panjab University per hearing after the first three dates, for defending the University in the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

**Recommendations
(No.7 & 22) dated
28.03.2017 (Appendix-
_) of the Faculty of
Law regarding
migration**

11. Considered recommendations (No.7 & 22) dated 28.03.2017 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Faculty of Law that applications be invited for migration from 1st September to 7th September every year and within next two weeks the whole process of migration be completed i.e. upto 21st September of every year

NOTE: An office note along with the decision of the Syndicate dated 30.10.2010 (Para 25) is enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).

RESOLVED: That recommendations (No.7 & 22) of the Faculty of Law dated 28.03.2017, **as per Appendix**, that applications be invited for migration from 1st September to 7th September every year and within next two weeks the whole process of migration be completed i.e. upto 21st September of every year, be approved.

**Additions in Rules 2 and
22.1**

12. Considered if, the following addition, as per proposal (**Appendix-XII**), be made in Rule 2 and 22.1 appearing at pages 70-73 and 100-101, respectively, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016:

- (i) Rule 2- Definitions and Interpretation under Chapter (vii)-Service & Conduct Rules for University Employees appearing at pages 70-73 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016;

“Contractual employee” means-

An employee appointed under a contract for a specific job at a specific rate of pay for a limited time.

“Daily wage employee” means-

An employee appointed on daily wage basis at the sanctioned rates, from time to time.

- (ii) Rule 22.1 appearing at pages 100-101 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, regarding Maternity Leave;

**Maternity Leave for temporary/
contractual/daily wage women employees
(teaching and non-teaching) :**

“Women employees of the University may be granted maternity leave on full pay for a period not ordinarily exceeding 3 months. The grant of leave should be so regulated that the date of confinement falls within the period of this leave. This leave may be extended to six months without the necessity of production of a medical certificate. Extension if any, beyond 180 days shall however, be permissible by the grant of leave of the kind due.

- NOTE:** 1. No leave under this Rule shall be granted to a female employee who has three or more children.
2. The maternity leave will be granted to the extent of number of days balance in the term of engagement of the employee.

Period of absence beyond the number of days, as per term of engagement would be treated as leave without pay and employee would be allowed to re-join after providing the valid medical fitness certificate.”

- NOTE:** 1. The pending cases, if any, be also taken into consideration for release of salary for the period of maternity leave.
2. The proposed addition will be incorporated at the end of the Rule 2 and Rule 22.1.
3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).

RESOLVED: That the following proposed addition to be made in Rule 2 and 22.1 appearing at pages 70-73 and 100-101, respectively, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, be approved:

- (i) Rule 2- Definitions and Interpretation under Chapter (vii)-Service & Conduct Rules for University Employees appearing at pages 70-73 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016;

“Contractual employee” means-

An employee appointed under a contract for a specific job at a specific rate of pay for a limited time.

“Daily wage employee” means-

An employee appointed on daily wage basis at the sanctioned rates, from time to time.

- (ii) Rule 22.1 appearing at pages 100-101 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, regarding Maternity Leave;

Maternity Leave for temporary/ contractual/daily wage women employees (teaching and non-teaching):

“Women employees of the University may be granted maternity leave on full pay for a period not ordinarily exceeding 3 months. The grant of leave should be so regulated that the date of confinement falls within the period of this leave. This leave may be extended to six months without the necessity of production of a medical certificate. Extension if any, beyond 180 days shall however, be permissible by the grant of leave of the kind due.

- NOTE:** 1. No leave under this Rule shall be granted to a female employee who has three or more children.
2. The maternity leave will be granted to the extent of number of days balance in the term of engagement of the employee.

Period of absence beyond the number of days, as per term of engagement would be treated as leave without pay and employee would be allowed to re-join after providing the valid medical fitness certificate.”

- NOTE:** 1. The pending cases, if any, be also taken into consideration for release of salary for the period of maternity leave.
2. The proposed addition will be incorporated at the end of the Rule 2 and Rule 22.1.

After consideration of the item, Professor Mukesh Arora pointed out that employees are appointed on contract basis and accordingly, the salary is paid. For example, they had appointed Library Assistants on 22.03.2011. Those employees are continuing till, but their pay has not been increased whereas the salary of all other employees on contract basis has been revised. He requested that their salary should also be enhanced and a small Committee could be formed in this regard.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Dr. Dalip Kumar also supported this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now he did not know how the things are going to evolve. But whatever the Centre has stated, how many employees the University could sustain, all this is left to the University in consultation with the Punjab Government. The work of the Think-Tank is to address all outstanding issues concerning financial management of the University. The point raised by Professor Mukesh Arora is very genuine. This also applies to the employees appointed on 89 days basis. They are continuing. The Joint

Consultative Machinery (JCM) recommended that those who have completed 7 years of service be regularised, but could not be regularised due to some issues related with the Uma Devi's case. But nobody disallows them to give benefit to the people whom they are continuing year after year. They could be innovative and devise their own ways giving allowance to the fact that somebody is taken in, he/she has given a decade of service, they could grant some differential rate of benefit for the length of service as those employees are not granted the other benefits like the LTC, etc. If they go by what Centre is saying, the Centre would not interfere as to how they handle their affairs beyond the grant that the Centre is giving. The Centre is saying that they would pay the salary of the teachers in the ratio of 1:1.1, but it is a number that is not defined. It is the quantum of money that the Centre has decided. That would increase by 6%. When the 7th Pay Commission recommendations are to be implemented and the 6% increase would not be able to bear the expenditure, then they would have to approach the Centre. If they have to implement the 7th Pay Commission for the teachers, then they would have to implement the pay commission for the non-teaching staff also. If they pay higher salaries to the teachers, in the similar way, they would have to pay to the non-teaching staff also as per the pay commission recommendations. All such things have been left by the Centre on the University as per the letter that has been received from the Centre. They have to work it out and this is to be done broadly by the Think-Tank as also to examine the recommendations of the Committee formed for enhancing the income. In the background of all this, they would have to think of some innovative ways which addresses the concerns like Professor Mukesh Arora has. He has also a feeling that if a temporary person even after serving for 30 years retires, that person spends his whole life on the minimum salary. So, something should be done. What should be done, that is what the people who have been given this task, they should think about all this task and make proposal which should find ways and means of meeting either from the internal income or by persuading the Punjab Government. After all, this problem is not only in Panjab University, but it would also be there in Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University. Any State Government must holistically look at all these things and come out. It is not that this problem is only in the universities, this problem would also be there in all the Government Colleges, all other Government organisations also. As the Government grapples with the situation, as the new Finance Minister grapples with the situation, they should also work with the Education Minister. They should bring these things to the attention of the Education Minister that when the other Ministries are making demands on the Finance Minister, the Education Minister also must make demands on behalf of all the universities. He would also go and meet when the new Vice-Chancellors of the other two universities are appointed and discuss with them that the problem could be brought at such a platform where it could be attended to.

Principal I.S. Sandhu pointed out that the Registrar must be knowing that the Library staff is missing from the recommendations of the JCM regarding regularisation. The Library staff should also be included in the regularisation policy.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that an employee who was appointed in the year 2011 at a salary of Rs.20,000/- p.m., he/she is drawing the same salary even in the year 2017.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are financial implications involved in every issue. For the last three years, they have been prevented from taking any financial decision.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that a Committee could be formed about the cases which could not be covered under the recommendations of the JCM. The matter could be referred to the JCM.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the present item is not salary related, but related to leave.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the matter is related with the salary also.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the item be approved and a Committee be formed on the issue of salary.

Professor Mukesh Arora requested that as suggested by Dr. Dalip Kumar, the Assistant Professors or Principals from the Colleges should also be made members of the Think-Tank as the Colleges also have some issues.

Raising another issue, Principal I.S. Sandhu requested that the payment of TA/DA should be made in cash.

Professor Mukesh Arora quoted a case of the Library staff. Mrs. Arun Prabha was promoted from the post of Assistant Librarian to the post of Deputy Librarian during the term of Professor R.C. Sobti as the Vice-Chancellor. He (Professor Mukesh Arora) was pursuing the case for about 6-7 years. At last, he succeeded in getting the promotion, but the letter which has been issued to the candidate says that the benefit be granted from 1.7.1997, he is having a copy of that letter. But the benefit is being granted w.e.f. 28.7.1998 whereas the University in its letter is saying about giving the benefit w.e.f. 1.7.1997. The decision of the Syndicate/Senate is not being implemented and the benefit is being given w.e.f. 28.7.1998. Those employees who approached the Court, the benefit to them has been granted from 1.1.1996.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that whatever Professor Mukesh Arora is pointing out, the benefit should be granted as per the decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everything has financial implication and after examination, it would be put up to the Board of Finance in its meeting on 1st August.

Professor Mukesh Arora handed over some documents.

**Enhancement in age
of retirement of
Medical Officers**

13. Considered the recommendations of the Administrative Committee of BGJ Institute of Health dated 30.05.2017 that the present age of retirement of Medical Officers working at the Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, P.U., be increased from 60 years to 65 years.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 17.4 appearing at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 reads as under:

“A whole-time Medical Officer of the University shall retire on reaching the age of sixty years; provide that extension may be granted for a period upto two years in special cases, on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor.”

2. A copy of the notification dated 31.05.2016 downloaded from the website attached by the Committee meant for Centre Govt. Doctors was enclosed.
3. As per budget estimate 2017-2018, the Medical Officers of Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health Centre, P.U., are working in the pay-scales of the Punjab Government, notified vide notification No.7/1/97-FPI/314 dated 16.01.1998 and adopted by the University vide Endst. No.B/2187-2336/A dated 02.03.1998.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is a Regulation. In principle, they could agree but first it should be sent to the Regulations Committee.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that since it is a necessity, it should be done at the earliest. Otherwise, there would be no doctors in the Health Centre

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Regulations Committee.

Recommendation of Executive Committee of PUSC dated 30.05.2017

14. Considered recommendation (No.5) of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 30.05.2017 (**Appendix-XIII**).

RESOLVED: That recommendation (No.5) of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 30.05.2017, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Condonation of delay in submission of Ph.D. thesis

15. Considered if, delay of 1 years 7 months and 15 days beyond the period of eight years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Gurpreet Kaur, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Laws, Department of Laws, be condoned and she be allowed to submit her thesis upto 31.07.2017, as she could not submit her Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons mentioned in her request dated 18.05.2017 (**Appendix-XIV**):

- NOTE:**
1. Ms. Gurpreet Kaur was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Laws on 18.12.2007. She was granted three year extension upto 17.12.2013.
 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 is enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

RESOLVED: That delay of 1 year 7 months and 15 days beyond the period of eight years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Gurpreet Kaur, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Laws, Department of Laws, be condoned and she be allowed to submit her thesis upto 31.07.2017, as she could not submit her Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons mentioned in her request dated 18.05.2017 (**Appendix-XIV**):

Condonation of delay in submission of Ph.D. thesis

16. Considered if, delay of 2 years 8 months and 27 days as on 20.06.2017 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 Ms. Ngairangbam Diana Chanu, enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Department-cum-Centre for Women’s Studies & Development, be condoned and she be allowed to submit her thesis upto 20.06.2017, as she could not submit her Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons mentioned in her request dated 16.05.2017 (**Appendix-XV**).

- NOTE:** 1. Ms. Ngairangbam Diana Chanu was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Arts on 24.09.2008. She was granted three year extension upto 23.09.2014.
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 is enclosed (**Appendix-XV**).

RESOLVED: That delay 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 Ms. Ngairangbam Diana Chanu, enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Department-cum-Centre for Women’s Studies & Development, be condoned and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the date of communication of the decision, as she could not submit her Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons mentioned in her request dated 16.05.2017 (**Appendix-XV**).

Minutes of Sub-Committee dated 06.06.2017 regarding making the University vehicle free

17. Considered minutes dated 06.06.2017 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Sub-Committee, constituted by the Syndicate to review the recommendations of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor and suggest implementation plan by 14.06.2017, to make the University vehicle free.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 28.05.2017 (Para 24) (**Appendix-XVI**) considered the minutes dated 10.05.2017 with regard to make University vehicle free had constituted the following Sub-Committee including Syndics to review the recommendations of the Committee and suggest implementation plan by 14th June 2017:

1. Shri Varinder Singh Chairperson
2. Professor Promila Pathak
3. Shri Deepak Kaushik
4. Dean Student Welfare or nominee
5. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
6. Dr. Dalip Kumar
A.R. (DSW) Convener

It was resolved further that:-

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor be authorised, on behalf of the Syndicate, to approve the recommendations of the Sub-Committee; and
- (ii) Permission be sought from the Chandigarh Administration to open the Panjab University Gate near Department of Laws.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not understand clause (ii) of point No.1 that the research scholars should have permission of their Supervisor/Chairperson of the Department concerned as research scholar is 24-hour student.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the entry of the students is not being stopped even after 5.00 p.m. as they could enter the campus and walk. Only the entry by four-wheeler is being stopped after 5.00 p.m.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that actually the problem of traffic is only during the peak hours and after 5.00 p.m. there is not much rush of traffic.

Shri Varinder Singh said that by 5.00 p.m. all the Departments and the Administrative Block are closed. If the students wanted to come to the campus after 5.00 p.m., they could come on their cars, park the cars at the gate and walk down the campus. If the supervisor of the research scholar certifies that he/she needs to visit the Supervisor, the permission could be granted for a particular period.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that there is a problem also for the College teachers as has been mentioned at Sr.No.2.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that at Sr.No.2, instead of valid identity card and an authority letter, it should be valid identity card or an authority letter.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is some typographical error and it should be corrected as pointed by Dr. Dalip Kumar. The clause related with the research scholars should also be removed from the guidelines.

Dr. Dalip Kumar pointed out that the rates of parking for 4 hours in Chandigarh have been fixed at Rs.5/-. Why they are charging Rs.10/-, it should also be kept at Rs.5/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University has a large density of people and there is no other sector which has this much population.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in the University, it is a restriction. Even the parking charges could be enhanced so that the rush of the vehicles could be reduced.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they could take action against the students in so many ways, but what action they could take against the outsiders.

Shri Varinder Singh said that some of the measures they are taking just to build up a pressure.

Principal I.S. Sandhu informed that the Punjabi University, Patiala has constructed parking near the entry gate and the vehicles are not allowed beyond that even if a student has to take his belonging to the hostel. If the parents of the students or other persons are coming from far off distances, where those persons could park their vehicles? Since on average, about 10,000 vehicles enter the campus, how would they manage the parking.

It was informed that the parking near Gate No.1 is a huge one and could accommodate more than 200 cars.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that making the University no vehicle zone is a good attempt and it should be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a parking near the Gate of Dental Institute in Sector-25 be created. There should be a shuttle

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

service between Gate No.1 of Sector-14 to Gate of Dental Institute in Sector-25.

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested that the parking could also be created near Department of Laws.

It was informed that free shuttle bus service exists. There are 3 buses which are shuttling one after the other. In addition to that, there is provision of available e-rickshaws parked at Gate No.1.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the e-rickshaw service is paid service. There should be a shuttle service between Gate No.1 of Sector-14 to Gate of Dental Institute in Sector-25.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he had earlier also suggested that parking near Department of Laws should be constructed as there is large space available.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the suggestion given by Professor Mukesh Arora is a good one and the parking be constructed there, as also the gate should be got opened. Before the problem really crops up, additional parking should be constructed and the shuttle service should continuously run all the time.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they would have to review the system weekly.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the points raised by him should be integral part of the guidelines.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has seen that the shuttle service is continuously running in the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre (BARC). The upper limit of waiting time at any stop is 5 minutes.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they would have to increase the number of buses.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 06.06.2017 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Sub-Committee, constituted by the Syndicate to review the recommendations of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor and suggest implementation plan to make the University vehicle free, be approved, with the deletion of clause 1(ii) and under clause 2, the word 'and' be replaced with 'or'.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That option for creating parking space near Gate No. 3 of Sector 25 be explored immediately. The frequency of shuttle bus service between the two parking lots (Gate No. 1 of Sector 14 and 3 of Sector 25) be enhanced so that waiting time at any bus stop of the shuttle service is not more than 10 minutes. Feasibility to open the gate near Law Department be explored.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

- (i) Inspection Report (Pages 203-204) and
- (ii) P.U. Fire Safety Manual containing 55 pages

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there is a draft of the Panjab University Fire Safety Manual. The meaning of the manual is related to products. It should be Panjab University Comprehensive Fire Safety Guidelines as in the text, everywhere the word guidelines has been mentioned. Otherwise, these are very useful and comprehensive guidelines.

It was informed that the manual was prepared by the office of Registrar and was got vetted by the Chief Fire Officer (UT). Certain changes have been recommended by the Chief Fire Officer, U.T., the same have been incorporated.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is a good thing that they have got it vetted the manual from specialised persons.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested that this should be put in the website.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Director, Public Relations to issue a press release in this regard.

RESOLVED: That inspection report dated 03.06.2017 (**Appendix-XVII**) of Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh, Fire & Emergency Services, regarding Fire & Safety point of view in the Administrative Block of Panjab University, Chandigarh, be accepted and the Fire Safety Manual for Panjab University, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Repair estimate of
Rs.56,60,680/- for
repair at Regional
Centre, Sri Muktsar
Sahib**

19. Considered recommendations of the Committee 12.06.2017 to carry out major repairs of the roof of the Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, which is in dilapidated condition.

- NOTE:** 1. The existing campus at Sri Muktsar Sahib was inaugurated in 1998 and after an investment of Rs.8,52,355/- approximately for the re-appropriating and up grading the existing Gurudwara complex for use as an educational institution. Ever since no major expenses has been incurred by the University to upgrade this facility. The building complex was on lease @ Rs.1100/- per year (copy of lease enclosed) ever since the year 1998 when additional alteration work was got carried out to make it functional, no major expenditure has been incurred on the maintenance of the building. The building premises at present are in the dilapidated condition and as such needs major repairs.
2. Desh Bhagat Institute of Dental Sciences initially offered block-I of academic area of the Dental Institute in response to the tender, but subsequently they changed their proposal and

offered girls and boys hostel instead of block I of academic area, which were not found suitable for shifting the centre on account of repair as the rooms of the hostels were not found fit to use as classrooms.

3. The new infrastructure which is to be built on recently acquired land at Sri Muktsar Sahib may take more than 3 to 4 years subject to availability of funds.
4. The Committee observed that the most economic option would be to carry out major repairs of the roofs of the first floor classrooms and renovation of the toilets at the earliest to provide safe and clean infrastructure to the students.
5. The estimate of renovation & repair of existing regional centre building will incur expenses of Rs.56,60,680/- approximately

It was informed (by the Registrar) that he had gone there physically. Earlier, they had taken a decision to hire a suitable accommodation for the Regional Centre till the new building is constructed. So, they went to the building of Desh Bhagat institutions which is being offered. It was observed that this building is in a dilapidated condition. They would have to incur expenditure on it if they want to make it usable except some portion of the building where the classes were earlier being held. The rooms of the hostels offered by the institution are very small which are not suitable for using them as classrooms. It was observed that the rooms are not suitable and it was recommended not to take the same. Even they take the possession of the other portion which was used by Desh Bhagat Institute for academic purposes, they would have to re-appropriate it and would have to spend some money. Thereafter, the Committee visited the new Regional Centre site where the land has been recently acquired, the boundary wall of which has now been constructed. The construction would take about 3-5 years subject to availability of funds. After the University gets funds, only they would be able to start the work. The existing campus site was also visited. The University has not spent any money on it ever since they have taken over the possession of the building, only initially some expenditure was incurred. The land has been allotted on lease to the University at a rate of about Rs.1,100/- per annum till the time the University does not construct its own building. Whenever the construction work is complete, the same could be returned and the fixtures could be taken away otherwise for life long, it has been given to the University. Initially, some money had been spent to make the building usable. Now, over period of time the roof of the classrooms on the first floor have become weak and could fall down anytime, at 3-4 places, it has already fallen. Earlier, it was advised by the construction office that the building could not be made functional. However, on Physical inspection by him (Registrar) along Executive Engineers and the Architect of the building and it was opined that if the existing roof is removed and replaced by temporary roof of GI sheets with insulated puffed panel to control the temperature, the building could be put to use. The toilets are also not usable. It was suggested to shift the Library, which at present is on the upper floor, to the ground floor. In this way, the load of the building could be

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

reduced and the classes could be held. The Executive Engineer was asked to prepare an estimate for this purpose. Accordingly, the estimate has been prepared and if it is viable, they could spend the money to put the building to use. Even if they shift to the new location, the law campus could remain in the present building and the other classes in the other building. They could make additions as it is an asset.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Principal I.S. Sandhu enquired about how long will it take to construct the new building.

It was informed that it would take about 4 to 5 years. It took almost one year to construct the boundary wall.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired whether there was shortage of funds or the contractors as it took one year to construct the boundary wall.

It was informed that various permissions were required. Since he took over in October 2014, it took him 6 months to get the permission. He met the Deputy Commissioner and an army colleague, the ADC helped in the matter. Thereafter, the Punjab Government was spoken to and only after the possession was handed over. It has been over 15-20 years that the files were shuttling from one office to another. But with the help of ADC, it was got done. Thereafter, it was thought to construct the boundary wall. It took a year to complete all the formalities, like allocation of funds, approval from Building Committee etc. Then the tender was floated. Now the drawings for the new building have been approved and if the grant is given, the building could be constructed.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired as to from where the money is to be received.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a grant of Rs.5 crores is to be given by the Punjab Government.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they are planning to spend Rs.57 lacs on the proposed construction that building would not be of any use thereafter. If they spend this Rs.57 lacs, they could construct the building within 2 years and till then the classes could be run at Kauni where they are already having a building. This amount of Rs.57 lacs could be spent there.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that if a bus is arranged for the students, even then much money would not be involved.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they should not spend Rs.57 lacs just for a period of 2-3 years.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that other alternative arrangement could be made.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang and he would try to look for some other alternative building.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that they would arrange 10 rooms.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he was a member of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor. Shri Raghbir Dyal and the Director of the Centre were requested to locate some alternative building, but they also could not succeed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let they not take a decision by forcing an opinion. He requested Principal I.S. Sandhu, Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang and the Registrar to visit.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that if there is a requirement of 10 rooms, he would arrange these rooms for one year.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal I.S. Sandhu, Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang and the Registrar to make another visit and they would come back to the item again.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal requested that the option of holding the classes at Kauni should also be kept in mind.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the problem is serious because they have to run the classes. The three members should visit the place within a week. If the solution is there, then they would follow that. If the solution is not there in the hand, then he would send an e-mail to all the members, then they come back to this solution

RESOLVED: That a Committee comprising of Principal I.S. Sandhu, Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang and the Registrar will visit the Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib and explore the possibility of some alternative accommodation for running the classes in near future before considering the above proposal. The matter be placed in next meeting.

Reappointment of Dr. Zarreen Fatima in Department of Urdu

20. Considered if, Dr. Zarreen Fatima, be re-appointed as Assistant Professor in Department of Urdu, P.U., on contract basis at fixed emoluments of Rs.30400/- per month for the session 2017-18 w.e.f. 10.07.2017 to 31.05.2018, against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on the same term and conditions according to which she worked previously during the session 2016-17, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Dr. Zarreen Fatima, was appointed as Assistant Professor on contract basis for the academic session 2011-12 at fixed salary of Rs.25800/- p.m. which was revised to Rs.30400/- p.m. as per Syndicate decision dated 29.08.2011 (Para 11). Her appointment as such has been reviewed session to session, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007. Her appointment for the session 2016-17 i.e. upto 31.05.2017 was noted by the Senate dated 17.12.2016 (Para XXV).

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015 (General Discussion (1& 2)) has decided that all the persons working as guest faculty and/or temporary or part-time basis should be allowed to continue as such until they are replaced by the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

regular appointee. A copy of the circular dated 06.07.2015 is enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

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

RESOLVED: That Dr. Zarreen Fatima, be re-appointed as Assistant Professor in Department of Urdu, P.U., on contract basis at fixed emoluments of Rs.30400/- per month for the session 2017-18 w.e.f. 10.07.2017 to 31.05.2018, against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on the same terms and conditions according to which she worked previously during the session 2016-17, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

Revision of rent of auditoria, seminar halls, lawns and other venues

21. Considered minutes dated 02.05.2017 (**Appendix-XIX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 20.03.2017 (Para 8) (**Appendix-XIX**) regarding revision of rent of Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues of P.U. in sector-14 & South Campus of Sector-25 and also framing of guidelines for booking etc.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 02.05.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 20.03.2017 (Para 8) (**Appendix-XIX**) regarding revision of rent of Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues of P.U. in sector-14 & South Campus of Sector-25 and also framing of guidelines for booking etc., **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Appointment of Professor Suveera Gill as Chief Vigilance Officer

22. To ratify the orders of the Vice-Chancellor issued vide No.8135-145/Estt. dated 09.06.2017 (**Appendix-XX**) with regard to appointment of Professor Suveera Gill, University Business School, P.U. as Chief Vigilance Officer, Panjab University P.U. w.e.f. the date she accepts the responsibility, till further orders, in place of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra (appointed as Dean of University Instruction from 07.06.2017).

NOTE: 1. Professor Suveera Gill has joined as Chief Vigilance Officer of Panjab University on 09.06.2017 (F.N.) (**Appendix-XX**).

2. Curriculum Vitae of Professor Suveera Gill enclosed (**Appendix-XX**).

RESOLVED: That the orders of the Vice-Chancellor issued vide No.8135-145/Estt. dated 09.06.2017 (**Appendix-XX**) with regard to appointment of Professor Suveera Gill, University Business School, P.U. as Chief Vigilance Officer, Panjab University P.U. w.e.f. the date she accepts the responsibility, till further orders, in place of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra (appointed as Dean of University Instruction from 07.06.2017), be ratified.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

After some discussion on Item No.C-9, Shri Varinder Singh requested that since he has to go, he would be thankful if Item No. C-23 is taken up for consideration. Along with this, Item No.C-17 was also taken up. Accordingly, these items were considered. Thereafter, the remaining discussion on Item No.C-9 took place.

Proposal of Shri Varinder Singh, Fellow regarding amendments in Rural Border Reservation Quota

23. Considered proposal dated 16.07.2017 (**Appendix-XXI**) of Shri Varinder Singh, Fellow, Panjab University, with regard to amendments in Rural Border Reservation Quota:

NOTE: A copy of the decision of the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 (Para 47 R-(xxii)) with regard to admit the students falling under categories of Rural Area students and Border Area, over and above the sanctioned seats is enclosed (**Appendix-XXI**).

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the issue relates to rural area and is a genuine one.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is a concession given to the rural areas by the other two universities of Punjab and they should follow exactly what the other two universities are doing. A student of rural could take admission anywhere in Punjab. There should be uniformity about this. Whatever the other universities are doing, they should also follow the same. They could plead with those universities whatever Shri Varinder Singh and Dr. Sangha are saying and it should be a common thing for all the three universities. He would like to get it verified before recommending. He could just give his opinion and the decision is to be taken by the members.

Shri Varinder Singh said that whenever a policy is framed, some of the deficiencies are known later on. Most of the schools in rural areas are up to 10th class and in those schools, only limited number of subjects are taught. The Punjabi University, Patiala grants admission to those students who had studied from 1st class to 10th class in rural area. They had taken a decision that the candidate should have studied at least 5 years in a rural school on the plea that this period of 5 years could include the 10th and 12th classes. Due to this, the students did not have the choice of subjects due to limited number of subjects available in rural areas. Recently, there have been instances of students suffering due to this. There is a case of student who has applied for admission to University Business School (UBS).

The Vice-Chancellor said that in that particular case of UBS, the Dean of University Instruction has talked to the student and the student admitted that he did not take admission in the border area because the school was not a good one. The student had already moved from a region to an urban area in a good school because the High School was not a good one. Now, the student could not say that he should be given the concession as he had passed the 10th class from there. This would get challenged in the Courts also. That is why, what they wanted to approve, they should do it in a uniform way. Find out what the Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar have done. If these universities have given the concession, it is okay with him.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the particular student was considered and the merit was also prepared. The student did not apply for admission to anywhere else and due to this, he is deprived of admission anywhere else. The seat under the category of rural area is also lying vacant. The student has studied from 1st class to 10th in a rural area. They could make the amendment which would be beneficial for the student.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they are not here to grant benefit to any individual. They should take unanimous decision which could benefit the public at large. If a student has studied in +2 from a better school, how that student could be granted the benefit of rural area.

Shri Varinder Singh said that as he has already pointed out there are so many schools in the rural areas in which most of the subjects are not taught at +2 level. Therefore, if a student has studied from 1st class to 10th class from a rural school, that should be considered.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they could examine the policy of other universities as to what is the policy of the State Government whether they are granting the admission on the basis of 10th or 10+2. They could not go beyond the policy of the State Government.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they have already resolved that the student must have studied 10th and 12th class from a rural school. The present proposal is that because some students are left out, the student has studied up to 10th class from a rural area and good higher schools are not available in rural area. Every parent sends the children for good education at other places if that is not available at their place. Moreover, there are also cases where a student has taken admission in a school while he is studying at some other school. If whatever they have already notified and according to that the seats are vacant and the rural students are available, what is the harm in extending the benefit to that student.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could not be done only on the basis that a seat is vacant.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the policy be got examined.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the earlier policy is a good policy framed by the Committee comprising of 10-12 members. He was not the only member of the Committee that he had himself framed the policy. Some deficiencies were there in the policy and if the students are suffering due to that, they should take decision which could benefit the students. He is not asking for granting the benefit to a particular student but for all the students. This is just an example that he has given.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that the policy of other universities should be got studied.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a simple thing that either the Dean College Development Council or the Registrar be authorised to collect the information from the other two universities of Punjab.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that a small Committee be formed and authorised to take the decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that quick action should be taken. He requested that the information be collected within the next days from those universities and he would take the decision.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they could not go beyond the policy of the State Government.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it is not a policy of the State Government. These are the additional seats that they have created on their own.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the additional seats could not be given to the general students and the seat would remain vacant. Either the student with rural background be admitted and the seat would not go to the general category because these are additional seats.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the policy of the State Government is that even if a person has his home in the rural area, even then the benefit is granted. They have taken the decision to grant the due benefit to the students.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that these seats were created only for the rural students. If the students with 10+2 and 10th are not available, if the benefit goes to a student with 10-year rural schooling, what is the harm as that seat could not be given to any other body.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they have adopted the policy for granting benefit on the basis of 10th and 12th and if a candidate is not fulfilling the condition, how could they grant the benefit to the students even if 2% seats have been created.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it is a genuine problem.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that everybody could take a plea of having genuine problem. If the candidate fulfils the condition of the policy, then the benefit could be granted otherwise not.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that a Committee of neutral persons be formed and the seat reserved for rural students should go only to the rural students.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the seats reserved for SC candidates are not given to general category.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the seats for rural students are additional but not reserved seats.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that a policy was framed for additional seats. If the conditions of the policy are not fulfilled, how the seat could be allotted.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he is not favouring anyone. If a candidate has applied in the University, his name was included in the merit list and all other formalities have been completed, there is some

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

fault on the part of the office also due to which the candidate did not apply anywhere else as his name was included in the merit list.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired whether the UBS prepared the merit list without checking the 12th certificate.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the merit was prepared.

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

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it should be noted that the intention of Shri Varinder Singh is that the seats should be allotted to the rural students. It should be so. As Shri Varinder Singh has pointed out the problem of the rural area schools, it should also be noted that some big schools like DPS, etc. are being opened in the rural areas.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it also needs to be checked whether the student of rural area is studying in the village school or a public school.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the student stands at Sr.No.3 in the merit list of MBA and if the UBS has made a genuine mistake on behalf of the University and if the Vice-Chancellor has power to give additional seat, to overcome the mistake made by the University, he would use his jurisdiction. But he would not recommend that if a mistake has been committed, they should change the policy.

The members agreed to it.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that his point be also noted that the big houses like DPS, Rachna International are opening the schools in rural areas, such schools should not be considered in the category of rural areas.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the policy is for border rural areas.

RESOLVED: That the information be sought from the Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University regarding the policy of Punjab Government on the issue and the same be followed.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to take a decision in a particular case of the student of University Business School whose name has been placed at number 3 in the waiting list.

**Recognition of Centre
for Development of
Advanced Computing
(C-DAC), Mohali, as
Panjab University
recognised Research
Centre**

24. Considered recommendation (No.4) of the Research Promotion Cell Committee dated 04.05.2017 (**Appendix-XXII**), that Centre for Development of Advanced Computing (C-DAC), Mohali, be approved as Panjab University recognised Research Centre for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. Degree of Panjab University, Chandigarh in the subjects of (1) Electronics and (2) Information Technology of University Institute of Engineering & Technology under the Faculty of Engineering under the broader CRIKC initiative.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Dr. Dalip Kumar enquired whether they could grant a Research Centre to the institutions which are not in their ambit. As per the guidelines, only a co-investigator could be appointed but they could not give a research centre which is not in the affiliating area and it should be reviewed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal also said that it is not within the affiliating area.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that earlier they have granted permission to run M.Phil Course at IIPA, New Delhi as also at the Centre located at Mhow.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if it is a genuine case, then the permission could be granted, if it is not within the jurisdiction, then there might arise any problem in future.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the permission in the case of DST Centre at Lucknow has also been granted

RESOLVED: That recommendation (No.4) of the Research Promotion Cell Committee dated 04.05.2017 regarding recognition of Centre for Development of Advanced Computing (C-DAC), Mohali as Panjab University recognised Research Centre for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. Degree of Panjab University, Chandigarh in the subjects of (1) Electronics and (2) Information Technology of University Institute of Engineering & Technology under the Faculty of Engineering under the broader CRIKC initiative, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Issue regarding contractual Lecturers at Dental Institute

25. Considered the deferred Item No.9 of the Syndicate meeting dated 20.03.2017 (**Appendix-XXIII**) with regard to the request of contractual Lecturers working at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital along with the minutes of the Committee dated 05.06.2017 (**Appendix-XXIII**) constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.03.2017.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that last time they had deferred the item. It was thought that if the posts are advertised, the earlier persons working on the posts would be out of service, but it is not so, the reason being that those persons are working against the position of Assistant Professor but not against these positions. There would be no issue as the persons would have some chance. The recommendations are correct.

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 (**Appendix-XXIII**), with regard to the request of contractual Lecturers working at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Reconstitution
of
Committee**

26. Considered the re-constitution of the Committee to find ways and means as to how the following three demonstrators working at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital on temporary basis, be appointed on regular basis, examine legally whether any weightage can be given to them while considering their candidature for appointment on regular basis, whether they are on the non-teaching side or teaching side etc:

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

NOTE: 1. The following Committee was constituted by the Syndicate dated 31.07.2016 (Para 41) for the purpose:

1. Shri Ashok Goyal
 2. Dr. Ajay Ranga
 3. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
2. A.R. (Estt.) being the convenor of the Committee has written that Shri Ashok Goyal, Chairperson of the Committee was requested to suggest date, time and venue for convening the meeting but no feedback has been received from Shri Ashok Goyal till 15.05.2017.
 3. An office note was enclosed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this matter is pending for a long. Earlier, it was resolved to constitute the Committee but no meeting of the Committee was held. So, could now they form a new Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that before this item, they have taken a decision and these persons would be covered under that.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to examine the case.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested that a Committee of 2-3 persons be constituted to examine the case.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine, he would form a Committee.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to re-constitute the Committee under the Chairpersonship of Professor Navdeep Goyal.

Request for lateral admission to M.Sc.-II Environmental Science

27. Considered request dated 05.06.2017 of Ms. Bharti Mawa, mother of Ms. Ujjwal Naresh Mawa, with regard to lateral admission to M.Sc. II Environmental Science in Panjab University in respect of her daughter viz. Ms. Ujjwal Naresh Mawa.

NOTE: 1. Ms. Bharti Mawa, in her request has written that as per Handbook of Information of P.U. at page No.253, lateral entry is given to post graduation course of humanities stream i.e. M.A. She has also written that M.Sc. environment is also not a core science subject and she should be made equally eligible for lateral admission.

Ms. Bharti Mawa has also submitted No Objection Certificate issued by Gujrat Forensic Science University (GFSU).

2. The faculty members of Department of Environment Studies in its meeting dated 09.06.2017 discussed the case of Ms. Ujjwal Mawa for lateral admission to M.Sc. Environment Science 2nd year (3rd Semester and resolved that the lateral to M.Sc. Environmental Science is not admissible as per migration rules given at page 258 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
3. A copy of the letter dated 02.06.2017 vide which she was informed that the migration in the said course is not allowed as per Migration rule of the University was enclosed.
4. Rule 6 appearing at page 258 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 reproduced below:

“No migration shall be allowed in the postgraduate course.”
5. The Vice-Chancellor has observed that “In view of no precedence in sight, let this be put up to Syndicate for their consideration”.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that before this, a Committee was formed to look into the cases of migration from 2nd year onwards. Unfortunately, the meetings of the Committee are not being held. Otherwise, such cases should be allowed after framing a general rule. Individual cases should not be considered.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in other cases also, it should be allowed.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal to examine this and other issues which could be placed as consideration item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the earlier Committee is not doing anything, then they could do it.

RESOLVED: That the following Committee be constituted to examine the issue and submit its report:

1. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal (Chairperson)
2. Dr. Dalip Kumar
3. Professor Navdeep Goyal
4. Principal B.C. Josan
5. Professor Mukesh Arora
Assistant Registrar (DUI office) (Convener)

E-mail of Dr. Kawaljit Kaur

28. Considered e-mail dated 10.06.2017 and 13.06.2017 of Dr. Kawaljit Kaur, Principal, SPN College, Mukerian

NOTE: An office note along with relevant papers was enclosed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is a very serious matter. It is not a matter of an individual. He has been told that this thing is happening in the background of a very disturbing notice of Punjab Government that the persons be employed only on the basic salary. It is a very unfortunate thing as people want to move ahead in their life. Everybody wants to become a Principal and there is no harm in aspiring to be a Principal. If a College does not pay the full salary and if a person comes even after sacrificing something and if the Management has a right that a person is removed from service without any reason, this requires a very serious consideration by the governing body. He could not think of a simple way of how to handle this and protect. What is at the stake, it is a College as an institution.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they are facing problems. They should take a decision and issue a letter to the Management. He has earlier also discussed that they are facing problems. The teachers and the Principals in the grant-in-aid Colleges who are working in pay band-4 are eligible and getting full salary of about Rs.1.25 lacs to Rs.1.5 lacs as is the case of Dr. Kawaljit Kaur. She joined that College. Either the Management should bear the whole expenditure on the salary on the similar lines as the DAV Management is doing as of today. The individual Managements advertise the positions of the Principals as per the decision taken by the Punjab Government. Since the advertisement has been done with such conditions, one should think over before joining. He is also getting so many queries, even from a friend from Jalandhar that the post has been advertised and what should he do.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is depriving the Colleges of good candidates.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they should take a decision otherwise the Colleges would say that they would make the appointment on contract basis for 3 years on the grant-in-aid post. Due to this, there are problems like in the case of Dr. Kawaljit Kaur who has left a reputed College and joined as Principal in a new College and her career is ruined. Therefore, they should take a decision for their own Colleges at least for the Principals if not for other posts. Otherwise also they should take the decision for the Principals and the Lecturers. If the Government is paying only the basic, the other emoluments should be borne by the Managements. In this way, a solution could be worked out. The Managements would say that they are paying the salary as per the advertisement. Some of the small Managements including Education Colleges are paying a salary of Rs.40-50,000 to the Principals. He pointed out that most of the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Principals are going in those Colleges. It is a very big issue and problem. Therefore, they should take a decision in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma whether they could take up it with the Education Minister of Punjab.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it could be discussed.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it is a separate case. Whatever Principal I.S. Sandhu is saying is a general issue of the Colleges that they appoint the Principals in such a way. As far as this particular case is concerned, if a Principal is appointed on an aided post, the Management writes in the appointment letter that the person is appointed for a period of one year on probation which might be extended by another year. The Management has the right to terminate the services before the expiry of two years of probation. In this case, it is a claim by the Principal but the claim of the Management could be that the candidate is not efficient for them. In this particular case, the views of the Management should also be listened to. In general, they could take a decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had asked the Dean College Development Council to contact the Management.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that decision on the representation of a Principal on probation is not enough and they could not destabilise the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is why he had asked the Dean College Development Council to contact the Management.

It was informed that the Principal under reference was selected on 2.8.2015 through properly constituted Committee by the Vice-Chancellor, the University gave the approval of appointment on probation for one year on 19.12.2015. The approval by the Punjab Government was granted on 11.7.2016. She has been relieved by the Management of the College on 9.6.2017. She had reported the matter to the Vice-Chancellor on 10.6.2017 and to the Dean College Development Council on 12.6.2017. On 13.6.2017, the University has written a letter to the President of the Management as to under what circumstances, she has been removed from the service, if her probation was extended whether the University was informed or not. As per Regulation 2.3 appearing at page 171 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-I, if the probation period is extended, the same is to be intimated. But till date no intimation has been received. The letter was written to the President, a copy of which was sent to the Secretary and the Punjab Government, but till date no reply has been received.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he would like to talk in continuation of this information. He read the letter of the Secretary written to Dr. Kawaljit Kaur, Principal "this has reference to your appointment letter No. SPN/MC/2178 dated 03.08.2015 and resolution No.5 of the meeting of the General House of the Management held on 08.06.2017, your probation period for two years comes to an end on 02.08.2017. The Management has unanimously decided not to confirm you." Accordingly, she has been relieved. The question arises as to what was the basis about this process regarding her work and conduct. Whether any notice was given or any proceedings took place, no such

document has been attached by the Management. After one month of her joining the College, there was the inspection by the NAAC. Within a month of experience in that very particular College, she handled all the issues of the inspection and the grading already awarded to the College was maintained. If there is no reason, then a clarification be sought as to what were the circumstances before the completion of the period of 2 years. According to the appointment letter, her pay was fixed at Rs.47400/-, but it was never given to her. He wanted to know under what circumstances, the Management relieved her before the confirmation period.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired whether at the end of one year, she was given the letter that her probation period is being extended.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that after the completion of one year, if the work and conduct is not satisfactory only then the probation could be extended. At the end of one year, it was for the Management to prove that her work and conduct was not satisfactory. When she has been relieved, there is no mention about the work and conduct. There is nothing mentioned in the UGC rules that the teacher is to be paid Rs.21600/- and the Principal Rs.37400/-. The Management of the Colleges have started violating the rules of the University and thereby exploiting the teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if her job is terminated, she could not enter the College. Whether she is retaining her previous job?

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the candidate has requested for some time from the Management so that she could apply somewhere else.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the Management has not a good record as earlier also a teacher was removed and Regulation 11.1 was imposed on which there is a stay.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that whenever an inspection is done, some conditions are imposed. Whatever Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu has said is right that the UGC has not directed the Colleges to appoint the teachers on the scales suitable to them. The conditions to be imposed on the Colleges regarding pay scales should be that the salary be paid as per Panjab University/UGC norms and not Panjab University/Punjab Government norms. If the Punjab Government is not giving grants to the Colleges, then why the Punjab Government norms should be followed, in this way the Colleges are being saved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should not save such Colleges.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it is their duty to see that the Panjab University and UGC norms are followed. He requested the members of the Syndicate that when any condition regarding pay scale is to be imposed, it should be mentioned as according to Panjab University/UGC norms.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to talk to the Education Minister, Punjab in an informal way as this is a generic issue. The Dean College Development Council would prepare a note to be given to the Education Minister in advance so that it is

got examined by the office. The prevalent situation is causing anxiety. Ultimately, the Punjab Government has to pay the full salary after 3 years because these are grant-in-aid posts and the Punjab Government is committed to it. But Punjab Government is not eventually giving full money to the best candidates. It should be in the best interest of Punjab Government to be releasing the full money to the best candidates. The best candidates would not apply under such uncertain circumstances. So, let them write a note, pose a generic problem to the Education Minister, Punjab.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that if they are talking about issuing a directive to the Colleges to follow the Panjab University/UGC norms regarding salary, they should also check the status of the persons already appointed for the last 5-10 years whether they are getting the pay as per Panjab University/UGC rules. The Managements are exploiting the teachers. There have been instances that the salaries are credited to the account of the teachers and the same is withdrawn by the Managements through ATMs or other means. They should get it thoroughly checked through a Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Government must also come to their help to some extent. What the Managements were doing unofficially, with the issuance of the Punjab Government notification, it has been given legitimacy.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that some big managements say that how could they pay the salary as per UGC norms as they are following the Punjab Government notification.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he got an information from a teacher that a grant-in-aid post has been advertised at a salary of Rs.21600/- and he is already working on management post and getting a salary of Rs.30,000/-. That is why he is not applying on this post.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to set up a meeting with the Education Minister as early as possible.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there is a history of the College under reference. The teachers were being exploited. There was a teacher unionist who was bold and struggled for the interests of the teachers. He was terminated. The matter was discussed in the Senate and Regulation 11.1 was imposed on the Management. The Management got a stay from the Court. The University should have also countered the stay to implement the imposition of Regulation 11.1. That teacher is fighting his case in the High Court for the last about 10 years, the benefit is not being released to him. He himself, Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Professor Mukesh Arora personally talked to the Chairman to release the benefits. It meant that the College is a den of exploitation and the hire and fire policy is adopted. The University is the custodian to watch the interest of the teachers and the Principals. So, they should see all the matters as in this case no explanation or show cause notice or any such notice has been issued. They should get the issue examined at the level of the Dean College Development Council.

The Vice-Chancellor suggested three things: (i) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma would set up a meeting with the Education Minister,

where he would also go. (ii) The case which has been filed by the Management, that should be traced out and find out who is the lawyer of the University. If some other lawyer could be engaged and see how many hearings have been held in the case. (iii) The Dean College Development Council should invite the President of the Management to meet him (Vice-Chancellor) and let him talk one-to-one.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu suggested that the President of the Management should be invited with complete record.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they should not be neutral on this issue.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the issue about which Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma has talked about, that is a dead issue now. As earlier Regulation 11.1 was imposed, nothing would come out of that. It is better that the President of the Management be invited for talks. As Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma has talked about the release of the benefits to the teacher, he is with them on this issue. Excepting one isolated case, is there any such case of termination of any teacher as the College is functioning since 1971 from the days, when there was no other College in that area.

The Vice-Chancellor reiterated that the Dean College Development Council would invite the Chairman of the Managing Committee for a meeting with the Vice-Chancellor and he would meet him. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma would set up a meeting with the Education Minister and he would take up the generic issue of low wages paid by the Management in the background of Punjab Government notification. If the earlier court case is dead, let them see at which stage it is lying dead, how far it has proceeded and where it is. On a suggestion by Principal I.S. Sandhu, the Vice-Chancellor said that he would take the help of Shri Jarnail Singh being a senior member of the governing body to resolve the matter.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he including Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma had talked to the Chairman who said that if the already imposed Regulation 11.1 is removed, they are ready to release the benefits.

Principal B.C. Josan said that U.T. Administration is also following this decision of the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would talk with the new Director of Higher Education, U.T.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the U.T. could not implement it because it was a direction of the court relating to 1925 posts due to financial crunch. There is no such financial issue with the U.T. Administration. The Managements and the University should take up the issue.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang requested the Vice-Chancellor also to take up the case of Dr. Neena Aneja, Ludhiana.

RESOLVED: That –

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

- (i) a meeting of the Vice-Chancellor be arranged by the Dean College Development Council with the President, Managing Committee, SPN College, Mukerian and he be summoned with the related record to resolve the matter;
- (ii) Vice-Chancellor shall take up matters relating to service conditions and salary bands of newly appointed teachers in affiliated Colleges of Panjab University with the Education Minister, Punjab.

Addition in rules of destruction of various records

29. Considered if, the following addition/s with regard to destruction of record of RTI Cell, be made, in Chapter XLVIII "Destruction of Various Records" appearing at pages 677-691 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III:

| | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | RTI Applications and Correspondence Files | 3 years |
| 2. | RTI Registers showing receipt and disposal of PIOs/Bank Demand Drafts | 5 years |
| 3. | First appeal files under section 19 (1) of the RTI Act and Second appeal files under section 19 (3) after the decision of the Central Information Commission Hearings | 5 years |

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

RESOLVED: That the following addition/s with regard to destruction of record of RTI Cell, in Chapter XLVIII "Destruction of Various Records" appearing at pages 677-691 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, be approved:

| | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | RTI Applications and Correspondence Files | 3 years |
| 2. | RTI Registers showing receipt and disposal of PIOs/Bank Demand Drafts | 5 years |
| 3. | First appeal files under section 19 (1) of the RTI Act and Second appeal files under section 19 (3) after the decision of the Central Information Commission Hearings | 5 years |

Item No. 30 was taken up together with Item No.5

Payment of Rs.69,750/- as legal fee of Shri Girish Agnihotri

31. Considered if, the amount claimed by Shri Girish Agnihotri, Sr. Advocate by way of the six legal fee bills dated 20.10.2016 (for the main case) and subsequent dates i.e. bills dated 01.11.2016, 09.11.2016, 12.12.2016, 16.01.2017 and 06.03.2017 total amounting to Rs.69,750/-, be paid to him in CWP No. 18745 of 2016 titled Court on its own motion V/s P.U. in the Punjab & Haryana High Court.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.07.2015 (Para 52 (x)) (**Appendix-XXV**) has ratified the fee scheduled payable to the Panjab University Panel Advocates, for High Court i.e. 12,500+10% clerkage + Misc. expenses.

2. The name of Shri Girish Agnihotri exists in the panel (**Appendix-XXV**) of Panjab University meant for High Court for the term commencing 01.01.2015 to 31.12.2017.
3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXV**).

RESOLVED: That the amount claimed by Shri Girish Agnihotri, Sr. Advocate by way of six legal fee bills dated 20.10.2016 (for the main case) and subsequent dates, i.e., bills dated 01.11.2016, 09.11.2016, 12.12.2016, 16.01.2017 and 06.03.2017 total amounting to Rs.69,750/-, in CWP No. 18745 of 2016 titled Court on its own motion V/s P.U. in the Punjab & Haryana High Court, be approved.

Revision of charges of Main Guest House/Golden Jubilee Guest House/Faculty House/Teachers' Holiday Home, Shimla & Revision of rates of University residential accommodation

32. Considered minutes dated 15.6.2017 (**Appendix-XXVI**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 30.4.2017 (Para 18) (**Appendix-XXVI**), regarding revision of Room Rent, Mess Charges & Washing of linen charges of Main Guest House/Golden Jubilee Guest House/Faculty House/Teachers' Holiday Home, Shimla & Revision of rates of University residential accommodation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the rooms to the ex-Fellows are also recommended to be rent free.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Jarnail Singh said it is only for the purpose of University meetings and not otherwise.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if an ex-Fellow has been made member of any Committee, then the rent would not be charged.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if the ex-Fellows come for their personal work, they would have to pay Rs.300/-.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired about the guests of Fellows.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that persons not covered under Category 1 to D are almost the guests for which the charges have been revised.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to who are the persons not covered under category A to D.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that under this category, the guests of Fellows, Professors or others who are neither official nor working would be covered. All the others are covered under category A to D.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the charges of Rs.1500/- for the guests are too much.

Principal I.S. Sandhu pointed out that the charges have been fixed as it is a guest house of good standard.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired about the rent to be charged from the experts coming for the viva.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Shri Jarnail Singh said that these experts could be included under the rent free category.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that these experts should be given rent free accommodation as they are paid very less TA/DA as compared to the rent of the guest house.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that the members of the Selection Committee should be provided rent-free accommodation in the guest house.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Finance and Development Officer to prepare a supplementary list of the persons who come to the University on official work like Honorary Professors, outstation Emeritus Professors, members of the Selection Committees. He proposed that he be authorised to include the left out categories.

The members agreed to this proposal.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu pointed out that the teachers are doubly taxed in terms of allotment at the Faculty House because 4% amount is deducted from the remuneration for the paper-setting and they are asked to pay the charges for the Faculty House also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that the mess charges are charged by the persons managing the mess of the Guest Houses and it is not the income of the University. The Committee has kept all these things in mind.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the linen charges are very less.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the rates have been revised by 1.5 times and these are the charges to be paid by the University for washing of linen. The salad charges vary from time to time depending upon the rates of vegetables.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu pointing out to category E & F at page 135 of the agenda said that 4% amount is deducted from the remuneration for the paper-setting, examination, evaluation etc. The rent charges for the Faculty House in respect of teachers of affiliated Colleges have been revised which should not have been revised as they are already contributing 4%.

It was informed that the University also contributes some amount towards sustaining these facilities.

Shri Jarnail Singh enquired about the progress of the Holiday Home at Dalhousie. He also requested that the employees' house at Shimla should also be renovated. He suggested that the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to consider the left out categories.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the Faculty House was constructed with the grants from the UGC for the teachers where now the teachers are not being provided the accommodation and most of the time it is occupied by the guests.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to consider the left out categories.

This was agreed to.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that since they have enhanced the rates of the Guest House, Golden Jubilee Guest House, etc., the burden of the booking would now shift to the College Bhawan because the rent charges there are as were prevalent earlier. All agree to it that the accommodation at the College Bhawan is better than the Golden Jubilee Guest House and the charges at the College Bhawan are Rs.500/- while at the Golden Jubilee Guest House the charges are now revised to Rs.700/-. He suggested that the guest charges at the College Bhawan should also be enhanced equivalent to Golden Jubilee Guest House.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what Principal I.S. Sandhu is saying is correct and directed the Dean College Development Council that the charges at the College Bhawan should be enhanced.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 15.6.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 30.4.2017 (Para 18) (**Appendix-XXVI**), regarding revision of Room Rent, Mess Charges & Washing of linen charges of Main Guest House/Golden Jubilee Guest House/Faculty House/Teachers' Holiday Home, Shimla & Revision of rates of University residential accommodation, **as per Appendix**, be approved and the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to include the left out categories.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the matter regarding revision of rates of College Bhawan be placed before the College Development Council.

**Enquiry report
submitted by Professor
R.K. Gupta**

33. Considered

- (i) an enquiry Report dated 23.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXVII**) 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.
- (ii) if the above enquiry report is accepted, the penalty to be imposed on the delinquent official- Shri Ashutosh, Sr. Assistant, PUSSGRC, be decided.

NOTE: 1. As per rule 1.1 (II) appearing at page 74 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, the post of Assistant held by Shri Ashutosh Sharma is a Class 'B' post; and

As per Regulation 3.1 appearing at page 117 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the Syndicate is the appointing authority of Class 'B' employees belonging to the category of Assistants.

2. Regulation 3.3 appearing at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 speaks that the appointing authority shall be the punishing authority.
3. The minor and major penalties stand defined under rule 3 at page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
4. A detailed office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XXVII)**.

It was informed that the person had family relations with the Deputy Librarian and they had faith in that person and he used to handle all their financial deals. The person took advantage of this belief and committed a fraud.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the money involved belongs to the University.

It was informed that the person gave the wrong account number to the dealing official of the University and got transferred the money into that account.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that when the money is transferred to an account, the name of the account holder is also checked.

It was informed that the name is not checked. In the text file being sent by the University to the bank, only the account number is not mentioned and the name is not mentioned which is a standard format of the bank.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it was the duty of the Accounts branch to see whether the amount is being transferred to a right account. If a person says that his account number has changed, would the University not ask for the proof from that person. How the money could be transferred without the proof?

It was informed that written approval for transfer of money to the changed account number was not taken.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it a case similar to the case of Ms. Pooja who had earlier committed a fraud. Now, this fraud has been committed. Tomorrow, there could be another fraud. The Accounts branch should have looked into the account number. If one wanted to withdraw the money from his own account, even then the bank officials ask for so many documents as identity proof which might not be available at that particular time which sometimes lead to non-payment by the banks.

It was informed that the money involved is not the University money. This case is an old one of the year 2011. The bank has its own format in which the information is sent. Earlier, a CD used to be sent to the bank. Mr. Ajay changed the account number in the CD and handed over to the bank.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the persons involved are the University officials.

It was informed that since the persons are University officials, that is why the enquiry was conducted.

Shri Jarnail Singh enquired whether the person involved was the regular employee of the University.

It was informed that the daily wage employee was removed from the service.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that now the issue involves Mr. Ashutosh.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could impose the major penalty.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the dismissal could be done.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if minor penalty is imposed, the person might again commit a fraud.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that either removal or dismissal should be imposed.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if dismissal is done, the person would not be able to apply somewhere else.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the penalty of removal could be imposed and the person could do service anywhere else.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if the person wanted to go and serve anywhere else, he would go with a stigma of removal from service.

The Vice-Chancellor said that why do they not dismiss the person.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in one sense removal is also dismissal as the person would be no more in service in the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then that person would be a burden on the society, what kind of punishment is it.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the person could commit a fraud wherever he goes.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested the penalty of dismissal.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if a person is punished once, he would try to improve himself.

A couple of members suggested the punishment of removal.

The Vice-Chancellor agreed to the penalty of removal from service

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.

Amendment in rule

34. Considered if, Rule 5 appearing at page 434 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 under Annual System/ Supplementary/ bi-annual examinations, be amended as proposed below:

| Existing Rule-5 at page 434 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 | Proposed Rule-5 at page 434 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 |
|--|--|
| <p>5. xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>The answer-book of such candidates (for all examinations) whose results are R.L. be got preserved by the Examination Branch/Conduct Branch till their results are declared and their applications for re-evaluation be entertained within the prescribed time as laid down in the Rules.</p> <p>Provided that no application for re-evaluation of such candidates whose results are declared late due to omission or negligence on the part of the candidate, such as non-payment of fee, non-submission of documents required for the confirmation of the eligibility or for non-fulfilment of similar other requirements shall be entertained after 31st December of the Calendar year of examination in the case of annual examinations and after 31st March of the ensuing Calendar year in the case of supplementary/ biannual examinations.</p> | <p>5. xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>The answer-book of such candidates (for all examinations) whose results are R.L. be got preserved by the Examination Branch/Conduct Branch till their results are declared and their online applications for re-evaluation be entertained within the prescribed time as laid down in the Rules.</p> <p>Provided that no application for re-evaluation of such candidates whose results are declared late due to omission or negligence on the part of the candidate, such as non-payment of fee, non-submission of documents required for the confirmation of the eligibility or for non-fulfilment of similar other requirements shall be entertained after 31st December of the Calendar year (in case of the examination held in April/May for Semester System) and 30th June of the ensuing Calendar year (in the case of examinations held in November/ December for Semester System).</p> |

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

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

RESOLVED: That Rule 5 appearing at page 434 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 under Annual System/ Supplementary/ bi-annual examinations, be amended as under:

| Existing Rule-5 at page 434 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 | Proposed Rule-5 at page 434 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 |
|--|--|
| <p>5. xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>The answer-book of such candidates (for all examinations) whose results are R.L. be got preserved by the Examination Branch/Conduct Branch till their results are declared and their applications for re-evaluation be entertained within the prescribed time as laid down in the Rules.</p> <p>Provided that no application for re-evaluation of such candidates whose results are declared late due to omission or negligence on the part of the candidate, such as non-payment of fee, non-submission of documents required for the confirmation of the eligibility or for non-fulfilment of similar other requirements shall be entertained after 31st December of the Calendar year of examination in the case of annual examinations and after 31st March of the ensuing Calendar year in the case of supplementary/ biannual examinations.</p> | <p>5. xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>The answer-book of such candidates (for all examinations) whose results are R.L. be got preserved by the Examination Branch/Conduct Branch till their results are declared and their online applications for re-evaluation be entertained within the prescribed time as laid down in the Rules.</p> <p>Provided that no application for re-evaluation of such candidates whose results are declared late due to omission or negligence on the part of the candidate, such as non-payment of fee, non-submission of documents required for the confirmation of the eligibility or for non-fulfilment of similar other requirements shall be entertained after 31st December of the Calendar year (in case of the examination held in April/May for Semester System) and 30th June of the ensuing Calendar year (in the case of examinations held in November/ December for Semester System).</p> |

After having considered Item No. C-29, the Item No. C-35 was taken up for consideration

Recommendation of Academic Council regarding Choice Based Credit System

35. Considered recommendation dated 21.06.2017 of the Academic Council, that the Choice Based Credit System, be introduced in the following courses from the session 2017-18.

1. B.A./B.A. (Hons.)
2. B.Sc./B.Sc. (Hons.)
3. B.Com./B.Com. (Hons.)/B.B.A.

NOTE: A copy of the note dated 22.06.2017 of the DCDC enclosed (**Appendix-XXIX**).

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal requested that since mentally, physically and in terms of infrastructural facilities, the Colleges are not ready to implement this, the implementation of Choice Based Credit System be extended by one year. During this period, the workshops of the Principals be organised to sensitize them about this system. Otherwise it is feared by the Colleges, especially the rural ones, that they would have to fill up many posts of teachers and how could they hold classes for so many subjects and how the classrooms would be made available. He requested that the system be approved

in principle but be implemented after one year and during that period, it should be worked upon.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the counselling for admission is going on for which the last date is 26th. Reading material and other things are available according to the earlier system. The students do not have any information about the CBCS. If they adopt the CBCS, according to him, they would not be able to start the current session before the month of August because they would have to give more time to students to apply, update the data. Thereby, the classes would be late by one month.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that teachers are also not mentally prepared.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if it is not a compulsion, then it could be implemented after one year.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that when the semester system was adopted in postgraduate classes, they had in principle approved that the semester system in undergraduate courses would be implemented from the next session. Since there are queries coming from the Colleges, students or any other stakeholders, they should address those. If it is mandatory from the UGC/MHRD, then they could think over it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the UGC is saying that under the CBCS, permission for Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC) be taken and should be implemented. In principle, it should be approved. Those interested could implement it while others might not.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it is their mistake. When the meeting was held under the Chairmanship of Professor A.K. Bhandari about 6 months ago, it was said that it be implemented, but for 8-9 months, no work was done in this regard. They could accept it in principle to implement from the next year. But the Committees formed in this regard would have to work out so many things. There is no clarity on the CBCS. Even he, being a member of the Committee, is not clear about it. The Principals also do not have any clarity. They should start working on it from now onwards so that by January-February next year, everything is clear and in place. At least 3-4 meetings of the Principals or workshops of 3-4 days be organised otherwise they would have to face problems. It should not be a case that again they start working in the month of March.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the S.D. College invited him on the issue on 31.5.2017. He told them that he would be talking only on the model of science. When he finished his lecture, he gave a working model of science which would work up to the 6th semester. Now, there is no need of awareness as to what is the system and what the pros and cons of it. They would have to display the working model of Arts, Science, Commerce and B.C.A. subject up to 6th semester. After the lecture, most of the teachers said that their most of the queries related with science model are cleared. They have to prepare working model in all the streams for which the Dean College Development Council could organise the workshops.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

The Vice-Chancellor said that could they permit few Colleges to start the CBCS.

A few of the members said no it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in principle it is to be implemented from the next year. They could not implement it College-wise.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it could be implemented uniformly.

The Vice-Chancellor asked whether the campus, Department of Evening Studies and SD College, could implement it.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the Board of Studies in Punjabi had suggested 9 periods of 45 minutes each under this scheme, thus totalling to 6.75 hours and in 6 semesters of BA it comes to a total of about 36 hours. The students who have studied Punjabi general at graduation level are eligible to admission to M.A. Punjabi. One activist has sent a letter which has also been published in the newspapers, 24 credits are required for a student to do M.A. Punjabi. They have decided that there would be 2 credits in one semester and in 6 semesters of graduation, the total credits would be 12 whereas the requirement for admission to postgraduate course is 24 credits. Therefore, the students would not be eligible for taking admission. Therefore, there are so many problems. Such queries could be discussed and sorted out if the workshops on CBCS are organised. They are not against the implementation, but if it is implemented immediately, there would be so many problems. Therefore, it be approved in principle to be implemented from the next year.

The Vice-Chancellor asked whether they could implement it in the campus on the lines of honours school courses. Could they implement it in the courses which are not running parallel in the Colleges? Let it be effected where there is no overlapping with the campus. In principle, they approve it and they would evolve a pattern and a schedule of workshops for the College Principals and this process should be completed in the first semester.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang suggested that a recording of the lecture of Dr. Dalip Kumar should be provided to the Principals either through CD or e-mail.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would complete all the exercise during the first semester so that it is notified after the first semester.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it meant that it is approved to be implemented from the session 2018-19.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would come back to the Syndicate before the term of this Syndicate ends as to what progress they have made towards the Choice Based Credit System.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang and Dr. Dalip Kumar requested the Vice-Chancellor to write a letter to the Government regarding introduction of 5-days week in the Colleges.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

RESOLVED: That recommendation dated 21.06.2017 of the Academic Council regarding introduction of Choice Based Credit System be approved in principle but be implemented from the session 2018-19.

Item No. C-35 was taken up for consideration after Item No. C-29.

Interim report-2 of the Committee to find the facts and errors, which occurred during the conduct of examinations

36. Considered the interim report-2 (**Appendix-XXX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to find the facts and errors, which occurred during the conduct of examinations, for the session 2016-17.

NOTE: The Syndicate at its meeting held on 28.05.2017 has noted the interim report already submitted on this account, as an item No.I-(xii).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the report is right, but some steps need to be taken as the printer committed the error. One thing is serious that the mid-term paper was picked up for the final examination.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the teacher should not only be debarred from the examiner but the Management of the College should also be informed and an entry should also be made in the service book that person for doing such an ethical work. Nothing less than should be done, at least some deterrence should be there.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there is a clause in the proforma that the teacher who has set the question paper, he/she should not be teaching that class.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is an unethical work. There should be a strong dismissal of this. The University earns its income or majority of its income from the conduct of examinations. The public should have faith in the conduct of the examinations. This man has done something which amounts to compromise that faith that the University as an examining body has. A serious displeasure has to be shown and it means removal from examiner and information to the Management if working in a private College and if a Government employee, then the Government should be informed about it. This is a very serious misconduct by somebody who is on public exchequer. An entry in this regard should be made.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that whatever the Vice-Chancellor has got examined and the report of which has been submitted, he had sent this issue to the Vice-Chancellor. With due apologies, he had an expectation from the Vice-Chancellor that the letter which he had written to him (Vice-Chancellor), that has not been acknowledged till date. He had written that letter on 5th. The operative part that his mind re-collects is that these should be got examined and that the same has been examined, the report of which has been submitted. If the Vice-Chancellor had sent a note on 9th to the Committee or the Controller of Examinations office that it should be got examined. The Committee held its meeting on 22nd, i.e., after 13 days, and submitted the report on the same day itself to the Vice-Chancellor. He requested that if the Controller of Examinations could abstain the meeting, he could have free and frank talk on the issue

with the Vice-Chancellor. He did not mean anything otherwise. Accordingly, the Controller of Examinations abstained at this point. On 22nd, the meeting was held in a hurry and within an hour the issue was examined and the report was submitted. When he saw the report minutely, he found that as they were discussing just now, the paper under reference was of Geography of B.A.-II whereas in the report is mentioned of B.A.-III, both the papers of house test and the final examination are attached with it. Everything was done in a hurry. Everyone was given clean chit and the fault was imposed on the printer and publisher. This issue was being discussed everywhere and that is why the Vice-Chancellor had formed the Committee. If everything is left to the publisher and printer, then what is the role and responsibility of the Controller of Examinations. He could not work like a postman. There are glaring examples such as the examination starts at 4.30 p.m. and continues up to 7.30 p.m. in an examination Centre at Dasuya because the question paper was delivered late. The paper related to Public Administration and which might have been prepared from someone in a hurry. The Centre Superintendent gave him all the details of what kind of problems they are facing during these days of examinations. He pointed out that it is a very big crime as two teachers of the Government College submitted a complaint to the Controller of Examinations that the papers were tampered with by bypassing the secrecy and after going through the numbers, the same were again tagged. In the report it is mentioned that a Principal was appointed to look into the issue who has said that everything is intact. But it is not as the packets were tagged again. But the clean chit has been given on this issue. There are two fundamental things. The first is that two teachers who submitted the complaint under their signatures on 20th February that their two papers were tampered and marks were given. Those two teachers have not been informed whether their complaint was a false one or the enquiry has been conducted and what is the report. In the report, it is mentioned that the question papers were provided handwritten whereas the teacher had typed and signed the same and the copy is attached. Those teachers are having the document relating to the involvement of the person who had taken out all the lists of roll numbers and tampered with the marks and the marks would be found the same in the answer sheets as well as the detailed marks certificates. The teachers had asked for an enquiry as to who is involved in all this, whether it is the head examiner or someone else. On that basis, it has been said that the enquiry was conducted and nothing wrong has been found. He is having with him documents related with it where everything is mentioned about the discrepancies. So, whatever has happened is a very big crime. The matter was dealt with in a casual manner. There is definitely a need to ponder that the credibility and the secrecy of the examination system is maintained. It is not that the complaint was submitted by anonymous person and the matter should be disposed off. The complainants are the Government College teachers and they have not been informed about the enquiry.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to give all the papers. He could examine the things only when the same are submitted to him otherwise he could not respond as he did not know what he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) is saying.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma requested the Vice-Chancellor that a small Committee of the Syndics be formed. He would provide all the documents to the Committee and discuss the issue in detail.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) has to give the documents to him and he has to know the details.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma requested the Vice-Chancellor to refer the documents to the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is also not appropriate as he does not know as to what he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) is talking about at the moment.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma asked then what is the process.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the documents be handed over to the Vice-Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor would refer those to the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) sends him some of the papers, he could also send all the papers.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that what he had pointed out on 22nd, the report which has been given to him today in the form of agenda if the same had been provided 5-10 days ago, he would have pointed out as to what kind of report it is.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as soon as he received the report, he has not lost any time in referring it to the Committee.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is correct as he has seen it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that about the other thing as to why he did not reply to the letter that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma wrote to him. The letter that he sent to him, he (Vice-Chancellor) felt extremely anguished and hurt, the way he has written in the contents of the letter.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he has also written the letter painfully and sent personally to the Vice-Chancellor and not through e-mail to anybody else.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had a talk after the Syndicate meeting in the Registrar's office and after that he did not expect that he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) would write to him this kind of a letter. He did not want that letter to become public.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he also did not make the letter public. Nobody except he himself and the Vice-Chancellor knows about it as to what he has written. He has not shown the copy of the letter to any of the members sitting here.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) is saying that he did reply to his letter. Now he is forcing him (Vice-Chancellor) to say why he did not reply. If he would have replied, the

matter would have stretched and he did not want the matter to go such a way. He wanted to attend to the complaint that he is raising and not to respond to what he has written. If he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) has written something, he (Vice-Chancellor) could have said that he did not agree with it, that is wrong and so on. He just absorbed all these things.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is good that if it has happened so as they have to run the University in a harmonious way and there are no contradictions. About the other matter, he would provide all the documents to the Vice-Chancellor and requested that a Committee of the Syndics be formed. Otherwise, he is not casting aspersions on anybody.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would form a Committee of Syndics. But the point is that he should be provided the documents. He formed a Committee of two persons, one of them is the former Registrar and the other one is a very eminent academic who is also a former Vice-Chancellor namely Professor Chahal, a very senior respected person who is even consulted by the UGC in all kinds of very high level Committees. That is why he had taken in Professor Chahal as a member as he is also a very eminent academic in his own right whose father-in-law was none other than Professor Gosal. So he felt that Professor Chahal would have a feeling for the University and he would do his best in the interest of the University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the content of the letter was that the matter be got examined.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had talked after the Syndicate meeting was over in the presence of Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma in the Registrar's office. After that he did not expect him (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) to write to him.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that whatever treatment he got here, it was only that anguish which he had expressed and nothing else.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in-between they had met. There is no point in opening the whole matter again. He is also an individual and a human being.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that leave aside that matter, but reply in this case should have been given.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they should read the last sentence of the report which is "the Committee recommended an enquiry to fix the responsibility for the lapse and take appropriate action thereafter". The Committee has not found anybody guilty. A Committee could be formed. The recommendation of the Committee is that an enquiry should be conducted. He got the information that the paper picked up for the examination was one for mid-term examination but the Committee has not mentioned about it. He had just now said that the punishment should be given but after reading the report, he wanted that some innocent person should not be punished. Supposing a golden chance is given to the students, the examiners put only important questions which could be repeated in some other examination. If the whole of the question paper had been put in, then the person should have been punished. The Committee

recommends that “other examiners of both the papers have framed the University question paper by including most of the questions which were asked in the mid-term semester examination”. If they do not hold an enquiry, how could they know whether it is 40% or 80%. The Committee recommends an enquiry to fix the responsibility and till then they could not award the punishment.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to give all the complaints which have been given by those teachers. If 60% of the income of the University comes from the examination, the credibility of the examination system has to be maintained.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should take the steps whatever Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma is pointing out. Ultimately, they have to think over the corrective measures to be taken.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it does not mean that whatever has happened that should be forgotten.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had not forgotten the issue, but immediately had marked an enquiry.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he was replying to whatever Professor Navdeep Goyal was saying.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that as they are talking about mid-term, when the examination for the mid-term is conducted, till that time, very little syllabus (1-2 chapters) has been covered. In this way, when the question paper is framed, most of the questions from the syllabus are covered and no questions could be left out.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that an enquiry should be conducted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the questions could be reframed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is no excuse but the enquiry should be conducted. Those persons would come and apologise and ask for mercy as they have committed a mistake and have no room.

RESOLVED: That the interim report-2 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to find the facts and errors, which occurred during the conduct of examinations, for the session 2016-17, be accepted and action as per rules be initiated against the guilty persons.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That on being pointed out by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma about some irregularities in other examinations also, the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to form a Committee of Syndics to enquire into the matter.

Assignment to the Faculties

37. Considered that the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name.

| | |
|---|--|
| Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, PCS Director Higher Education Chandigarh | 1. Science 2. Medical Sciences 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Education |
|---|--|

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name:

| | |
|---|--|
| Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, PCS Director Higher Education Chandigarh | 1. Science 2. Medical Sciences 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Education |
|---|--|

Execution of Memorandum Understanding

38. Considered if, Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XXXI**), between Indian Academy of Sciences, Bengaluru and Panjab University, Chandigarh, regarding Refresher Course in Experimental Physics, be executed

RESOLVED: That execution of Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Indian Academy of Sciences, Bengaluru and Panjab University, Chandigarh, regarding Refresher Course in Experimental Physics, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Amendment of rule relating to Estate Fund in Accounts Manual

39. Considered if, the following amendment, be made in Rule 16.3 under Chapter XVI "Estate Fund" appearing at page 141 of Account Manual 2012 of P.U., as proposed by Finance & Development Officer (F.D.O.), P.U. :

16.3 Authority competent to incur expenditure:

| | Existing Provision | Proposed |
|----------|--|---|
| 16.3 (a) | Unless power to incur expenditure out of Estate Fund Account has been delegated to any other Officer, expenditure to be incurred out of the Fund shall be sanctioned by the Vice-Chancellor. | The competent authority to accord financial sanction of expenditure against an approved budget provision out of Estate Fund shall be such as defined under Rule 5.3 of this manual. |
| (b) | Expenses relating to litigation and other law charges in respect of | Expenses relating to litigation and other charges/ expenditure with |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | properties detailed in Para 16.2 (a) ibid shall be paid out of the Estate Fund Account. | respect to the Estate of the University, including all properties shall be paid out of Estate Fund Account. |
|--|---|---|

- NOTE:** 1. A copy of Rule 5.3, under Chapter V, General Instruction for payment of bills, regarding competent authorities to accord the financial sanction/approval appearing at page 34-35 of Account Manual is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXII**).
2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXII**).

RESOLVED: That the following amendment in Rule 16.3 under Chapter XVI "Estate Fund" appearing at page 141 of Account Manual 2012 of P.U., as proposed by Finance & Development Officer (F.D.O.), P.U., be approved:

16.3 Authority competent to incur expenditure:

| | Existing Provision | Proposed |
|----------|--|---|
| 16.3 (a) | Unless power to incur expenditure out of Estate Fund Account has been delegated to any other Officer, expenditure to be incurred out of the Fund shall be sanctioned by the Vice-Chancellor. | The competent authority to accord financial sanction of expenditure against an approved budget provision out of Estate Fund shall be such as defined under Rule 5.3 of this manual. |
| (b) | Expenses relating to litigation and other law charges in respect of properties detailed in Para 16.2 (a) ibid shall be paid out of the Estate Fund Account. | Expenses relating to litigation and other charges/ expenditure with respect to the Estate of the University, including all properties shall be paid out of Estate Fund Account. |

Routine and formal matters **40.** The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(xii)** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.,-

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:
- (i) re-appointed (afresh) the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 10.07.2017 till the end of session 2017-18 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through regular selection whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, with one day break as usual, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and

conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

| Sr. No. | Name of the person | Designation & Subject |
|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. | Ms. Inderjot Kaur | Assistant Professor in Law |
| 2. | Shri Hardip Singh | Assistant Professor in Punjabi |

- (ii) appointed Dr. Rajnish Mutneja as Assistant Professor at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib on Part-time basis w.e.f. 10.07.2017 till the end of session 2017-18 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through regular selection whichever is earlier, on an honorarium or Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours a week), on the same term and condition on which he was working earlier for the session 2016-17.

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has:

- (i) re-appointed afresh Dr. Ramandeep Kaur Saluja, Associate Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis from 03.03.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 02.02.2018 with one day break on 02.03.2017 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier.
- (ii) re-appointed afresh the following faculty at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis from 04.05.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 03.04.2018 with one day break on 03.05.2017 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

| Sr.No. | Name and Designation |
|---------------|--|
| 1. | Dr. Rose Kanwal Jeet Kaur, Assistant Professor |
| 2. | Dr. Poonam Sood, Assistant Professor |
| 3. | Dr. Lalit Kumar, Associate Professor |
| 4. | Dr. Vishakha Grover, Associate Professor |
| 5. | Dr. Shipra Gupta, Associate Professor |
| 6. | Dr. Puneet, Assistant Professor |
| 7. | Dr. Neha Bansal, Assistant Professor |
| 8. | Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal, Assistant Professor |
| 9. | Dr. Sunint Singh, Assistant Professor |

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Ms. Rajni Chauhan, Assistant Professor in Commerce, University School of Open Learning, P.U., purely on temporary basis, against the vacant post of the Department, w.e.f. the date she starts work, for the academic session 2017-18 or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP or Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed (afresh) the following as Assistant Professors at P.U. Rural Centre Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 10.07.2017 till the end of session 2017-18, or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, with one day break as usual, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/-, plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

| Sr. No. | Name | Designation | Nature of Appointment |
|----------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------|
| 1. | Dr. Gurjit Singh | Assistant Professor in Punjabi | Temporary basis |
| 2. | Mr. Surinder Singh | Assistant Professor in Political Science | Temporary basis |
| 3. | Ms. Seema | Assistant Professor in Physical Education | Temporary basis |

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed the following Lab. Instructors at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, purely on temporary basis in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University Rule as under and has also allowed to charge/paid their salary against the vacant posts of Technical Officers/Workshop Instructor/ Senior Workshop Superintendent/Deputy Librarian as mentioned below against each in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology as before:

| Sr. No. | Name | Post against which salary to be charged |
|----------------|----------------------------|--|
| 1. | Mr. Nand Kishore, (I.T.) | Technical Officer |
| 2. | Mr. Sandeep Trehan, (M.E.) | Technical Officer |
| 3. | Ms. Seema, (Biotechnology) | Workshop Instructor |
| 4. | Mr. Lokesh, (CSE) | Senior Workshop Superintendent |
| 5. | Ms. Sunaina Gulati, (CSE) | Deputy Librarian |

(i) w.e.f. 01.06.2017 to 07.07.2017 or till the vacancies are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier; and

- (ii) for next Academic session 2017-18 w.e.f. 11.07.2017 to 01.06.2018 i.e. upto end of semester examinations, (after one day break on 10.07.2017, 08.07.2017 & 09.07.2017 being Saturday & Sunday) or till the vacancies are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Leave Cases Committee dated 23.05.2017 (**Appendix-XXXIII**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted:

- (i) Duty leave to Dr. Rupinder Bir Kaur, Assistant Professor, University Business School, upto 02.03.2018 w.e.f. the date she is relieved by the School, under Regulation 11 (C) at page 138 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, to facilitate her project completion in time for which she has got extension from UGC, vide letter No. F.30-18/2015 (SA-II) dated 27.02.2017 and allowed her to take half of the workload of her classes during the period of her duty leave without any further remuneration from the University.
- (ii) Extraordinary Leave without pay to Dr. Jasmeet Gulati, Assistant Professor, UILS upto 31.12.2019 w.e.f. the date she is relieved from the Institute, under Regulation 11 (C) at page 139-140 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, to enable her to join post of Associate Professor of Law at Jindal Global Law School, Sonipat.

NOTE: The Vice-Chancellor has passed orders to appoint someone against the leave arrangement of above by either Guest Faculty route or Walk-In-Interview so that there should be no shortage of faculty in professional courses.

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following recommendations (No. iv & v) of the Sub-Committee of Administrative Committee dated 19.05.2017(**Appendix-XXXIV**) USOL, to be incorporated in the Prospectus of PU-MBA (Executive) Entrance Test-2017:

- (i) The cut off percentage for MBA (Executive) for General Category should be 20% and for reserved category (SC/ST/BC/PwD etc.) should be 15%.
- (ii) The fee for MBA (Executive) and B.Ed. students will be charged only through Bank draft. The MBA students will deposit draft amounting to Rs.24,487/- and B.Ed. students will deposit drat amounting to Rs.16,892/-

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Class 'A' and 'B' employees upto 30.06.2017, on the previous terms & conditions:-

| Sr. No. | Name of the employees/Designation | Department |
|---------|---|------------------------------|
| 1. | Shri Pritam Chand, Technical Officer (G-I) | Department of Physics |
| 2. | Shri Pritam Chand, Senior Technician (G-II) | Department of Bio-Technology |
| 3. | Shri Birender Singh, Driver | D.U.I. Office |
| 4. | Shri Surmukh Singh, Work-Inspector | Construction Office |
| 5. | Shri Bikram Singh, Driver | Vice-Chancellor's Office |

- (ix). The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has condoned the shortage of lectures of the following students of various teaching Department/s (**Appendix/Annexures-XXXV**):

| Sr. No. | Department | Name of the Student/Courses | Appendix/Annexure |
|---------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| 1. | Department of Laws P.U. | 1. Mr. Satwant Singh 2. Mr. D.C. Bansal 3. Ms. Shweta Soni 4. Ms. Sukhmani Boparai 5. Mr. Saurabh Mittal 6. Mr. Bharat Bhandari 7. Mr. Gagandeep Singh Virk 8. Mr. Navdeep Singh 9. Ms. Upinder Kaur 10. Ms. Salena Bedi 11. Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Negi | A (Pages 217-232) |
| 2. | Department of Life Long Learning and Extension, P.U. | 1. Ms. Karminder Kaur 2. Ms. Simran Sachdeva | B (Pages 233-234) |

- (x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XXXVI**) between University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh and M/s Boolean Ventura Private Limited, New Delhi.

- (xi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Harsimran Kaur Boparai, as Assistant Professor in Anaesthesia, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., (purely on temporary basis) w.e.f. 01.07.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 31.05.2018 with one day break on 30.06.2017 (break day) or till the posts are filled in, on regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5

at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier.

- (xii)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes dated 10.04.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) of the Selection Committee and also approved the appointment of the following Doctors (Full-Time/Part-Time) purely on contract basis at B.G.J. Institute of Health, P.U. initially for the period of six months (w.e.f. the dates they report for duty) and further extendable on six monthly basis or as per any amended University rules, on the recommendation of the Administrative Committee of BGJ Institute of Health on their satisfactory services, with the terms & conditions as notified by the C.M.O. vide Notice No.407-415/HC dated 01.03.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVII**):

| Sr. No. | Name of Doctors | Designation | Salary per month (fixed) (in Rs.) |
|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. | Dr. R.V. Suri | Medical Officer (Full-Time) | 45,000/- |
| 2. | Dr. Harmanjot Dhindsa | Medical Officer (Full-Time) | 45,000/- |
| 3. | Dr. Madhu Tuli | Part-Time Medical Specialist | 20,000/- |
| 4. | Dr. Meenu Kapila | Part-Time Ayurvedic Medical Officer | 10,000/- |

Routine and formal matters

- 41.** The information contained in Items **I-(i)** to **I-(xix)** on the agenda was read out, i.e. –

- (i)** The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of Dr. Manoj Kumar, Assistant Professor (Temporary) at Centre for Public Health, IEAST, P.U. till 30.06.2017 (with one day break), under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which he was working earlier vide letter No.5741-42/Estt.-I dated 26.05.2016.

- (ii)** The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis for one month i.e. upto 31.05.2017 (with one day break), on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier as per letter No.8482-83/Estt.-I dated 16.08.2016, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:-

1. Mrs. Inderjot Kaur, Assistant Professor in Law
2. Mr. Hardip Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi

- (iii)** The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur (purely on temporary basis) for one month i.e. upto 31.05.2017 (with one day break) on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier vide letter No.7617/Estt. I dated

14.07.2016, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

| Sr. No. | Name | Subject |
|----------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. | Dr. Gurdeep Singh | Punjabi |
| 2. | Dr. Resham Singh | Punjabi |
| 3. | Dr. Harnam Singh | Physical Education |
| 4. | Ms. Simarjeet Kaur | Mathematics |
| 5. | Ms. Nishi | Commerce |
| 6. | Mr. Mohammad Sazid | Commerce |
| 7. | Mr. Harjinder Singh Bhardwaj | Political Science |

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur, on contract basis for one month i.e. upto 31.05.2017 (with one day break), on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier as per letter No. 7610-11/Estt. dated 14.07.2016:

| Sr. No. | Name | Subject |
|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1. | Shri Varun Maini | Computer Science |
| 2. | Shri Pawan Kumar | Computer Science |

- (v) In pursuance of orders dated 22.05.2017/24.10.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 11226 of 2017 (Dr. (Ms.) Gayathiri Pathmanathan Vs. Panjab University & Ors.) which has been adjourned sine die and will be heard after decision of Division Bench in LPA 1505-2016, wherein the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court has passed interim orders in the same terms as CWP No.22165 of 2016. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 20.07.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. (Ms.) Gayathiri Pathmanathan, Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.06.2017 as applicable in cases of other teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing as on 31.05.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by her. The payment to her will be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) she be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those

the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(vi) In pursuance of orders dated 25.04.2017/24.10.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 8368 of 2017 (Dr. Renu Chadha & Anr. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) which has been adjourned sine die and will be heard after decision of Division Bench in LPA 1505-2016, wherein the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court has passed interim orders in the same terms as CWP No.22165 of 2016. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is fixed for hearing on 20.07.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Ashwani Kumar Bhandari, Professor, Department of Mathematics, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.06.2017 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing as on 31.05.2017 without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him will be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) He be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to him by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor has:

- (i) extended the term of appointment of Dr. Jyoti Sood as Assistant Professor (temporary), UIET, P.U. upto 30.04.2017.
- (ii) granted further extension w.e.f. 02.05.2017 to 30.06.2017 on the same term and conditions with one day break on 01.05.2017.
- (iii) re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Jyoti Sood as Assistant Professor (temporary), University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U., for the next academic session 2017-18 w.e.f. the date she starts work in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions.

NOTE: 1. Dr. Jyoti Sood was appointed as Assistant Professor (temporary) at UIET

for the period 04.01.2016 to 30.04.2016 vide order No.2031/Estt.I dated 26.02.2016.

2. Dr. Jyoti Sood was re-appointed as Assistant Professor, purely on temporary basis, UIET, for the period during which she has actually worked i.e. w.e.f. 04.05.2016 to 30.06.2016 and 07.07.2016 to 31.12.2016, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/-, plus other allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 by the Syndicate dated 20.03.2017 (Para 14 R(i)) **(Appendix-XXXVIII)**.

(viii) In pursuance of orders dated 25.04.2017/24.10.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 8368 of 2017 (Dr. Renu Chadha & Anr. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) which has been adjourned sine die and will be heard after decision of Division Bench in LPA 1505-2016, wherein the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court has passed interim orders in the same terms as CWP No.22165 of 2016. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is fixed for hearing on 20.07.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Renu Chadha, Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.06.2017 as applicable in cases of other teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing as on 31.05.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by her. The payment to her will be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) she be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to him by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(ix) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Laxmi Devi W/o Late Shri Ram Bahadur Thapa, Security Guard, A.C. Joshi Library, P.U., Chandigarh, who expired on 01.01.2017 while in service:

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Ex-Gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.
- (iii) Earned Leave Encashment up to the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(x) 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. | Ms. Surksha Sobti Assistant Registrar Secrecy Branch | 02.04.1976 | 31.05.2017 | Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough. |
| 2. | Ms. Kailash Kumari Superintendent USOL | 21.04.1982 | 31.05.2017 | Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations. |
| 3. | Shri Amrik Singh Superintendent UIPS | 08.12.1982 | 31.05.2017 | |
| 4. | Shri Darshan Singh Senior Assistant USOL | 25.11.1982 | 31.05.2017 | |
| 5. | Ms. Kalawati Devi Senior Assistant Secrecy Branch | 24.07.1985 | 31.05.2017 | |
| 6. | Shri Jagdish Lal Gogna Mechanic (Type-Writer) R&S Branch | 21.05.1991 | 31.05.2017 | |
| 7. | Shri Singh Ram Cleaner P.U. Construction Office | 26.10.1981 | 31.03.2017 | |
| 8. | Shri Ram Kishan Cleaner-cum-Chowkidar Department of Gandhian and Peace Studies | 14.01.1974 | 31.07.2017 | |

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

(xi) The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of Dr. Manoj Kumar, Assistant Professor (Temporary) at Centre for Public Health, IEAST, P.U. after

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

30.06.2017 (with one day break), for the session 2017-18, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which he was working earlier vide letter No.5741-42/Estt.-I dated 26.05.2016.

- (xii) The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term appointment of following as Assistant Professors at P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis for one month i.e. upto 31.05.2017 (with one day break) on the same terms and conditions on which they are working earlier vide letter No.7618-27/Estt.I dated 14.07.2016 (**Appendix-XXXIX**), under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

| Sr. No. | Name | Subject |
|---------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1. | Dr. Inderjit Singh | Political Science |
| 2. | Dr. Sukhjeet Singh | Punjabi |
| 3. | Dr. Ram Singh | Commerce |
| 4. | Dr. Sumit Mohan | Hindi |
| 5. | Mr. Sukhdev Singh | Punjabi |
| 6. | Mrs. Navdeep Kaur | English |
| 7. | Mrs. Mamta Rani | Commerce |
| 8. | Mr. Harpreet Singh | Economics |
| 9. | Mr. Rajesh Chander | History |
| 10. | Ms. Lakhveer Kaur | Physical Education |

- (xiii) To note and approve the status report (**Appendix-XL**) regarding loss and re-construction of record of Accounts Department in consequence to the incident of fire dated 14.05.2017.

- (xiv) To note the e-mail dated 19.06.2017 received from OSD to Vice President of India and Chancellor, P.U., and the reply already sent to him vide letter dated 16.06.2017, with regard to the clarification and follow up actions regarding Professor V.K. Chopra (Retd.) and issue arising out of his submissions, pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 25.02.2017 (Para 17).

NOTE: A copy of the reply dated 16.06.2017 has also been sent to P.M. of India, MHRD etc. and Fellows through e-mail.

- (xv) To note e-mail dated 19.06.2017 (**Appendix-XLI**) of OSD to Vice President of India, forwarded therewith the e-mail of Professor Rajesh Gill dated 17.06.2017 (**Appendix-XLI**) with regard to supply of DVDs of Syndicate meeting dated 28.05.2017.

NOTE: 1. A copy of the letter No. S.T. 11198 dated 20.06.2017 vide which the DVDs of the meeting of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 has been supplied to Professor Rajesh Gill is enclosed (**Appendix-XLI**).

2. O.S.D. to Vice-President of India and Chancellor P.U. has also been informed vide letter dated 22.6.2017 copy enclosed (**Appendix-XLI**).

(xvi) To note letter dated 20.06.2017 (**Appendix-XLII**) sent in partial supersession to letter No. 1333-34 dated 15.3.2017 (**Appendix-XLII**) to The Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education), Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi, regarding amendment/ additions/ deletions in various Regulations relating to pension appearing at pages 180-191 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(xvii) To note the legal opinion (**Appendix-XLIII**) of Shri V.K. Sibal, Advocate & Legal Retainer in respect of regularization of non-teaching staff working on temporary/daily wage/ contract basis in the Panjab University against sanctioned/budgeted posts.

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

(xviii) To note two letters dated 19.06.2017 (**Appendix-XLIV**), regarding Financial support to Panjab University, Chandigarh, addressed to Secretary, University Grants Commission, New Delhi and Additional Chief Secretary Finance, Government of Punjab by Dr. K.K. Tripathy, Director, MHRD.

NOTE: A copy of the above said letters have been sent to the Fellows, P.U. through e-mail on 21.06.2017.

(xix) To note the unsigned letter (**Appendix-XLV**) of all research scholars and students of Centre for Public Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh endorsed by a Senate member

While referring to sub-item I-(xix), Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this item has just been provided to them. Whatever is being done with the students, such complaints are coming from the students due to that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is attending to this issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor has done it but the orders of the Vice-Chancellor are not being followed and the fellowship of the students would be over after the lapse of one year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, all that is fine but they should see what he (Dr. Akhtar Mahmood) writes is that "it seems academics has become last priority in this University". If one writes that the academics is a last priority in this University and is writing to a Vice-Chancellor, he (Vice-Chancellor) has given his utmost only to protect the academics of this University. He is not alone that he does not do anything without the monthly meeting of the Syndicate of the University. During a period of 5 years, he has organised about 50-60 meetings of the Syndicate. None of the Vice-Chancellors has conducted so many meetings of the Senate as he has. And even after

that if it is said that it seems academics is the last priority in this University, the number of academic initiatives which were going on in the University, he did not discontinue any of those. He tried to add to those initiatives which he could do in the University and the city to generate a synergy between the academic institutions of the city. Even then someone says that the academics has been the last priority in the University. This is said by a person who is not only a Fellow of the University but also an Emeritus Professor of the University who has become an Emeritus Professor during his (Vice-Chancellor) term. What message he is trying to convey as he is also a nominated member of the Senate for so many terms in a row. Should he be doing this? He (Vice-Chancellor) is not alone responsible for the academics of the University, the governing bodies of the University are also responsible for the academics of the University. He wished to ask the members and did he not have a right to ask them each one of them to give a report that since whatever time each one of them has been a member of the governing body, how many academics initiatives they have proposed on behalf of this University. Attending to matters which are just put to them for consideration is something else. What are the academic initiatives that they proposed to improve the academics of this University? Could he ask this from the members and could they answer it? If he is supposed to respond to this thing, he could ask each one of them to give their report card. The members could say that it is an impertinent thing to ask. He also knows that it could be impertinent. But if he is supposed to respond to such a letter, why should he not retort back.

While referring to another issue of the letter which he has received is from a Head of the Department of this University, the Vice-Chancellor said that this pertains to a seniority issue that they discussed in the morning. The letter is from the Head of the Dental Institute who writes “anomalous application of UGC (minimum qualifications of appointment of teachers and other academic staff in Universities, Colleges and other measures for the maintenance of standards in higher education) Regulations, 2010 in the case of undersigned for the determination of inter-se seniority”. It is a service matter and the person says it as anomalous application of UGC Regulations. This applies to the governing body of the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it meant that the Dental Institute should be separated from it.

The Vice-Chancellor it is not that. They could make a plea that the Dental Institute be separated. They could make everything. He said that what hurts him is that the letter says that “it is further requested that the undersigned be informed about the decision to settle the said anomaly within 15 days and a copy of the directions to the authorities for implementing the Punjab Government Rules for the service condition related matter of the undersigned be sent to the undersigned within the stipulated time”. Could a Chairperson of a Department demand this thing from a Vice-Chancellor? Could a Chairperson of a Department say these things even to the Governing Body or his appointing authority? What is this going on? What is the level of insubordination? How to deal with such things? He requested the members as to how to handle this. Syndicate is the government of the University and some deterrence has to be put in place. Is it insubordination, is it a misconduct?

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the Vice-Chancellor could take strong note whatever he wanted in this matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that should a Chairperson of a Department do such things. Where is the authority, where is the regard for the Chief Executive Officer of this University if this is the way. The Punjab Government pay-scales have been given to those persons and does it mean that they could demand Punjab Government service rules. He checked up the appointment letter where nothing such has been written. All appointments are done by the Senate, which is the appointing authority. Should he forward this to the Senate and let the Senate take a call on it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that on behalf of the Syndicate, the Vice-Chancellor could take decision whatever he deems fit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not take a matter to the Senate without the consideration by the Syndicate.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that whatever is recommended by the Syndicate, the Senate could also do the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they want, he could bring as an agenda item with copies of the appointment letter and other details.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, according to him, it would be better and something needs to be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that under what circumstances the Dental College was started and how the appointments in the Dental College were initially made and under what circumstances they changed from the UGC system to the Punjab Government pay-scales.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is something also because when they are talking about one particular person, there was an enquiry in which the person had tried to drag someone in an issue. All those enquiry reports should also be tagged.

The Vice-Chancellor said that nobody helped him and he himself had to frame the promotion policy of the Dental College. The draft which had been submitted to him was so unsatisfactory that he took many days to redraft and get it checked and then sent the same to Delhi and is following up the matter. Fortunately, now it is lying at the desk of an officer, Mrs. Mamta Aggarwal, who has sympathy to Panjab University and Dr. Manju Singh is also helping us. He is following up the matter and trying to help so that there is a promotion policy for the Dental College. The Dental College does not have a promotion policy because they changed from the UGC system to DCI system. The UGC people had told him that DCI is more strict in promoting the people and advised that the promotion norms should be as per the criteria of the DCI. The UGC does not have any policy for promotion for Dental College. The policy of Panjab University is a model input for them as they look at the things in the 7th Pay Commission as to how to go for it. He is trying to attend to the concerns of the Dental College to the maximum possible that this University could do. In the background of this, someone says that the seniority list of the University should be made topsy-turvy. They have just recovered from the UBS problem. Now there is a problem of the

Dental College. In the same way, some other could also file a case. The way the letter has been written, he expected that a case could be filed and the matter would become sub-judice and the person could say that he had written to the Vice-Chancellor but the Vice-Chancellor did not reply. He said that no Vice-Chancellor of this University could take any decision in his individual capacity and if any such decision is taken, the validity of that decision is not more than one month because the House has to be kept informed. They have no option but to work in an open manner.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever has been done by the Vice-Chancellor is right. But that decision has not been implemented by the Coordinator of the Department and there are some more problems also and they need to decide about that also. He is talking about the case of Dr. Jayanti Dutta. Some student wanted to enrol under her.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has been done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that another case of Dr. Jayanti Dutta is that the Syndicate and the Senate had taken a decision to absorb but she has not been absorbed because the grant is being received from the UGC but the benefits should be given as if she has been absorbed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that she is a regular employee of the University as far as academic considerations are concerned except that she could not be granted the pension.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that naturally she is to be absorbed. He suggested that this should be a part of the resolved part. They are assuming that for all practical purposes, she is a regular employee of the University as people are taking different views.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should not do it in a hurry and bring it as an item for consideration.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that it should be brought as an agenda item next time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a note could be prepared which should be pre-circulated.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would work with the Finance and Development Officer on this issue.

While referring to sub-item I-(xii), Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the approval in this case is okay. He would like to share one problem about which he had a discussion with the Dean College Development Council and the Registrar. The Finance and Development Officer must remember that before the year 2013, the teachers of the Constituent Colleges were not being paid the salary during vacation but now they are paying it. Maximum of the Colleges, including the College being headed by him, had relieved the teachers on 31st May. In the year 2013, the Syndicate had taken a decision to pay the salary for the vacation period to the teachers as the recurring grant was being received and these persons were involved in the process of preparing the prospectus and admission. It is a very good decision. But there is a problem that if he had assigned these persons the duty of admission on rotation and the salary is being paid to

temporary teachers. The salary for the vacation period is released later on. Maximum of the persons are performing the duty during vacation but there are a few persons who are not performing the duty but are busy in their own functions but getting the salary. It might be that during the next vacation period, such persons might not be paid the salary. If they are paying the salary to those persons for the vacation period even after having relieved them, it is the duty of those persons to perform the assigned duty.

The Vice-Chancellor said that full salary for the whole of the year should be given instead of 9 months except for one day break and full work be got done.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if a person does not perform the duty during the vacation period, what action could be taken in such cases. He suggested that without the recommendation of the Principal, the salary for the vacation period to such persons should not be released.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that such persons would get the salary only if they perform the duty.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang suggested that if a person is not obeying the orders of the Principal, that person should be changed.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that a good decision has been taken that without the recommendation of the Principal, the salary for the vacation period would not be released to the temporary staff. He requested that College-wise panel of experts for appointment of the guest faculty in the Constituent Colleges be formed which could include the Principals and 2-3 Syndicate members like Dr. Dalip Kumar, Shri Jarnail Singh and Professor Navdeep Goyal so that whenever there is a requirement, the guest faculty could be appointed.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay. A Standing Committee would be formed which would assist the Principals. He requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to take up the responsibility of one of the newly opened Constituent Colleges.

Principal I.S. Sandhu clarified that he would not be able to take up the responsibility of the Constituent College at Dharamkot which is far away. He is ready to take up the responsibility of the Constituent College at Ferozepur.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that such a decision had already been taken and with this assignment to experienced persons, the Colleges would run smoothly which would not be possible if a new person is appointed there.

Principal I.S. Sandhu requested that Mr. Inderjit be allowed to continue at the Constituent College, Ferozepur and Mr. Parvinder could help Principal N.R. Sharma.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even if some additional honorarium is to be given to those persons so that their interest is maintained, they could approve it and he is okay with it and would get it approved from the Board of Finance. The honorarium could be at

Syndicate Proceedings dated 25th June 2017

the same lines as is being paid to the Deans etc. Presently, those persons are just getting salary without any increment or additional benefit. This would be a token honorarium just to show the appreciation for the work those persons are doing on behalf of the University. This would be taken up in the meeting of the Board of Finance going to be held in the month of August, 2017.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the honorarium equal to officiating pay to be paid to the Principals could be granted. He would discuss the issue with the Finance and Development Officer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that those persons are performing extra duty in addition to their teaching work.

While referring to sub-item I-(xiii), the Vice-Chancellor requested the members to study the report and if any additional information is required, the members should not hesitate to ask, the information would be provided. Some of the information which has been asked by the funding agencies has to be provided by the governing body of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor was authorised to approve the reconstruction of record of Accounts Department in consequence to the incident of fire dated 14.05.2017.

It was informed that around 12 meetings of the Committee constituted on the fire incident have taken place. The Committee had even enquired from the staff whether any electric gadgets were being used. Apart from that, the Committee is providing futuristic/progressive things as to how to handle such things. The Committee has suggested that there should be proper escape route with drawings which earlier were not there. The Committee has also suggested that there should be proper arrangements for water. Some of the suggestions given by the Committee have been incorporated in the Fire Manual. The Committee is looking into the issue in detail. The Committee had also desired that the report from the CFSL should also be provided to it. To expedite this report, a letter had been written to the SSP which has been given to the CFSL to expedite. The Committee had desired that until they receive the report from the CFSL, some of the things could be taken out of the debris for further investigation. Therefore, it should not be removed. Now, the Committee has said that an inventory be prepared in the presence of one representative from the police, one from the Enquiry Committee. That report is being prepared. The report submitted by Professor Umesh, from Roorkee is not the final report. The report would be finalised by him whenever the payment is released.

Shri Jarnail Singh and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that such payments should be pre-audited.

It was informed that the bill for the payment was received late and the paying would be released very soon.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the information contained in **Items I-(i) to (xii) and (xiv) to (xix)** be noted;

- (ii) the information contained in **Item I-(xiii)** be noted and approved and the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to take any further decision on behalf of the Syndicate, if required, with respect to re-construction of record or for processing the pending bills/payments.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

- (i) an agenda item to consider the representation of Principal-cum-Professor, Dental Institute along with copies of the appointment letter and other details be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate;
- (ii) an agenda item to consider the case of Dr. Jayanti Dutta, Human Resource Development Centre be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate
- (iii) that the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to form a College-wise Standing Committee of experts for appointment of the guest faculty in the Constituent Colleges including the Principals and Syndics Dr. Dalip Kumar, Shri Jarnail Singh and Professor Navdeep Goyal;
- (iv) case for payment of additional honorarium to the persons performing extra duty in the Constituent Colleges be put up for placing before the Board of Finance in its next meeting be held in the month of August, 2017.

General Discussion

1. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the people had faced hardships in the entrance paper of CET Undergraduate. There were two stages to apply i.e. first they fill the form, deposit the fee and then submit another form. Some students of villages had come to the University; they had given the applications alongwith fee slips. He had in his notice that there were 14-15 students who come there (Panjab University) and gave their applications with the request to issue them roll numbers as they had submitted the fees and were unable to fill the final form with fee details. There (in Panjab University) they were not entertained and were deprived to appear in the entrance test. He asked them to meet the Controller of Examinations, but no relief was given to them. When he sees, in the next time for the submission of Post Graduation entrance forms, students who could not fill their final forms were called by the Panjab University to give their photo alongwith other documents to get roll numbers. May be that had been considered later on. See those students, who could not appear, if some relief can be given.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that fee should be refunded to them.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that yes, fee should be refunded (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma gave the list of the students to the authority).

2. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that secondly either they were party in that issue, the issue of the students whose Ph.D registration had been cancelled by the Panjab University. The people were questioning them that they (members) had passed the cancellation of registration. He thinks that they should see that case with open mind even though there has been court case and F.I.R. They should not deprive her right to education being fundamental right. Her registration should not be cancelled and she be allowed to continue her study.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point was that she had not felt regret for what she had done. She had been levelling allegations. She had no remorse. So much arrogance she had.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that can it not be resolved amicably.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they should do one effort.

The Vice Chancellor said that so much arrogance. She was asked to accept the mistake and withdraw the things. But, she accused the Vice Chancellor.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he (Vice Chancellor) had received a representation from the Campus, when there was a meeting of the Campus Council, he was also there outside. He met person there, who was his friend, had made a representation, he told him that if he had to blame then he will not help and no person will help. If the student had made a mistake, no one neither Vice Chancellor, Registrar nor any Syndicate member would want to damage the future of a student. He thinks that the representation had been sent by correcting 2-3 columns thereby requesting to save her.

The Vice Chancellor said that no where mentioned unconditional regret. That had to be absolutely unconditional.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that suppose the person/teacher who had been approaching them, he (Vice Chancellor) might had received a request, they (members) may talk to him (teacher/person) that if the student accept her mistake, then they should see that.

The Vice Chancellor said that if be an unconditional regret to reverse the consequences, but nowhere there was regret

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that someone be put on duty to resolve the issue amicably. They should do the efforts.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the student should not suffer.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would be the last person to deprive somebody the right to education.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they had also resolved 2-3 issues earlier with the dialogue.

The Vice Chancellor said that if someone engages SFS party to pressurise him, those who had stoned the University and saying stone throwing was justified!

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said leave aside that issue of SFS. The issue at present is related to a daughter's/girl's career, she had earlier also sent a request.

The Vice Chancellor said that at least she should feel remorse and tender unconditional regret.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he (Vice Chancellor) should not feel the angry; the people ask questions from them, the accident/quarrel happened, when he was neither their student, teacher or employee, then why PUCASH was handling their case. He wants to know that for his clarity.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Act says that in the Campus, when any such incident happens that will go to the PUCASH, that was in the Act.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the girl was the student; he was talking about the boy.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that that can be there, even altogether such case of outsider, can be dealt there.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that then how they will punish the outsiders.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had asked Professor Mehta not to exaggerate the issue. He had also made a phone call to Principal B.C. Josan that the issue will defame his college as well as University, please request Professor Mehta don't exaggerate the issue. He told that because the student may not do something wrong in pressure. It would had been, had he not the personal knowledge of the incident, he was at home. It was the time of evening, an accident happened there. Direction of the accident was from right angle, she was saying the boy was coming parallel and after seven days, when he was not there, a complaint of Sexual Harassment was filed and then started the extortion. He went to the DGP, the DGP says that they had brought the girl on stretcher to his Office.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the girl should be advised.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they, don't know the girl, how they can advise her. He was talking because the issue was coming in the newspapers.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point was Professor Mehta should speak to her, he was her supervisor. The supervisor should be able to impress upon her.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that some other persons were with her.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the issue was that they should talk with the student if she accepts her mistake.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the persons will do their politics and the student will suffer. They should solve the issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that if her regrets come to him, he will put that to the Syndicate and the Syndicate can decide.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they know that when the regret will come that will be considered the Vice Chancellor and need not bring in the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that that was the decision of the Syndicate, he cannot take decision and he will bring that in the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they take the decisions that if that type of situation comes, they authorize the Vice Chancellor to take decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that after all the Ph.D was not being done immediately, they had to dispose that after a month. She should continue doing her work. He will bring in the next meeting as one of the first item, they (members) may take the decision. He will not say why they were doing. He had no prestige on this issue.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they should have no prestige in the case of students.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they were of the thinking that the issue of student be resolved as people ask them questions.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that that was right, the issue had been resolved.

3. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he had to repeat the issue for the tenth time the name of Block No.2 was Shaheed Bhagat Singh Hall. He had requested him (Vice Chancellor) and the Registrar that a correct plaque be put on.

4. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there was an inquiry committee regarding the death of Parveen Gupta.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had been getting that issue done completely. He was in touch with Dr. Amitabh Avasthi of PGI, Chandigarh.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there was one more thing to get done that was the job of his son.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the July that issue will be got done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the meeting may also be got done for the job of his (Sh. Parveen Gupta's) son.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will send the case to compassionate Committee. He (Sh. Parveen Gupta's son) should choose, where he wants to get the job.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he (Sh. Parveen Gupta's son) was of technical cadre. He had talked with him (Sh. Parveen Gupta's son), he prefers Department of Physics. Positions of technical were vacant in the Department of Physics, he (Sh. Parveen Gupta's son) be given job there.

The Vice Chancellor said that okay that was right; give him (Sh. Parveen Gupta's son) position in the Department of Physics.

5. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they had decided in the last meeting for the Research publishers and the publications that by the time list was not completed, they will be given exemption. Issue some letter in that regard.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that DCDC was told to issue a letter so that college teachers and other may know. People were waiting for their publications.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it was told that till the list was not completed, the previous pattern will be adopted.

The Vice Chancellor said that that had been done, University Grants Commission had one that.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he was talking about exemption of period. They had decided in the previous meeting that from 11th July to till date when list was published, that period be exempted.

The Vice Chancellor said that to see that if there was any valid thing in which University Grants Commission regulation be not violated, may be done.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that period from the 11th July till the list was not completed.

The Vice Chancellor asked that whether the University Grants Commission list was not uploaded.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu clarified that list of both, University Grants Commission as well as Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor said that their (Panjab University) list had no meaning.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they had to give the list of publishers.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they had to give the list of publishers. The decision had been taken in the Syndicate and DCDC knows that.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the University Grants Commission list had also come in the January.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they had told that by the time they did not release the list of publication, till that time the work will be considered. Therefore, send circular regarding that to the colleges.

6. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that a lot of complaints had been coming of S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal, Principal of Guru Nanak Khalsa, Ferozepur. A certificate that he had attached of the institution that institution does not exist.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he was totally fraud.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that Vice Chancellor might have received that certificate. A letter of overlapping was also sent by the University. That person was a fraud, there had been an FIR lodged against him in Mahalpur. In Sdabhavana College also written against him, teacher of district council (district council) had met him, they had also written to him (Vice Chancellor). Do something about him (S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal).

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if they (Panjab University) delay the matter, they will not do the justice. He would like to say off the record that that he (S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal) had been doing some wrong things there. He had come to know from a teacher that he (S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal) had been talking to the DPI get the approval. If the Principal had got approval from DPI, pressure will be on the University and the college will not be able to relieve him (S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal), till not rejected by the University. There was not single person with him (S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal) in the Syndicate to say that he was not a fraud person, his appointment should be rejected. If they (Panjab University) will linger on the case, that will harm the college the college as well as defame the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should call the management of the college.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the application Panjab University had received in which his ((S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal) selection was done, if the facts in that were wrong, definitely there should be no approval given on that application.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that not only disapproval, but a case of fraud should be filed against him (S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal).

Shri Jarnail Singh also said that a case should be filed against him (S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal). It was a big problem for Panjab University if someone gets selection by giving misinformation. In future, some other person may also apply with false experience of 10 years, that would be wrong.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that no need to form the committee, the University had his documents.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that management of that college was also a big fraud.

The Vice Chancellor said that the College Management will have to be told that in view of that they were not approving.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that don't talk about the Management who had gobble up with the F.D.s of P.F.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they had got examination done in their college by installing the cameras.

Professor Navdeep Goyal that don't talk about the Management.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that mark the rejection on that and inform the Management.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that people says that he (S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal) had remained in jail and how University had appointed him Principal.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he don't want to say that the college in which he (S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal) was teaching, he got married third time with the student of that college. He (S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal) had no good quality. Even he don't know him (S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal). He (S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal) had also approached him.

Shri Jarnail Singh and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the all the facts of S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal should be verified.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will get the fact verified of S. Sucha Singh Dhaliwal.

7. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the non-attendant of students was becoming an issue. He had also been receiving phone calls from Kashmir that they will give

them 10 students of MP.Ed students and how much money they will give. He told them that if students will not attend classes, he will even not tell them amount of fees. They don't want to come and wants money also. But, in most of their B.Ed. colleges, there were a lot of non-attendant students. Please constitute a committee to pay surprise visit in those colleges to hold those persons.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the DCDC had appointed him as Chairman of the two Executive Committees in the colleges. He had given general observations of the two colleges separately, which DCDC and his colleagues of affiliation committee know well. In one college, there were about 1600 students, they visited there twice. When the Committee went there first time, they declared the holiday to the students that day. He decided to visit there again and told them that college should remain open on the date given by him. There were total 82 students in that college. Some persons had been involved on commission basis in that practice. They will be surprised to know that only 82 students were present in the college out of 1650/1600 students. There may be a solution, what he feels that chalk out those colleges and put persons (Syndicate members) on duty with the recommendations committee. The persons will talk on the facts which may be checked. The admission in those colleges should be like that they must submit daily information of admission to the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had sent Principal Bhushan who recommended that there should be biometric attendance in all the Punjab colleges as had been done in his (Principal Bhushan's) college.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it was not possible to do in all the colleges, but those notorious colleges numbering 10,15 or 20, all knows about those colleges, the information of admission of those colleges must come daily by 4.00 or 4.30 p.m. He said that the admission of that college, whose observation had been given by him, would not be more than 600 students, if University asks for daily information. In the end of the admission, those colleges do the admission of students in bulk.

The Vice Chancellor said that bring that in a considered item, do not pass that like that. Bring that as item in the next Syndicate. Bring the proposal that the Office of the DCDC, in view of the wide spread apprehensions that many colleges had not attendant admission and some of those colleges were brining bad name to the University as an affiliated body for those things. So the University would like to curb someway of countering in checking those things. So the Office of the DCDC was authorized to seek information regarding attendance from any college wherever necessary. Come with proposal and pass the proposal and after that when the agenda will come, that agenda will be circulated to all. All the concerned will have the information.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that his submission was that he was not talking about the attendance, he is talking

about admission. During the time admission of 10-15 days, the information on daily basis regarding the admission of students should be before to the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that okay, accepted. The matter has been placed during the Zero Hour and in order to check the image of the University, DCDC authorized to ask for the daily admission of the students.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the position was that, at the moment, for the courses in professional colleges for their (Kashmir) students, those Colleges get Rs. 1,20,000 to Rs. 1,80,000 due to which students get the admission and then go back. But, however, that should be checked.

The Vice Chancellor said that at least the system of admission should be checked by the University.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he saw a lot of motor-cycles outside a college parking and there was so much rush, he was really very happy to see that that college had increased a good strength. He was very happy. When he inquired, he came to know that some function was being organized there. so the outsiders had come there, they were not the college students.

8. Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he had a requested in the case of Sh. Sanjeev Varma, Junior Technician in the Chemical Engineering.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has been trying his best to help Sh. Sanjeev Varma, who has been working as Junior Technician for the last 18 years. He (Sh. Sanjeev Varma) was neither eligible in Bio-Chemistry nor in University Institute of Chemical Engineering.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he (Sh. Sanjeev Varma) had not got any promotion in the last 18 years. Posts are vacant in both the Departments. Either he Sh. Sanjeev Varma) be sent to the Department of Bio-Chemistry with promotion or be given promotion in University Institute of Chemical Engineering. Take his case sympathetically.

The Vice Chancellor said that his (Sh. Sanjeev Varma) case was very complicated. Only the internal people were promoted in the University Institute of Chemical Engineering.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he (Sh. Sanjeev Varma) was in the Department of Bio-Chemistry, he came to the University Institute of Chemical Engineering and the Chemical Engineering was not giving him (Sh. Sanjeev Varma) promotion saying that he was not an internal candidate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that how they say that he (Sh. Sanjeev Varma) was not internal.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Navdeep Goyal to see if there was any solution.

9. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a committee was formed by him (Vice Chancellor) regarding promotion policy of technical staff in which Registrar and Dean of University Instruction was also there. That had been done by the Syndicate also. After that when the promotion policy came, he doesn't know what the establishment branch had done, he had also brought that to the notice of the Registrar also, that policy need to be checked.

The Vice Chancellor said that when the policy was made, individual cases were not discussed in that. It was said that they were not doing individual case; they made the promotion policy in which individual case will cover automatically, but that was not implemented.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the seniority list should have been amended.

It was informed that the list they had made, the seniority of that list was not fixed by the Establishment Branch so that could not be implemented. He had told them to revise.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that would have to be done again.

It was informed that the list will be revised and will be given to the same committee. They will revise as per the directions of the Syndicate and will be given to the same committee again.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the screening will be done again by the Committee.

This was agreed to.

10. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that date sheet for the Golden chance was being made, last time four centres were made like Muktsar, Chandigarh etc. That time a centre should also be made in Abohar for the Golden chance otherwise students had to go to far-off place.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that Abohar was the hub of education.

The Vice Chancellor said that make the DAV College, Abohar as one of the Centre for Golden chance exams.

This was agreed to.

11. Shri Jarnail Singh said that the results of re-appear candidates should come out at least one month before the examinations of next semester. Otherwise, uncertainty remains there.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that students could not come to know whether they had cleared 50% exams or not.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that two boys met him in Singapore and he gave them his introduction. They (boys) told him that he was a Fellow of the University. They (boys) had given him a complaint, which was with him. He asked them tell what was the complaint. They (boys) told him that the results of re-appear were declared very late.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that when they admit the students in the next semester, they don't know whether the students had 50% reappear or 30%.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the results of re-appear were must, otherwise uncertainty remains there.

This was agreed to.

12. The Vice Chancellor said that for planning the think-tank Committee, he needs two volunteers, one from Punjab and one from U.T.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he (Vice Chancellor) may take anyone.

The Vice Chancellor said that Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal from Punjab and Dr. Dalip Kumar from U.T. will be members for the think tank committee.

This was agreed to.

(G.S. Chadha)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR