

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

## **PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Sunday, 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017 at 10.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### **PRESENT**

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

Dr. Subhash Sharma, Shri Jitender Yadav, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Shri T.K. Goyal, Director Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

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

### **Condolence Resolution**

- (i) Prof. Keshav C. Kaistha, former Chairperson, Department of Sociology, Professor Baba Prithvi Singh Azad Chair and former Director, Population Research Centre on 05.05.2017.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Professor Keshav C. Kaistha and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed soul.

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

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

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

- (i) Dr. Rehana Parveen, Professor of Urdu, Department of Evening Studies, has been conferred with 'Award of Recognition' by the Chandigarh Sahitya Academy for her outstanding contribution in Urdu Literature/Language during Academy's Annual Award Ceremony on 29.04.2017.
- (ii) Two Colleges affiliated with Panjab University, viz., Govt. College of Education, Sector-20, Chandigarh and Dev Samaj College of Education, Sector-36, have been

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

accredited by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) with the 'A' Grade with CGPA of 3.23 and 3.22, respectively.

- (iii) Prof. Raghuram Rao Akkinapalli, an alumnus of Panjab University, has assumed the charge of Director, National Institute of Pharmaceutical Education & Research (NIPER) Mohali. Prof. Rao had served PU from 03.03.2006 to 31.03.2011 in the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences. During stay at PU, he had received Dr. Manjushri Pal Memorial Award for the best Pharmaceutical Scientist for the year 2010 from Association of Pharmaceutical Teachers of India (APTI).
- (iv) DST-SERB has approved a Project entitled, "Self assembled amino acid based constructs as potential antimicrobial traps" for funding to Dr. Nishima Wangoo, Assistant Professor of Applied Sciences (Chemistry), UIET.

She has also been given Grants-in-Aid from Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) for the Research Scheme entitled: "Thyrotropin Releasing Hormone (TRH) and TRH-Analogues Encapsulated Biodegradable Polymeric Nanoparticles as Intra-nasal Anti-epileptic Agents". These projects are for a period of three years.

- (v) Dr. Rohit K. Sharma, Department of Chemistry has been awarded a Project by DST-SERB entitled, "Enhancement of the immunogenicity and protective efficacy of lipopeptide vaccine against Mycobacterium Tuberculosis using peptidomimetic and conjugation with isoniazid" for a term of three years. In this Project co-Principal Investigators are Dr. Nishima Wangoo, UIET and Dr. Javed Agrewala, a Distinguished Scientist and S.S. Bhatnagar Awardee from CSIR-IMTECH, Chandigarh.
- (vi) Dr. Neeraj Kumar Singh, Assistant Librarian, AC Joshi Library, has been awarded the prestigious Commonwealth Professional Fellowship at the University of East London, UK. This Fellowship support mid-career professionals from developing countries to spend a period of time at a UK host organization working in the field.
- (vii) Dr. Anurag Kuhad, Assistant Professor, UIPS, has been awarded with Haryana Yuva Vigyan Ratna Award (2016-17) by Haryana State Council for Science & Technology. The award carries Rs.1 lakh, a citation and trophy as a token of appreciation and encouragement. He received this award from Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, Professor Kaptan Singh Solanki on May 10, 2017. Dr. Savita Chaudhary has also received her Haryana Yuva Vigyan Ratna Award for 2014-15 from the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana on the same day.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

- (viii) Panjab University has secured 2<sup>nd</sup> Rank by getting 43880 points for the award of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad (MAKA) Trophy as published by Association of Indian Universities in Annual Performance Report, National University Games 2015-16. Further, I wish to inform that Panjab University players have performed better during the session 2016-17 and trust that PU will gain more points for the award of MAKA Trophy as compared to the session 2015-16.
- (ix) Prof. Ashok Vijh, an alumnus of Department of Chemistry, PU, has been decorated with the honour of 'Ordre de Montreal' in Canada. He had visited PU Campus to deliver lectures during a GIAN Workshop on 'Advanced Lithium Batteries: Science & Technology' from December 12-17, 2016. He has retired now. A year ago, he was in Panjab University for INSA.
- (x) The tuition fee and other charges for the students enrolled in different courses at the affiliated colleges of PU for the year 2017-18, shall remain the same as those in the year 2016-17.
- (xi) It is recommended that admission at B.A. first year level in the Department of Evening Studies be restricted to 200 students in 2017-2018 instead of 300 students as had been in the recent years. The pass percentage of students in B.A. I, II and III have been examined to arrive at such a recommendation in consultation with DUI and Chairperson, Department of Evening Studies in addition to feedback from IQAC which looked at the performance of B.A. I, II and III courses.

The Vice-Chancellor said that today they are meeting after the fire incident. Whatever the University has done during the last two weeks, an update of that has been provided to the members in the form of a document. The same update was made available to the U.T. Administrator and Governor and a copy has been sent to the Secretary, MHRD. The members could have a look on it and they could come back to the issues related to it in the second half.

Shri Varinder Singh said that after a very long time, the performance in sports has improved. He requested that the Director, Sports be provided a bigger house as presently he is residing in a comparatively small house.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this matter related to zero hour and not a matter to react on the current item. If he (Shri Varinder Singh) wanted to say something, he could discuss the same during zero hour.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal requested the Vice-Chancellor to update on the fire incident.

The Vice-Chancellor said that an update of whatever has been done till 26.5.2017 has been provided on the table in the form of a document. The same information has been provided to the U.T. Advisor to bring it to the notice of the U.T. Administrator as also to the UGC Secretary and the OSD to the Chancellor.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it feels good to note that the Colleges have got 'A' grading. It is a matter of pride and they hope that it would improve in future. While referring to Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr.No. (x), he requested that the charges at the Panjab University Extension Library should also be the same as for the year 2016-17 as is being done in the case of the affiliated Colleges. Earlier also he had requested in this regard in the last meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, the charges would not be revised.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he would like to add to Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr.No. (ii) that U.T. Chandigarh becomes the first State/U.T. in the country to achieve 100% accreditation of the Colleges. There is no other State/U.T. where 100% accreditation of the College has been done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be added.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that out of the 15 Colleges, on an average, 75% of the Colleges are 'A' graded which is a big achievement against the national average of 26%.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be added.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the sports fee has been hiked, whether the hiked fee is to be taken from the students or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all the charges would remain the same.

The Vice-Chancellor further said that they are having 4 Constituent Colleges and 2 are running on an *ad hoc* basis. These two Colleges were run up to 31<sup>st</sup> March. However, thereafter, they did not have the approval of the Syndicate for meeting the expenditure beyond 31<sup>st</sup> March. At the moment, they have some money in this budget head because they could not fill up the positions which had been advertised. If they would have filled up the positions, the persons appointed would have got the full salary and other benefits due to which the expenditure would have increased. Since they could not spend the money that they had planned for the 4 Colleges during the last 3 years, so they have some balance in that budget head. If the members agree, approval be granted for meeting the expenditure of these two Constituent Colleges out of that money up to the end of the current session.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that one more chance be given to the Government to sign the MoU.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the process is going on but till then approval be granted for meeting the expenditure up to the end of the session.

This was agreed to.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired as to what problems they are facing as the seats in the Department of Evening Studies have been reduced from 300 to 200.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice-Chancellor said that the intake of the students in the Department of Evening Studies is 300-350. In the first year, only 100 students out of 350 could pass. In the second year, the students of USOL got transferred and took admission in the Department of Evening Studies. In the second year also, about 100 students could pass. In the third year, only 100-125 students appear in the examination out of which about 80-90 students pass the examination.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they keep the intake at 200 students, they could face this problem even then also.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that to solve this problem, there could be a decision that the students of Department of Evening Studies who pass the examination would be admitted to the next class and no other students would be admitted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the demand ratio is more and the number of students to enrol in the Department of Evening Studies is greater than 200, he could be authorised to enhance the seats.

This was agreed to.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that no student except the student of Department of Evening Studies should be admitted in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> class.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not against it. Nobody would be deprived of the education.

Principal I.S. Sandhu reiterated that no student except the student of Department of Evening Studies should be admitted in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> class.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be beneficial if they impart quality education.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Dr. Rehana Parveen, Professor of Urdu, Department of Evening Studies, on having been conferred with 'Award of Recognition' by the Chandigarh Sahitya Academy for her outstanding contribution in Urdu Literature/Language;
  - (ii) Govt. College of Education, Sector-20, Chandigarh on having been accredited by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) with the 'A' Grade with CGPA of 3.23;
  - (iii) Dev Samaj College of Education, Sector-36, Chandigarh on having been accredited by the National Assessment

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

and Accreditation Council (NAAC) with the 'A' Grade with CGPA of 3.22;

- (iv) Prof. Raghuram Rao Akkinapalli, former Professor at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences on assuming the charge of Director, National Institute of Pharmaceutical Education & Research (NIPER) Mohali;
  - (v) Dr. Nishima Wangoo, Assistant Professor of Applied Sciences (Chemistry), UIET on funding of her Project entitled, "Self assembled amino acid based constructs as potential antimicrobial traps" by DST-SERB;
  - (vi) Dr. Rohit K. Sharma, Department of Chemistry, on having been awarded a Project entitled "Enhancement of the immunogenicity and protective efficacy of lipopeptide vaccine against Mycobacterium Tuberculosis using peptidomimetic and conjugation with isoniazid" by DST-SERB;
  - (vii) Dr. Neeraj Kumar Singh, Assistant Librarian, AC Joshi Library, on having been awarded the prestigious Commonwealth Professional Fellowship at the University of East London, UK;
  - (viii) Dr. Anurag Kuhad, Assistant Professor, UIPS, on having been awarded with Haryana Yuva Vigyan Ratna Award (2016-17) by Haryana State Council for Science & Technology;
  - (ix) Dr. Savita Chaudhary on having been awarded with Haryana Yuva Vigyan Ratna Award (2014-15) by Haryana State Council for Science & Technology;
  - (x) Prof. Ashok Vijh, an alumnus of Department of Chemistry, PU, on having been decorated with the honour of 'Ordre de Montreal' in Canada;
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (viii) be noted;
  3. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (x) be noted and approved with the addition that this decision would be applicable to the Constituent Colleges also;
  4. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (xi) be noted and approved

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

and the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to take decision on the number of seats;

5. the expenditure on the two newly opened Constituent Colleges up to the end of the current session be allowed to be met out of the balance funds of the 4 Constituent Colleges; and
6. the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 30.04.2017, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Economics, P.U. Chandigarh**

**2(i).** Considered minutes dated 09.05.2017 (**Appendix-II**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Economics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there were many cases in that like item who was okay. Item no. 2(iii) was of Dr. Gurmeet Singh. His case was very good rather it had been processed as per University Grants Commission amendment 4 and marks given were also as per that amendment. But when they look at the papers which had been supplied, initially along with that item that was probably, when he (Dr. Gurmeet Singh) applied earlier as per 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment, whereas he thinks that by the time of screening, he (Dr. Gurmeet Singh) had submitted the new papers as per 4<sup>th</sup> amendment. Later on those papers had been supplied to the Syndicate members. He thinks that the earlier papers of Dr. Gurmeet Singh which were as per 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment got inadvertently attached in the agenda papers. Those should be removed from the proceedings otherwise definitely there would be confusion.

The Vice Chancellor said that he agreed with him (Professor Navdeep Goyal ).

There was also one more thing that when they look at the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment. In 4<sup>th</sup> amendment, when one talks about publication of books or chapters in the books, in fact books were to be uploaded on University web site. Those had already been recommended by the Syndicate, how that process had to be taken up. But he thinks RPC was following different procedure then what had been actually recommended by the Syndicate. They should be asked to follow the procedure which had recommended by the University and also they should do it fast because that will lead to lot of problems.

The Vice Chancellor instructed the official to note it down.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that even in those recommendations, they can see that there were books of publishers even like Springer, which could not be counted by the Selection Committee because those had not been simply uploaded on the University web site. So, he thinks that that should be done immediately that was one. That was the case with almost all six proceedings which were there in the Syndicate that papers of both of the earlier application and the application which had been finally taken from them, were there along with that. There was one more

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

thing which they need to discuss that was primarily about the applications which they had received from University Institute of Engineering & Technology. There was one case of Dr. Amit Chauhan that was okay. But, when they note the application of professors particularly, they can start with the application of Dr. Harish Kumar. In that case, see if they look at the category 3 D, 3 D was meant for research guidance, but actually that was M.Phil, Ph.D. That was not M.Phil or equivalent and Ph.D. or equivalent as per University Grants Commission and what had been awarded, certificate marks which had been awarded, do not primarily for M.Tech guidance and he knew that even when they were pursuing the matter with RAO for the old cases, M.Tech. guidance because that was not written in University Grants Commission as such, was not allowing those marks. So, he thinks even if they deduct those marks, even then they were eligible.

The Vice Chancellor said that M.Tech guidance was technology. M. Tech. was like, in some sense, not exactly equivalent, as if they were guiding MDS students one could take M.Tech. guidance like an M.Phil guidance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that that was true. Whatever he (Vice Chancellor) was saying, was correct. But, looking at the problem which they may face later on, he suggests that they may remove those marks right then for M.Tech. because all of them are otherwise also eligible. So, if they remove those marks and calculated the marks again, even then they were eligible.

The Vice Chancellor said that right then, leave that as that was and see what happens.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there would be unnecessary complaints.

The Vice Chancellor said that check that, if they do that then. If earlier also people had gone like that, then he had to open all that and remove marks of all those.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that okay that was alright. If there would be any problem, then he (Vice Chancellor) was authorized to take a final decision. But as far as other things were concerned, because there was complaint by one, but he would like to record, put that on record that all the marks given, because he had checked himself also from the University Grants Commission web site, marks for all the papers, only those papers had been given which were on the University Grants Commission website and marks had been rather divided also. Because there were multiple options, marks had been divided; so all those complaints were frivolous. They condemn those who put in frivolous complaints.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they should not bother about those complaints.

The Vice Chancellor said that RTI activists and disgruntled retired professors of the University were not to run the University.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that a proforma of eligibility had been attached particularly for 4<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> stage cases. Therein, the details



Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

had been attached with both 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment and 3<sup>rd</sup> amendment. His submission was that if they were interviewed on the base of 3<sup>rd</sup> amendment, he thinks there was no relevance to have papers pertaining to 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment with those documents.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that that had to be done.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that that has to be removed.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as Professor Navdeep Goyal had said, M.Tech. had not been mentioned anywhere by the University Grants Commission.

The Vice Chancellor said that M.Tech. was always a part of domain of AICTE.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that was why in the 3<sup>rd</sup> amendment, only 5 marks of M.Phil had been talked about, which were 3 marks earlier. Moreover, when there were issues of colleges also like that, the list had not to be approved of the books, the list had to be approved of the publishers. He thinks that that step should be taken immediately and earlier they had also requested that at least in each subject one college teacher may also be invited so that new weightage can be considered on behalf of that.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that perhaps they had earlier taken decision that there should be two representatives. The list of journals had gone.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that but that had not been done, the list of journals had been gone and the 15<sup>th</sup> of May was the last date and not a single representative from the college had been called, no Department had been called. They had made their list and updated.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that his suggestion was that in those matters rather writing in minutes, they should authorize Registrar and Controller to release notifications immediately. If one decision had come, where college teachers had been punished, to which they were also member that had been endorsed and whereas the college teacher had loss, their issue had come that there should be two college representatives, date had passed and notification had not been sent. The decision was taken that their representative from the colleges, like he was in Punjabi or there was any teacher from political science or Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu was from physics or other senior teacher from the nearest college may be called. But, no notification had been issued and the information had not been sent to the Departments. No Department had called them.

The Vice Chancellor said that minutes of Syndicate and Senate had been delayed of those meetings because there had been so many meetings and minutes were so long of about 300 pages. The point was that he gave them the authorization that someone gives him the operative part, he will sign that. The operative part did not come and he also got slipped on that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the approved part was ready after two days. That was approval, not operative part.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that approval was also of the part of operative part.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the recommendations should have been sent immediately by the General Branch, it had been delayed.

The Vice Chancellor said that how the General Branch will send before writing the Minutes.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that that had been approved in the minutes. They had approved the Committee's recommendations. Those recommendations should have been simply sent. Some delays had happened due to which problem of implementation was there. Even after sending the recommendations, those were being implemented in the wrong way, that was the problem.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that there the issue was being raised of book to be put on mail, it should not be book, it should be publication.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the Departments should be conveyed.

The Vice Chancellor said that there was a meeting of Chairpersons day after tomorrow, he will discuss that.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that kindly it should be ensured that Departments should include representatives from the colleges.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there was one another important point that upto the second amendment; there was demarcation between the college teachers and University teachers and when the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> amendments came, college teachers had to take same API as the University teacher had to take. If the college teacher will not get the facilities, then he thinks they will be deprived of that.

The Vice Chancellor said that well taken that, he was personally going to take interview

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if possible, the list of journals be added.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will talk to the concerned, no issue at all.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that since July 11, 2016, no list of publishers had come till date, though the teachers were publishing books. For that period, wherever, they had published books, he feels that they should accept that.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever the old credits, nobody can take that from them. For futuristic date, old credit cannot be taken. That was not correct.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that that should be to the date of publication of list. When they publish the list, till that date they will accept all the publications.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that that was okay. But how they can consider the old work, University Grants Commission cannot do that, no guidelines had been given, nothing had been done.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it must be noted that it should be the date of publication.

The Vice Chancellor said that come (to Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu & Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu ) and see him the next day.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Amrita Sher Gill be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) Department of Economics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **11.11.2012**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

**Preponement of date of promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for Human Rights and Duties T, P.U. Chandigarh**

**2(ii).** Considered minutes dated 09.05.2017 (**Appendix-III**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee to prepone the date of promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for Human Rights and Duties, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is a case of Dr. Namita who has been recommended for promotion from 14.8.2011. She joined on regular basis in the University on 20.7.2010 and before that her service was temporary and there was a break of 2-3 days.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that has already been taken care of, consistent with the UGC guidelines.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if that is so, in fact, in the past they have one case of Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur of IETVE. In her case, there was continuous service and there was a break of only one day and in that case the Vice-Chancellor was authorised to examine the case and issue the appointment letter, if the case is found okay. If as per UGC regulations, the present case is okay, then that case is surely okay. They could approve that the appointment letters of these two cases be issued together.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

**RESOLVED:** That the date of promotion of Dr. Namita be preponed and she be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at Centre for Human Rights and Duties, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), **w.e.f. 14.8.2011**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Hindi, P.U. Chandigarh**

**2(iii).** Considered minutes dated 09.05.2017 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Hindi, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Gurmeet Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Hindi, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), **w.e.f. 27.07.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Biophysics, P.U. Chandigarh**

**2(iv).** Considered minutes dated 09.05.2017 (**Appendix-V**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Avneet Saini be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), **w.e.f 22.07.2014** in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Biophysics, P.U. Chandigarh**

**2(v).** Considered minutes dated 09.05.2017 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Sarvnrinder Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), **w.e.f 05.03.2013** in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UIET, P.U. Chandigarh**

**2(vi).** Considered minutes dated 09.05.2017 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Amit Chauhan be promoted from Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engg. (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engg. (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), **w.e.f 06.06.2016** in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to third amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

**Promotion from Associate Professor Stage-4 to Professor Stage-5, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UIET, P.U. Chandigarh**

**2(vii).** Considered minutes dated 09.05.2017 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor/s (Stage-4) to Professor/s (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be promoted from Associate Professor in Computer Science & Engg. (**Stage-4**) to Professor in Computer Science & Engg. (**Stage-5**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- |                       |   |            |
|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 1. Dr. Harish Kumar   | : | 01.07.2016 |
| 2. Dr. Sarbjeet Singh | : | 01.07.2016 |
| 3. Dr. Sakshi Kaushal | : | 01.07.2016 |

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
  2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to third amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UIET, P.U. Chandigarh**

**2(viii).** Considered minutes dated 09.05.2017 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Vishal Gupta be promoted from Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Engg. (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Engg. (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), **w.e.f. 03.07.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
  - (xi) It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

to third amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the letter of promotions to the persons promoted under Item **C-2(i) to C-2 (viii)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate and only the relevant papers would form part of the proceedings to avoid any confusion.

**Appointment/  
of Dean of  
Instruction extension  
of Dean of  
University  
Instruction**

**3.** Considered the appointment/extension of Dean of University Instruction, for a period of one year, w.e.f. the date of joining, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U., Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. Professor Dinesh K. Gupta, University Business School, Panjab University, was appointed Dean of University Instruction for a period of one year w.e.f. the date he joins, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 by the Senate in its meeting dated 09.10.2016 (Para IX) (**Appendix-X**) and his term as DUI is going to expire on 06.06.2017.

2. Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U., Calendar, Volume I, 2007 reads as under:

“The Senate, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, may, from time to time appoint one of the University Professors to hold the office of the Dean of University Instruction. The term of appointment shall be for one year which may be renewed for one year more. \*The amount and nature of the allowance to be granted to the Dean of University Instruction for performing the duties attached to this office shall be as determined by the Syndicate at the time of appointment”.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they should deliberate on item no.3 because that item relates to extension of present Dean of University Instruction. In the last meeting of the Senate, some fellows had been concerned with what happened and what was the role of Dean of University Instruction of the incident of 11<sup>th</sup> April, 2017.

The Vice Chancellor said that that matter had been discussed and he (Dean of University Instruction) had explained them that. If they made that as a basis for not approving that thing, then okay they can discuss that. But, he feels that cannot form the basis for judging anybody's performance.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that but they also cannot turn a blind eye to what they had heard there also. That was his opinion to discuss that the matter must be discussed. The matter was before the Syndicate and he was not in favour of giving extension of Dean of University Instruction.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Principal B.C. Josan said that in the incident of stoned throwing by the student on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2017, he (Dean of University Instruction) had not performed his duty properly. If the situation had been controlled, that incident would not have happened.

The Vice Chancellor said that that was not the responsibility of Dean of University Instruction only. The entire University was involved there. There were so many Teachers, Senators in the University; there were so many Wardens in the University, there was a Chief of University Security, Syndicate members were also present on the Campus that day. So, that was a collective failure. He (DUI) gets little more blame. But, that was not a singular failure of one person and if they look at that, if somebody had determined to engage in stone throwing, even if he (Vice Chancellor) would had been present there, quite possible that stone throwing would had happened. The kind of determination with which the stone throwing had been done, they could have judicial inquiry of the incident or appoint a judge to have an inquiry the matter, to judge whether it was pre-planned, whether it was really done with the purpose of maligning the University. The people, who had indulged in that, justified the stone throwing later. He had three meetings with them. In the second meeting, Mr. Damanpreet Singh of SFS led the walkout without any provocation at all. He walked out saying that leave aside the issue of fees, regularize all the employees of the University and change the rule of attendance to 75%. When he walked out, the discussion on enhancement of fees had ceased to be an issue. When he (Mr. Damanpreet Singh) walked out of the meeting, he took along all his 10-15 SFS guys who were present there. The largest contingent of students present in teh meeting was that of SFS. They had asked all students representatives to come. They did not specify how many students representatives should come. He (Mr. Damanpreet Singh) comes in the meeting with largest people with him and on his one signal, all the SFS students went out, saying that regularize all the temporary employees and without checking 75% attendance, roll numbers to all the students be issued. Those were the type of things that the persons were talking. He doesn't think, when the people had come in determined to indulge in those things, anybody can do anything. He had been shown photographs by the Panjab University Campus Students' Council President where people had come with their faces covered with the handkerchief so that they cannot be identified. Photographs show that the whole thing was pre-planned and their (Panjab University) students were misled to participate in those things. They (Panjab University students) had also been carried away because they got trapped in that. When the people say that the blame entirely rests on Dean of University Instruction he has his serious reservations, but he is not the government of the University who has to take the decision.

Principal B.C. Josan said that he had one more submission. Yesterday, he had received a phone call from the ladies staff of the University, he think other Syndicate members might have received phone calls also, that the behaviour of the Dean of University Instruction was not good.

The Vice Chancellor said that please don't indulge in that situation on the basis of such phone calls. They have to substantiate those things.

Principal B.C. Josan said that he can produce the details.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Principal B.C. Josan) had to substantiate because that forum cannot be used to have information against the people who were not present. He (DUI) is also a member of the Senate of the University.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the Dean of University Instruction looks after the University in the absence of him (Vice Chancellor). Due to their more interaction, the Vice Chancellor can judge the working of the Dean of University Instruction in the best way. Therefore, the Vice Chancellor can rightly judge the working of the Dean of University Instruction. As per his understanding, the Dean of University Instruction was doing right work, he was doing good work.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal also supported what Shri Varinder Singh told.

The Vice Chancellor said that personally he doesn't have any complaint.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Shri Varinder Singh said that if there was no complaint then it was right.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he had no problem at all.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharm said that he had also told in the Senate in your presence. If the commanding chief runs away from scene, he (Dean of University Instruction), himself accepted that he left the office and he had handed over the Vice-Chancellorship to Director Research, what position he had in hierarchy and after that he says (Dean of University Instruction) that he went away from the backdoor along with his staff by getting the office locked. That was very high irresponsible approach. He (Vice Chancellor) says that the students had come with determination, should Vice Chancellor and others go to their home. They had to face the situation and the Vice Chancellor was the sole responsible for that situation, if he had gone from that scene. He thinks there was no bigger lapse than that in the world. He had earlier also said that get the inquiry of the incident to know what happened on that day, whether it was right for him (Dean of University Instruction) to leave the scene. His thinking was that that his (Dean of University Instruction's) behaviour was most irresponsible for that situation on that day. There was a case of sedition on the students, complaints were lodged and taken back. The persons performing as Vice-Chancellor on that day should have seen that entire situation. If the war was going on and a high ranked Officer says to lower ranked person to take note of situation, he (Officer) was going at home, that was not the responsible approach. He wants to say that what the lapse had been done by him (Dean of University Instruction) at that time and behaved like an irresponsible person, the inquiry of the incident should be done. He knows that, but he don't want to take the name of that person, he had taken a report from the responsible persons who said that the Dean of University Instruction had run away from the situation and created problem for them, what to do. Those were the functions of the University. He wants to say that don't defend any person, he (Vice Chancellor) might be satisfied form him (Dean of University Instruction) but he was talking of that particular situation due to which they had to face the people because of mishandling of the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

situation. Students protest on their issues, police comes in the University, everything happens but the situations are defused. What was the festival on that day that made him (Dean of University Instruction) to go there compulsorily? He says that that was not responsible behaviour. If he (Dean of University Instruction) must have to go on that day, the next person on hierarchy should have been put on duty. But that was not the way to say that the students had come determined. Police had also come determined; they were also come with force. The question was who had taken the action first, the provocation was from both sides, i.e., students and police. Get the inquiry of the incident. Everything should be thrashed out in the Governing Body meeting. If they give the extension to the Dean of University Instruction, the same situation may happen when the Vice Chancellor will have to go out of station. That thing had to be seen, inquiry should be got done. Everything should be seen, how the lapse happened, why that lapse happened. He (Dean of University Instruction) himself had said that he went from there by giving the charge to the Director Research. Whether the Director Research can become the Vice Chancellor, Where that decision had been taken? Therefore, they should talk with open mind. He doesn't come with any prestige issue and the Vice Chancellor should also not come with any prestige issue that he (Vice Chancellor) had to get that work done. Let them do the discussion; let the inquiry be done of the whole episode.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there was a general perception in the society that on the 11<sup>th</sup> of April, was very disturbing day in the University and that issue should have been tackled in a professional manner and in that background, he was also of the opinion that the extension period may duly be considered in the background that whether he would like to continue, he was not in favour that present Dean of University Instruction should continue.

Professor Pam Rajput said that what the situation had developed on the 11<sup>th</sup> of April, he (Vice Chancellor) rightly said that inquiry should be held. He (Vice Chancellor) was absolutely right. If somebody was really responsible and there was dereliction of duty then they have to take cognizance of it. But, otherwise whole House was of the wisdom to decide whatever.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to individually opine, he will come to the voting latter.

Principal B.C. Josan said that he was not in favour of extending the term of Dean of University Instruction.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that he was also not in favour.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that he was not in favour.

Shri Jarnail Singh and Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they had already spoken.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that had he talked to the students when he (Dean of University Instruction) was asked by the DSW, things could not have gone that bad.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that that was the point.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when there was another day, he (Vice Chancellor) put my responsibility and somebody else's responsibility, nothing that sort of happened because he talked to the students immediately.

The Vice Chancellor said that that was later.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that yes that was later.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) was also present in the University on that day (11<sup>th</sup> April).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they never know, the Chief of University Security called him. He believes that there was dereliction of duty; he (present Dean of University Instruction) should not be given extension.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that he was not in favour.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he was with the group.

The Vice Chancellor said that that was not a group. They were there representing respective faculties. There was no group. They were individuals there.

Professor Mukesh Arora said ok, he was not in favour.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that every person may not be brave that may stand in the brawl. Somebody may be cowardly. He (Dean of University Instruction) may have scared from stones and stood back. See his (Dean of University Instruction) other works also, if he had right works. If a person had abused some one, he cannot be hanged. Inquiry of the incident should be got done, if there was anything that could be seen. But, he was in favour of giving extension to him (present Dean of University Instruction).

Shri Varinder Singh said that firstly, he would talk the video of the incident that he had also seen. He had seen in that video that both the gates of Vice Chancellor Office were closed from inside. Some persons were outside, and some persons were stuck between the side walls and the stones were being thrown. In that situation, no one was able to come outside. Second thing was, there was DSW to tackle the students.

The Vice Chancellor said that there were three DSWs.

Shri Varinder Singh said that Chief Security Officer, other officials and Wardens were there.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had 17 hostels and their Wardens also.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that all were helpless.

Shri Varinder Singh said that DSW had maximum association with the students. It was not that only the Dean of University Instruction, who was next to the Vice Chancellor, had to tackle the students. Dean Student Welfare and Chief of University Security mostly negotiate with the students. He doesn't consider that logic. If

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

he (Shri Varinder Singh) and Dr. Ajay Ranga were sat on strike and Vice Chancellor did not come there. If Dr. Ranga had died, then.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had talked with them (Shri Varinder Singh and Dr. Ajay Ranga) two days before. What was the reason that the members of Syndicate decided to sit on hunger strike in front of Vice Chancellor's Office when the matter was put before the Syndicate? Don't open the old issues, all the persons will be denigrated in that.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he wants to say that that was not the logic that Dean of University Instruction did not come and he (Dean of University Instruction) would not be given extension. Other options were also there. Circumstances were so that quarrel happened there. He wants to say that no person wanted to do those things intentionally. Dean of University Instruction may not have wanted throwing of stones. Circumstances were so created that stones were thrown and cane (lathi) charge had to be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Dean Student Welfare and the Dean of University Instruction had explained to them in the Senate meeting. Professor Emanuel Nahar, DSW had explained to them everything in the Senate meeting.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the circumstances become like that, otherwise no one wants to do that.

The Vice Chancellor said that the three days before of that (incident), he was continuously holding the meetings with the students. He conducted four meetings with students. Before that, one day the students led by Council President were going to the Governor's House in protest; there were not more than 20 to 25 persons.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he (Vice Chancellor) was saying right, but sometimes situation become worse when students and police come face to face. Therefore, they cannot hold a single person responsible for that.

The Vice Chancellor said that's why he personally feels that DUI do not responsible for violence. Yes, he could have stayed on after 20 clock. Somebody could have acted differently in that, but those small things could not be responsible to judge him for a full one year of performance.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he doesn't think that on one issue the extension should be given or stopped. He thinks in the routine work, their University representatives, who had more daily dealings with the Dean of University Instruction in comparison to senators from colleges and Professor Navdeep Goyal and Principal Gurdip Sharma were also the University representative, if they feel that extension should not be given then he was will them that extension should not be given.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that that has happened for the first time that he had received phones of 40 teachers that since he was in the meeting of combined faculty, he was not personally against him (Dean of University Instruction), he (Dean of University Instruction) was very good friend of him. What that pressure had been built up for the first time, for that he was not in favour of his extension.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that they should see everything by not extending his (Dean of University Instruction's) extension, also sending a message to the society about the reason; anybody can take a video and see what was the back ground in which they were taking decision. There had been so many unsavoury things that had happened with past, on behalf on behalf of the Government Body of the University, the Syndicate had never taken any such calls. Did the Syndicate express even a minor displeasure when the members of the Senate and Syndicate held hunger strike in front of the Vice Chancellor Office? They never expressed displeasure, when the Syndicate members just walked out of the meeting on September 21, 2013.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that that had totally democratic function. Every minister had the right to protest in the meeting, that was quite part of their democratic set up.

The Vice Chancellor said that his personal view at the moment was that was the senate, which also has to revalidate Dean of University Instruction's performance!

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that once whatever was recommended by the Syndicate that would be there. But once Syndicate decides that somebody should be given a chance, that person was given a chance.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that then send that to the Senate.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that what he feels is that when once Syndicate took a decision, even that decision he (Professor Dinesh K. Gupta), did not accept, e.g., he (Vice Chancellor) had approved the guide for commerce faculty; they don't have the candidate as a guide till that date. He as Dean of University Instruction says he will not allow doing that for the Colleges.

Principal B.C. Josan said that till today Research Centre had not been given (for Commerce) by present DUI.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Senate on the recommendations of the Syndicate may from time to time appoint one of the University Professors, i.e., senior Professor as Dean of University Instruction, any professor can be there. One of the professors holds the office of the Dean of University Instruction; the term of appointment shall be one year that may be reviewed after one year. So, if all of them or the majority was not in favour of giving him (then Dean of University Instruction) extension, then somebody else had to be given the chance till the Senate meets.

Professor Mukesh Arora and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the next senior most be given the chance.

The Vice Chancellor said that nowhere it was written that next should be senior most.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that that was the tradition.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that, that was fine, but not written there (in the Panjab University Calendar).

The Vice Chancellor said that the seniority of teachers was already a complicated issue. Which seniority, people were then continuing beyond the age of 60 years age and their status was dubious. Their status was more dubious because they were hybrid of regular faculty and re-employment faculty. Status for which there is no precedence, there was no place where people were regular along with re-employment and regular with contractual because the Court had not decided, that have got a very strange peculiar situation.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as already decided administrative posts were not given to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that okay; then he had to first take a call. First option could be that Professor Dinesh Kumar Gupta is not given continuation at all, second option could be that Professor Dinesh Kumar Gupta be given extension only upto the Senate meeting.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that no, question does not arise of extension up to Senate meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was just giving the proposals; members can reject anything, he was not the Government of the University, (Syndicate) members were the Government of the University. He may be allowed to articulate the options before them (members). Option one, he is not given an extension, if that is passed then they have to move on. Option two is that he be given extension only upto the date of special Meeting of the Senate. Option three that they appoint somebody straight away right then for a period of one year, if it was that then some name has to be given.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he (Vice Chancellor) may do as he wants (as regards next DUI).

The Vice Chancellor said that no, he will not be doing so.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if senior most was not available, they authorize Vice Chancellor to appoint a person who can work for him (Vice Chancellor) in a better way.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they can see some way by giving an extension and after that a special Senate meeting be convened.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it would be a wrong precedent to call a special meeting of Senate for a small issue, which would be mockery.

The Vice Chancellor said that the appointment of Dean of University Instruction is not a small thing. That is his personal opinion. He is not the Government of the University; they (members) are the government of the University. They will have to take a call on this.

Principal B.C. Josan said that he was not in favour of extending the term of present Dean of University Instruction. He

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

suggests the name of senior most Professor. Meenakshi Malhotra, i.e., third option.

The Vice Chancellor said that he doesn't know, if she is the senior most.

Members confirmed that she was the senior most.

Shri Varinder Singh said that that not necessary, he can also suggest name of his choice.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would like to know from the members one by one. So, there are three options. Option one that he be discontinued, option two that he be continued until the special meeting of the Senate or the normal meeting of the Senate, i.e., a couple of months away, option three was that his (Dean of University Instruction) term is declared over, and they decide to appoint somebody else. If somebody was else, they have to give the name.

Professor Pam Rajput said that her submission was that was a serious issue. If she knows about the history of the University, Dean of University Instruction has never been denied an extension. That item may be deferred for the time being, they will take that item after the lunch.

Principal B.C. Josan said that he was in favour of discontinuation.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Principal B.C. Josan said that new appointment be made.

The Vice Chancellor said that okay, one and three.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that his option was third, i.e., to appoint Professor. Meenakshi Malhotra.

The Vice Chancellor said that okay; his (Principal Gurdip Sharma) option was one and three.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that option three, Professor. Meenakshi Malhotra.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that definitely option three, with that senior most Professor which was eligible under the rules.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that option third, the senior most.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that option third, Professor. Meenakshi Malhotra.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that option third.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that option third.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that option second.

Shri Varinder Singh said that option second. Giving time, a special Senate meeting be called. His personal point of view was that it was not written in the calendar that the senior most be appointed

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

as Dean of University Instruction, he would suggest the name of Professor Karamjeet Singh.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that option third.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that option third.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that option third.

Professor Pam Rajput said that so she would go to the group's option.

The Vice Chancellor said that there was no group here. All are elected on behalf of the faculties, there is no group as such.

Professor Pam Rajput said that she wanted to say that she will go with the majority. She will go for Professor. Meenakshi Malhotra.

The Vice Chancellor said that okay, if it was Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, he would like to make an appeal to all of them that the Dean of University Instruction was currently engaged in a very serious issue of completing the Handbook of Information. For that decision should be effected, and the fact that Professor. Meenakshi Malhotra is proceeding on leave abroad, let the present Dean of University Instruction continue till Professor Meenakshi Malhotra returns from abroad.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu asked as for how much time she was going abroad, this be checked. Some other person should be appointed Dean of University Instruction, if she was not available.

The Vice Chancellor said that she had told him that she was going abroad.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he (Dean of University Instruction) had to complete the work of Handbook of Information; he would help in that and ask from Professor. Meenakshi Malhotra whether she was going abroad or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that she had come to him sometime back and told she was going away.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that then appoint some other person, if she goes abroad for three months, the work of the University will suffer.

The Vice Chancellor said that on her (Professor Meenaksh Malhotra) saying, Professor Suveera Gill had been given charge as Chief Vigilance Officer. She had come to him and suggested that as she was going abroad, in her absence, Professor. Suveera Gill be appointed as CVO.

He (Vice-Chancellor) would like appeal to them (Syndicate) let him (Dean of University Instruction) continue till Professor. Meenakshi Malhotra returns from abroad. If they want to discontinue him (Dean of University Instruction), please have the grace to continue him till Professor Meenakshi Malhotra returns.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that today Syndicate is being conducted, Syndicate will not be conducted tomorrow. If they



Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

found that Professor Meenakshi Malhotra will say tomorrow that she is going abroad, then decided the second option, there in the Senate meeting, see who was the next senior most.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they can ask from Professor Meenakshi Malhotra.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if the person was appointed in her (Professor Meenakshi Malhotra) reference, the next senior most person will be automatically joined.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they should take the decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was okay with what they decide.

Shri Jarnail Singh asked who is the next senior most.

The Vice Chancellor repeated that he was told that Professor Meenakshi Malhotra had asked for the leave.

The members said that okay, she (Professor. Meenakshi Malhotra) could on the leave.

The Vice Chancellor said that okay, the decision was that Professor Dinesh K. Gupta will complete the job of Handbook of Information. Professor Meenakshi Malhotra shall be appointed as Dean of University Instruction and in the absence of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, (the next senior most) Professor Shankarji Jha will perform the duty of DUI. In such a case they will also have to appoint a new CVO. Right now, Professor Suveera Gill is there on officiating charge, till they see her alternate, she (Professor Suveera Gill) will continue and that approval has to be from the Syndicate, interim arrangement was Professor. Suveer Gill will work as CVO.

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that –

- (i) the term of Professor Dinesh K. Gupta, the present Dean of University Instruction be not extended beyond 06.06.2017;
- (ii) Professor Meenakshi Malhotra be appointed as the Dean of University Instruction for a period of one year w.e.f. the date she joins, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007; and
- (iii) In case, Professor Meenakshi Malhotra proceeds on ex-India leave, during the leave period of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, Professor Shankarji Jha will officiate as Dean of University Instruction.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the appointment letter be issued in anticipation of approval of Senate.

**Exemption in fee for higher study (MDS)**

**4.** Considered request dated 11.5.2017 (**Appendix-XI**) of Dr. Monika Nagpal, Assistant Professor on temporary basis at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for exemption in fee for higher study (MDS) from the said Institute.

**NOTE:** The Vice-Chancellor has observed that if she gets a seat in MDS, let her be permitted to retain her seat on payment of token amount of 10% of the tuition fee, while her request is considered by the Syndicate Meeting to be scheduled in last week of May, 2017.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that item No. 4, 16 and R (V) be combined as these items were related to one person.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him tell what the issue was. The issue was that there was a faculty member who joined the Dental Institute on a temporary appointment. But that temporary appointment was a kind of canker. They appointed people temporarily, as they opened professional courses in the University, which had required approval/consent of AICET, DCI external agencies. So, while the institutions were being stabilized, they continued the temporary appointments year after year, and made very few regular appointments. When he came there as the Vice-Chancellor, tens of temporary positions had been advertised and very few were filled up. Because they can fill up only 178 positions out of the 400 positions that were advertised and that remaining could not be filled. So, that was the situation. Many of those positions in the colleges of the University, whether it was Engineering, Dental, Law or Hotel Management, there temporary faculty members were working. She was the faculty member in that vintage. She has been working on temporary basis since 2007. She had BDS Degree and at some stage, it may be said that BDS people cannot continue on a regular basis, only MDS can be appointed. So, that faculty, regular as well as temporary, with a BDS degree appointed in the University system, are under pressure. So, they go where they get the admission in MDS. One regular faculty had got admission in MDS and University had given study leave. Now, that was a case, she had been working temporarily since 2007, she had got MDS seat in Panjab University, now if her job would not be filled, in the intervening period and when she comes back, if her colleagues had continued working on temporary basis, then she should also be given a temporary job. That was one only plea she was making. The second plea she was making was that since she will not betechnically entitled to a leave with pay, she can take only extraordinary leave.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it can be extraordinary of half pay leave.

The Vice Chancellor said that half pay was not there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that half pay was there for some time only, he had read that.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that he had also read that she was not entitled for full pay. She was losing her salary. She may be given some fee concession.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that she is entitled for fee concession and that definitely 50% fee concession should be given to her. If they give her leave then lot of applications will come for the leave. When she comes again, she should be given consideration after MDS. That should be with reference to conditions of contract. Leave rules simply say that with reference to the conditions of contract

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they cannot give her study leave.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that she will not be given study leave. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal was saying right that study leave cannot be given. Temporary appointees cannot get study leave, but when they look at extra ordinary leave, that was clear, temporary teacher cannot be given more than 24 months where leave was required for pursuing study in the University interest, provided that the teacher had completed 3 years continuous service on date of commencement of extra ordinary leave.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there was one thing that she herself had come in general merit. She may be given pay.

The Vice Chancellor said that legal opinion needs to be sought. On that day, he doesn't want to do anything due to which MHRD may have an excuse and they (MHRD) stop their (Panjab University) grant.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there was written directions that no half pay be granted to temporary teacher, unless authority competent to sanction leave has reason to believe that the teacher will return to duty on expiry of such leave. Right then, they should give the extra ordinary leave.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that a permanent teacher also gets half days medical leave.

The Vice Chancellor asked them not to get into technicalities.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that she (Dr. Monika Nagpal) be given fee concession.

The Vice Chancellor suggested a practical solution. Practical solution was as follows. She may be given extra ordinary leave, without pay because she was temporary employee without fee, in order to enable her to return to that job. In case, some DCI requirement forces them to fill up those positions, the person who will come on that position, i.e., to fill up that position, his/her appointment will be upto that date she be given leave. Syndicate gives the temporary appointment at a time for one year.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that his suggestion was to take legal opinion.

The Vice Chancellor said that the proposal that he was taking was legally sound. Syndicate gives appointment to everyone for one year and that continue when another proposal come for one year and

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

then another proposal come for one year. As if, they (Syndicate) were competent to give her leave on the basis of her appointment with one day break, continued for nine year. So, that was temporary appointment with one day break, as if that was quasi continuous appointment. If they advertise the post and if she does not get selected, quasi continuous appointment comes to a halt, which would be end of that. So, since they want to permit her to compete for that position, currently she cannot compete for that position as she does not fulfil the requirements. One reason was that they will not advertise that position for a period of 3 years, only then she will come back. To enable her to come back at the end of 3 years again that will be with the approval of the Syndicate. The person on leave appointed on her position will be given one year appointment at a time, and cannot be given more than 3 times. Only then she will return, otherwise, she cannot return. If she returns and no position was advertised, she completes her degree, comes and join. The position that has to be advertised, the University has the regular position, the persons continuing or quasi continuing has no right. Then Uma Devi case will come. So, the practical solution was to give her 3 years leave and don't give her any money. What they had to give as half-pay share, we may give that in the form of fee concession. The fee concession was 50%, we may give her 75% fee concession.

Principal Gurdip Sharma asked how much the fee was.

The Vice Chancellor said that the fee was to the hike of 4 lakhs or 5 lakhs?

It was confirmed that the fee was 4-5 lakhs per year.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that in their all the colleges and constituent colleges in the University, appointments were made for one academic year. For academic session, they give their appointment. They can maximum help her by giving her leave upto the academic year. Suppose, she had joined in September or joined in August/July, and moves on leave in September, if comes back by the end of academic session i.e. by February or March, give that person leave and appoint a guest faculty in her place. That was not that she was on leave vacancy and that cannot be filled. Guest faculty may be appointed and maximum she can get leave of the tenures that was between academic session, not more than that. Which the example was being given of temporary service, that was continued service as the Government Colleges had appointed temporary persons. Though were doing continued service for 7-8 years, that was not actually continued service because there was one day break. Though they were appointing teachers for 5 years, but the order of their appointments were for the academic session and the second order was that if they get regular appointment, they must be removed. Even if they do not make any regular appointment in between the session, but during the next session they give the appointment to the same persons by doing their interview. Their appointments were renewed every year and they had a new appointment. He (Vice Chancellor) might remember that he had not appointed a person though they (members) tried to appoint for the benefit of the person. Because, he could not had get relief from the court. Had he been relieved in the mid-session, then Court could have given him relief, because his appointment was for the academic session. If they had not appointed a regular person, court would have given him relief. If, after the end of the session, they don't give appointment to a person in the new

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

session, court does not give relief, because it was their (authority's) prerogative to give appointment or not, because the appointment was for one session. So, leave for that temporary teacher either she had 3 years or 5 years. Only during that academic period, whether 5 months or 4 months, can be given leave, if they want to help her and appoint a guest faculty in place of her. Nothing more can be done in that case. The rule that was there (in Panjab University) for temporary appointments, that was also in the Government colleges, where persons were working for 8 years, their services were continuous service.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they had the stay of the Court.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the Court's stay was applicable later on. The court's stay has been allowed now. Earlier, they got the stay on the basis that they were continuously working from 3 to 4 years and when they were given new appointment, they took the stay from the court. That temporary rule was implemented on those persons, who were doing continuous service, but in this (Dr. Monika Nagpal's) case, there was a break. She had no continuous service.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that break was also in their case. After 4-5 years service, Court says to give benefit.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in the letter attached in the agenda it is written that appointment will be for a period of one year.

The Vice Chancellor said that more than hundred teachers were there like her.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal asked if he (Vice Chancellor) would make them permanent.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that if they give them one year's appointment, it may be that in the next year, some other candidate may come.

The Vice Chancellor said that we could make them permanent, when the posts will be advertised.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they will be allowing her joining again, but, if they relieve a person in the academic session and make a new advertisement, no Court gives relief to him/her.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that perhaps, they (Panjab University) had not given break to her. If there was break, then how the service can be continuous.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the break was there technically.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that suppose they give exemption of fee and the person pursues higher studies, will they get a bond filled that the person will come back to them. Money will be given by them if he/she gets another job and he/she may go there. That should also be seen. That will have to be done with that permission.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that when they were permitting her, then giving her offer as many as she has.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that she will be exempted fee and do the MDS. If she gets better job, she will join there, and whereas the money will be spent by them (Panjab University). Benefit should also go to Panjab University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he (Professor Mukesh Arora) was right; some undertaking should be taken from her.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that when the temporary person going to leave the seat, some other person should not be deprived and be appointed in her place.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they gave the money and she may leave the job after doing MDS.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that at page 97, leave for temporary employees, clause 8 says that leave to the employees engaged on contract will be in accordance with the terms of the contract entered into. Temporary employees mean on contract. There was nothing mentioned in their terms and conditions. That was not arbitrarily, he does not think that, that will be a good precedence. Give her what she has the right.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it was written there that one month notice from either side be given.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they should take the legal opinion.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that don't do the wrong thing, don't do that.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point was he told what he had the understanding of that case. That the person who will be appointed at her place, that person will be given appointment of one year each time. At the end of the year, it has to be decided whether she is to be given appointment in the fourth year.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it cannot be a vacancy.

The Vice Chancellor said that, if at the end of the third year, if this lady wants to continue and if she is available, should we give her the job? This is the thing.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if she is better qualified and the Syndicate approves her appointment, she can be appointed.

While asking about who is a temporary employee, the Vice Chancellor said that our calendars were written when there was no Dental College. and University Institute of Engineering & Technology and no such appointment was made at that time. Neither anybody used to demand leaves at that time, nor they say that he is working on temporary basis and his job be kept secured for him/her, when he comes back after doing his Ph.D.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

However, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that such appointments were made in other departments.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that even today, nobody ask for leave. In it is only we people who give them such facilities and they start demanding the facilities. He asked if anybody in 194 colleges of Punjab has been given such leave. When we give such type of leave to a person, he will apply for more leave. Temporary means, temporary arrangement, if someone likes to go, he could go.

The Vice Chancellor read out a letter dated 11.5.2007, in which it has been mentioned that the Vice Chancellor is pleased to appoint you (you means her) as Lecturer in Dental/Oral Anatomy at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., Chandigarh on contract basis for one year in the scale of 8000-275-1350 + NPA at a basic pay of Rs. 8000/- from the date she joins the duty on terms and conditions of the appointment. The appointment is for a period of one year or up to the age of 65 years or till the post is filled by regular selection. They asked whether the letter is written in 2006 or 2007. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he was not there in 2006.

The Vice Chancellor said that if we ask her to give an undertaking that she will work with us for one year after completion of her MDS, it will give the impression that we have bound ourselves to give her appointment.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said if we appoint her on regular post, then she will say that she will do the job. However, the Vice Chancellor made it clear that they will not appoint her on regular basis.

Most of the member said that she cannot be granted leave.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said if she is such a good teacher, then why she is not appointed on regular basis as she has been working since 2007.

Most of the members said that she cannot be granted study leave. With this, the University will unnecessarily lose Rs. 3-4 lakhs. She can also not be granted fee concession. When the post gets vacant, she could compete.

The Vice Chancellor said that if we have to make her able to compete for the regular job, then it will be necessary for her to do MDS, otherwise she cannot compete for the regular position.

However, most of the members gave their opinion in favour of granting her fee concession.

Dr. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that she should be given atleast 50% fee concession.

Sh. Varinder Kumar, however, requested for more fee concession

**RESOLVED:** That request dated 11.5.2017 (**Appendix-XI**) of Dr. Monika Nagpal, Assistant Professor on temporary basis at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

University, Chandigarh, be accepted and she be granted 50% exemption in fee for higher study (MDS) from the said Institute

**Case of Dr. Gurmail Singh  
(Re-employed) regarding  
leave without pay**

5. Considered if, Professor Gurmail Singh, (Re-employed), Department of Economics be granted extension in Leave without pay for one year more, w.e.f. 05.05.2017, as requested by him vide dated 17.04.2017 (**Appendix-XII**) to enable him to continue as Vice-Chancellor of Akal University Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda, Punjab.

- NOTE:**
1. Dr. Gurmail Singh, Professor (Re-employed) was granted EOL without pay for one year w.e.f. 5.5.2015 to join as Vice-Chancellor at Akal University, Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda, Punjab.
  2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 01/05/2016 (Para 10) had resolved that Professor Gurmail Singh, (Re-employed), Department of Economics, be granted extension in Leave without pay for one year more, w.e.f. 05.05.2016, to enable him to continue as Vice-Chancellor of Akal University Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda, Punjab.
  3. Professor Gurmail Singh is working as re-employed Professor w.e.f. 03.06.2014 and his re-employment is up to attaining the age of 65 years, which will be ending on 01.05.2019.
  4. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 08.10.2013 (Para 5) (**Appendix-XII**) has resolved that the teacher re-employed after superannuation, be entitled to 20 days Casual Leave (any time), Special Casual Leave for 10 days and Special Academic Leave for 30 days and Duty Leave as per University Rules and Regulation except Half Pay Leave and Commuted Leave. In addition, Extra Ordinary Leave without pay not exceeding one year be also allowed to the incumbent.
  5. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XIII**).

**RESOLVED:** That Professor Gurmail Singh, (Re-employed), Department of Economics be granted extension in Leave without pay for one more year, w.e.f. 05.05.2017, as requested by him vide request dated 17.04.2017 (**Appendix-XII**) to enable him to continue as Vice-Chancellor of Akal University Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda, Punjab.



## **Approval of revised Ph.D. Registration Form**

**6.** Considered if, the revised Ph.D. Registration Form (s) (**Appendix-XIII**), as recommended by the Committee (constituted by the DUI) in its meeting dated 13.01.2017 (**Appendix-XIII**), be approved:

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there are two forms, i.e., Appendix 'A' and Appendix 'B' for Registration as a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The Appendix 'A' at Sr. No. 6, in the line "(in case of approved Centre, permission of Head of the Centre be enclosed), the word Principal may also be incorporated after the word 'Head'.

However, the Vice Chancellor said that, here the Head means Principal and every college has to designate the Principal as Head of the Research Centre.

Dr. Dalip Kumar further pointed out that below the heading 'Declaration/Consent of the Proposed Supervisor(s)', there are eight columns given for filling up the details. He wanted to know the details to be filled, in these eight columns. These details should be clear, i.e., name of the candidate, enrolment etc. Mentioning the eight columns without details is not enough. He, therefore, requested that details should also be there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that these details should be taken on a separate letter. There may be a Supervisor or a Co-supervisor. Therefore, such details should be taken separately from the Supervisor and the Co-supervisor, as these may not be the same.

Dr. Dalip Kumar further referring to the second page of the Appendix-A read out the heading at the top i.e. 'Recommendation of the Chairperson of the Department of the Panjab University'. He suggested to add the word 'Principal' here and it should be Chairperson/Principal. He again pointed out to add the word 'Principal' after head/Chairperson, where the recommendation part ends. He also pointed out that the Panjab University Website has been wrongly mentioned as 'puchd.ne.in' whereas it should be 'www.puchd.ac.in'. He also pointed out that the fee for Ph.D. (Payable at the time of submission in the University Office) has been mentioned in Appendix-B, but the same has not been mentioned in Appendix-A. He requested to mention it in Appendix-A also. He, further said that the fees has been mentioned as Rs. 7000/-, whereas at present it is Rs. 12000/-. He again pointed out to add the word 'Principal' under the heading IMPORTANT NOTES.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the quantum of fee should be removed from the form as it may change.

As regards the number of copies to be appended with the form for submission to the faculties, Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the students deposit even 25 copies of the synopses. Such a large number of copies is not required. After some discussion, it was unanimously agreed that in place of 15 copies, it may be permitted to deposit 10 copies of synopses, in case of Faculties of Arts/Pharmaceutical Sciences/Business Management & Commerce/Engineering & Technology/Education/Design & Fine

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Arts. In the same way, instead of 25 copies, the students be allowed to submit 15 copies, in case of Science/Law/Medical Sciences Faculties. He further pointed out that at the end of Annexure-B, in the column 'Signature of the Chairperson of the Department', it has been also written, "Principal of Home Science". He requested that the word 'Home Science' should be removed as the form is common for all. Since there were many mistakes in the form, Dr. Dalip Kumar was requested to carry out the corrections and then submit the form.

Shri Jarnail Singh raised the issue with regard to the number of research students being supervised by the Head Supervisor or a Co-Supervisor. He said that, the eight students supervised by a Head Supervisor and a Co-Supervisor, are shown by both of them as their own students. Thus, making the number as sixteen, which is not fair. He, therefore, requested that some genuine number of students should be arrived at and conveyed for further action. He suggested that this number should be less than double, so that it should look that some research is actually being done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is another issue. Earlier, a teacher could supervise eight Ph.D. students. However, in the new Ph.D guidelines, an Assistant Professor could guide only four Ph.D. students. He pointed out that there are some cases where the work is very slow. He pointed out that some of the cases have been sent from the department, but these are lying in the office. The students have already joined the programme. He, therefore, requested that such cases should not be delayed/stopped.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to submit a note in this regard, so that the same could be discussed in the Chairpersons meeting

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised, on behalf of the Syndicate, to approve the revised Ph.D. Registration Form (s) (**Appendix-XIII**), as recommended by the Committee (constituted by the DUI) in its meeting dated 13.01.2017 (**Appendix-XIII**), with suggested modifications.

**Request of Shri Kuldeep Singh to appear as a private candidate in LL.M. examination**

7. Considered recommendation dated 31.03.2017 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.02.2017 that the request of Shri Kuldeep Singh to appear in LL.M. examination as a private candidate, on account of being a disable person with disability with 100% deafness, cannot be acceded to.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.02.2017 (Para 14) (**Appendix-XIV**) considered the request of Shri Kuldeep Singh for allowing him to appear in Master of Laws (LL.M.) examination as a private candidate and it was resolved that a committee of the Dean, Faculty of Laws, Chairperson, Department of Laws, Director, UILS and the Controller of Examinations be constituted to examine the matter and submit the report.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation dated 31.03.2017 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.02.2017 that the request of Shri Kuldeep Singh to appear in LL.M. examination as a private candidate, on account of being a disable person with disability with 100% deafness, cannot be acceded to, be approved.

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 09.05.2017**

**of Interest dated**

**8.** Considered minutes dated 09.05.2017 (**Appendix-XV**) of the Interest Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the rate of interest on Contributory Provident Fund and General Provident Fund to be paid to the employees for the period 01.04.2016 to 31.03.2017.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was unofficially told that when the permission for continuation of grant from Centre Government will come, we will be given the strict instructions by the Government to adhere to the financial rules. Here 'government' means Central Government', but we think it is Punjab Government because we are governed by Punjab Government rules. But, nothing has come from Delhi so far. The indications are that the Central Government financial rules will override the Punjab Government Financial Rules. He said that the Government of the University is the Syndicate so the matter will come to it and they should be prepared to take a call on conflict of instructions from two stakeholders.

**RESOLVED:** That minutes dated 09.05.2017 (**Appendix-XV**) of the Interest Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the rate of interest on Contributory Provident Fund and General Provident Fund to be paid to the employees for the period 01.04.2016 to 31.03.2017, be approved.

**Conversion of residential building of PUSGRC into Guest House**

**9.** Considered if, the residential building at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur campus (which was donated by Late Dr. Lajpat Rai Munger), be converted into a guest house and the immediate family members of Late Dr. Lajpat Rai Munger be allowed to stay in this guest house accommodation free of cost as and when they visit the campus in the coming years. This will be a goodwill gesture and a tribute to the departed noble soul.

**NOTE:** 1. The Senate in its meeting 18.12.2005 (Para III) (**Appendix-XVI**) had read out the recommendation of the Syndicate dated 17.12.2005 (Para 2) that the proposal of Shri Lajpat Rai Munger, President, Swami Sarvanand Giri Institute of Information Technology, Hoshiarpur, for donating the land (i) on Una Road: 10 acres, 15 marlas and all buildings constructed on this land and (ii) about 22.5 acres of land in Village Throli, planted with poplar trees, be accepted and appreciation and thanks of the Syndicate be conveyed to the donor.

2. As per report of the D.R. Estate, Dr. Lajpat Rai Munger had left for his heavenly abode on 22.08.2016.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

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

Shri Jarnail Singh said, he has heard that perhaps Dr. Lajpat Rai Munger has expired last year. So he urged the Vice Chancellor to include his name in the Vice Chancellor's Statement as Dr. Lajpat Rai Munger has made a great contribution. He further requested that a copy of the resolution be sent to the members of his family. The Vice Chancellor instructed the Director of Public Relations to send a Condolence message to the family members of Dr, Lajpat Rai Munger.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma while pointing out another issue said that at the time of agreement, it was decided that the employees who were otherwise eligible, would be absorbed in the University system. He informed that all of them have been absorbed, except one Homeopathy doctor and requested to absorb her also in the University system.

The Vice Chancellor said, let the financial sanction come from Delhi, then they will see to it.

Professor Mukesh Arora requested to fill up the vacant post so the studies of the students may not suffer.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment they cannot fill any teaching post. However, he said that he would do it before his term ends.

**RESOLVED:** That the residential building at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur campus (which was donated by Late Dr. Lajpat Rai Munger), be converted into a guest house and the immediate family members of Late Dr. Lajpat Rai Munger be allowed to stay in this guest house accommodation, free of cost as and when they visit the campus in the coming years.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That –

- (i) the Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Dr. Lajpat Rai Munger; and
- (ii) a copy of the above Resolution be sent to the members of the bereaved family.

**Recommendation of Executive Committee of PUSC dated 02.05.2017**

**10.** Considered minutes dated 02.05.2017 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Executive Committee of PUSC.

**RESOLVED:** That minutes dated 02.05.2017, as per **Appendix**, of the Executive Committee of PUSC, be approved.

**Report of the Survey Committee dated 18.04.2017**

**11.** Considered report of the survey Committee dated 18.04.2017 (**Appendix-XVIII**) in respect of newly proposed degree College namely Doraha College for Girls, Doraha, Distt. Ludhiana, to undertake and assess the availability of Land / Building/ required Infrastructure and other facilities for starting of the proposed new course.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma pointed out that the Change of Land Use Certificate (CLU) is not attached with the item.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice-Chancellor said that the CLU has been attached.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the CLU is from the Municipal Council, but it is issued by the Punjab Government and not by Municipal Council. He requested that the CLU be sought from the College.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the Dean College Development Council to seek the CLU from the College.

Shri Varinder Singh said that in some earlier cases also, the CLU was from the Municipal Council.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that this College is already functioning.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that in the case of B.Ed. Colleges running in the rural areas, they have granted permission even to the Colleges having less than 1 acre in which cases the CLU is issued by the Panchayats.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the requirement of CLU is in the cases where new Colleges are to be started, but this is an old College.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there is a letter from these Government that in the rural areas, the certificate is issued by the Panchayat. He would provide a copy of this letter.

Shri Varinder Singh said that on the basis of the certificate by Patwari, the Tehsildar/SDM issues such a certificate.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the CLU is required for opening a new institution, whereas in the present case the College is already running and the management is also the same. The new building is also not to be constructed. Therefore, there is no requirement of a fresh CLU.

Shri Varinder Singh and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that for rural areas, the certificate is issued by the SDM, therefore, it should be allowed.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it should be allowed as also the case of a College at Malout.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if a new College is to be started in place of a already running College, then the NOC is required. It should also be checked.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested that it should be got verified. If this case is to be approved, then other cases should also be allowed. He said that it should be allowed subject to verification

**RESOLVED:** That report of the Survey Committee dated 18.04.2017 (**Appendix-XVIII**) in respect of newly proposed degree College namely Doraha College for Girls, Doraha, Distt. Ludhiana, to undertake and assess the availability of Land / Building/ required Infrastructure and other facilities for starting of the proposed new

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

course, be approved subject to verification of the Land Use Certificate from the competent authority.

At this Stage Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he had requested the General Branch to hand over him the supplementary agenda as he was in the town. Even Principal B.C. Josan is also not having. Anyhow, he could not get it and went home. He got a telephone call on 25<sup>th</sup> night at 10.30 p.m. while he was sleeping. He told the person on the phone to leave the agenda wherever convenient and inform in the morning. He again received a call which he did not receive and switched off the phone. Thereafter, there was no information about the delivery of the agenda. Sometimes, it is easy to collect the agenda from Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang. He did not like to use such words, but it is an irresponsible behaviour that till date he has neither received any information nor the supplementary agenda. He has not read even a word of the supplementary agenda which he could discuss. Even Principal B.C. Josan, being a local Fellow, has also not received the supplementary agenda. He could not contribute anything in the absence of the supplementary agenda as there might be some important issues to be discussed.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they have provided the address for the agenda to be delivered. The main agenda is delivered at that address, but sometimes the supplementary agenda is delivered at the College and by chance he went to the College and got it. He suggested that the supplementary agenda should also be delivered at the same address, where the main agenda is delivered.

It was informed that the delay is regretted and the proper delivery of the agenda would be ensured.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he even sometimes requested to provide the agenda at the guest house and there is no use of sending special messengers through vehicles, which also entails a lot of expenditure on behalf of the University. He did not receive any message from that person again.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that some extra copies of the agenda could be placed in the guest house, which would enable the members to go through the agenda.

It was informed that proper delivery of the agenda would be ensured.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that whenever the delivery persons start from Chandigarh, they should inform in advance, instead of making a call after reaching the destination late in the night.

Principal I.S. Sandhu also supported this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the number of the outstation members of the Syndicate is less than 10. A phone call could be made to all these persons. The issue raised by the members is well taken.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that his agenda could be given even to Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice-Chancellor said that phone call would be made to the outstation members and directed the Deputy Registrar General to ensure it

**Master seniority list of teachers**

**12.** Considered the proposal (**Appendix-XIX**) of Professor A.K. Bhandari in respect of preparation of Master Seniority list of teachers.

**NOTE:** A copy of letter No. 3508/Estt.I dated 22.05.2017 with regard to withdrawal of tentative masters seniority list of teachers enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**).

- (i) re-considered the entire case with regard to make master list of seniority of teachers in the University, pursuant to the legal opinion dated 16.05.2017 (**Appendix-XIX**) of Shri Subhash Ahuja, Advocate with regard to reply to contempt notice in CWP No.14639/2015 Dr. Deepak Kapur Vs. Panjab University and others dated 27.04.2017.

**NOTE: 1.** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.04.2017 (Para 5) (**Appendix-XIX**) considered the minutes dated 30.03.2017 to make master list of seniority of teachers in the University and has resolved that the seniority list of teachers be put on the Panjab University website and objections, if any, be invited from the teachers within a period of 15 days and the item be again placed before the Syndicate.

2. Professor Deepak Kapur vide e-mail dated 16.5.2017 has requested for grant of permission to approach the Chancellor and Minister of HRD etc. He has been informed in this regard by the Vice-Chancellor vide email dated 23.5.2017 (copies enclosed) (**Appendix-XIX**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is a perennial problem, it is a generic problem and not related to only Panjab University but to all the universities of India because the promotions have to happen as per the UGC guidelines and UGC keeps changing guidelines from time to time particularly whenever a new Pay Commission is coming or whenever the Chairman of the UGC changes, these things keep happening. Before the implementation of the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, promotions used to be carried out in a certain way. After that the things have changed a little. Some universities have a clause of probation while others do not have this clause when it comes to appointment at the level of Professor. For example, in University of Delhi, there is no probation period when one is appointed as a Professor. Many universities have no probation period when it comes to promoting people through CAS, it is a routine thing. Where is the question of probation period when one is promoted? He also did not have any probation period where he worked for 40 years after his first probation period of one year. First time, there was a probation period



Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

of one year and there was also a clause of an efficiency like bar of 5 years and one could be kicked out of the job at the end of 5 years because one is not worthy of having a job till the age of 60 years. Thereafter, there were no probation periods as where one got promoted in TIFR system. In the year 2010, the UGC in its wisdom decided not to make a distinction between people who are appointed via an open advertisement and people appointed to a given rank of Associate Professor or Professor against CAS. This problem is not again specific to the Universities. He (VC) has been attending the PGIMER Selection Committees as the Vice-Chancellor for the last 4 years and they also have the similar problems. At some stage, they decided that if the promotion of a person under CAS is due from a back date, which is before the date of interview of open selection and a person has got CAS promotion, that person would not be interviewed. Because a person has already got CAS and appears for the open selection and gets selected, then the waiting list would exhaust. The PGIMER and AIIMS have stopped this practice and there is no confirmation clause. But in the University, there is a practice of confirmation. The confirmation makes sense only for those external persons who are appointed through open selection, but, not for the (internal) persons coming through CAS. There is some difficulty when the confirmation is done after one year. As a result, the matter went to the Senate and the Committees were formed but the Committees did not deliberate on the issue. After a long time, Professor A.K. Bhandari accepted this responsibility and according to his recommendations, a seniority list was prepared which was presented last time before the Syndicate, but there were some issues and thus the matter is back in the Syndicate. In the meanwhile, so many other things have got entangled. One of the entanglement is of the appointment of Professor Deepak Kapur as Professor in the University Business School (UBS) in the year 2009. It is after the cut off date of 31<sup>st</sup> December, 2008 up to which the old things would apply. Now, there is a new date, which is 2010 where the UGC has categorically stated that when it comes to seniority, then the date of eligibility and the appointment against open selection have to complete. There is no explicitly expressed opinion from the Syndicate that they endorse whatever Professor Bhandari Committee used to prepare the seniority list. The Syndicate accepted that the UGC guidelines of 2010 would apply and how it would apply is that after 1<sup>st</sup> January, 2009, the date of eligibility and the date of joining for the open candidate would be compared for the purpose of preparing the seniority list. In the meanwhile, the case of Professor Deepak Kapur was going on that he is the senior-most to the persons whose date of eligibility is before his appointment under CAS and some of those persons who had appeared with him for the open selection, but were not selected and he was selected. Therefore, he is the senior-most amongst them. To buttress his claim, Professor Kapur is citing a previous case of Professor Rajesh Gill where similar question had occurred. But the Court could not come to an ultimate decision, but Professor Rajesh Gill had been given the benefit in the interim period and the case is still going on. No decision in that case has been taken. Professor Kapur is saying that whatever consideration Professor Rajesh Gill had been given, the same should also be given to him. He is blaming that whatever the University is doing, it is doing deliberately to deprive him of the benefit. Yesterday only, they have received a legal notice that the Syndicate ought not even consider the agenda item No.12 in view of the matter being debated in the Court. Professor Kapur had also made a representation saying that he be granted the permission to articulate his case before the Chancellor, as he is the authority

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

beyond the University. He invited Professor Kapur and told him that he has looked into his case in its entirety and found that the University has been very kind to him to enable him to permit whatever he wanted to do in life for his professional progress. In view of so many enabling things that the University, the governing bodies of the University have done to allow him to reach wherever he has reached and requested Professor Kapur not to try to force the University to litigation and accept whatever the rest of the University desires. It should not be complicated and the UGC guidelines of the date of eligibility and date of new appointment as a Professor should be respected. Professor Kapur says that the University has not been very kind to him, but has discriminated against him. He tried to plead with him that the facts do not speak otherwise and are very clear. He would not come in his way to go and represent his case to the higher authorities, he (Professor Kapur) could go ahead and represent his case to the higher authorities. He told him that he would also not hesitate to tell the higher authorities how the University has been kind to him to enable him to pursue his professional career. If the University has to fight the case in the Courts, then they would also put the University's viewpoint with whatever strength the University has to put. Then Professor Kapur said that the University has gone to the Supreme Court and the case is still under consideration there and he could go and fight there. He requested Professor Kapur to understand the entire history of his own career in the University and the University has been helpful to him at so many stages, how the governing bodies have been helpful to him at so many stages. But Professor Kapur did not listen to him and withdrew his plea that he would not go to the higher authorities and instead he has issued a legal notice that the Syndicate should not consider the item. When he (Vice-Chancellor) looked at the whole thing, supposing Professor Kapur had not quit the University and come back and claimed his position in the open, he would have been nowhere in the University. Professor Kapur joined the University in the year 1994 as a Lecturer in Mechanical Engineering in the Department of Chemical Engineering. He has a brilliant record in his B.Tech. from Punjab Engineering College. He joined Government job in several public sector undertakings from 1984 to 1993. In the year 1994, he applied for a teaching position in Chemical Engineering and at that time he was not serving anywhere. He was doing MBA (part-time) 3-year course at the University Business School when he applied for a job of Lecturer in Department of Chemical Engineering in 1994. He was taken in 1994 and in 1996, he completed his MBA (part-time) 3-year course. As soon as he completed MBA, he applied to do Ph.D. at IIM, Ahmedabad. In IIM, very few people are taken in the Fellowship Programme, which is a prestigious programme. He got it and he applied for study leave. Since he was a regular employee, he was given 2-year study leave as his confirmation was over. The Syndicate gave him 2-year study leave with pay. He went on study leave for two years and applied for extension of leave with pay, but, the Syndicate granted him extraordinary leave without pay for two years. His thesis could not be completed in four years and he asked for further extension which was given to him. He returned after four years and four months to the Department of Chemical Engineering. Since he was on study leave and two years extraordinary leave, when he came back and he got all the annual increments. When he returned back, he was given two additional increments for having obtained the Ph.D. Since he was Ph.D. and having so many years of service, out of which he has taught only for 2 years, but being permitted by the rules, he became a Senior Lecturer. When he was a Senior Lecturer, a well-

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

wisher Syndicate member moved a resolution that his services could be better utilised in the UBS instead of Chemical Engineering, he was transferred to the UBS. As resolution was passed in Syndicate the Department of Chemical Engineering protested that they would be losing a teacher and the UBS people asked that if he comes in the UBS, where he would stand in the seniority vis-a-vis other teachers in the UBS. Whether he would be treated as a fresh entrant or the seniority would be counted from back date. They pointed out that he is not a UBS faculty but transferred from Chemical Engineering. Because of non-resolution of this issue, they kept protesting but anyway since it was a resolution of the Syndicate, accepted by the Senate, he was transferred from Chemical Engineering to UBS. Now he was teaching in UBS and he applied for leave to accept the position of Reader in the XLRI, Jamshedpur. On journey XLRI, he was sent to their Dubai Campus. In the meanwhile, the Reader's position fell vacant in the open category in UBS. He was on leave, but he returned (from Dubai) to appear for the interview. He was selected. The leave that he had availed, he abandoned the leave, he came back and joined as a Reader in the UBS. After 30 days of joining as a Reader in the UBS, he got selected as a Professor at Dehradun in Institute of Petroleum and Energy Studies which is not a Government organisation but of a kind of public-private partnership of corporate sector as well as Ministry of Petroleum. It is a kind of quasi deemed University in private category. There is some Government presence also. There, the scale of Professor was as per the UGC norms. He was given 7 advance increments. From Reader's position in UBS, he moved as Professor at Dehradun and that too with 7 advance increments and his basic pay was fixed at Rs.19550/-. He stayed there for less than one year and applied to IMT, Ghaziabad. He was given the Professor's position, whose salary scale was like that of IITs. The scale of the University started at Rs.16,400/- and his scale started at Rs.18,400/-. In that pay scale, he was given two increments and the basic was kept at Rs.19400/-. But he protested that this is less than what he was getting at Dehradun. So, before he joined that place, the offer was enhanced to Rs.19,900/- which was more than Rs.19,550/- which he was getting at Dehradun. Now, he was at IMT, Ghaziabad which has a salary structure which is very funny, Rs.18,400/- with increment of Rs.500/- up to Rs.22,400/-. After that there is an increment of Rs.600/- till the scale of Rs.29,000/-. In the scheme of 5<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, even the Secretary to the Government of India did not have that basic salary. This is a scale which goes even beyond the Secretary to Government of India, all Vice-Chancellors, even the Directors of IITs got only Rs.26,000/-. This scale at IMT was going up to Rs.29,000/-. These are private organisation that they could do whatever they wanted. He joined there at a basic salary of Rs.19,900/-.

Then a position of Professor falls vacant and is advertised on behalf of the University. He applies for this position and is given the position, and the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission had not yet arrived. The position is advertised in the scale of Rs.16400-22400 with an increment of Rs.450/- up to Rs.19,900/- and thereafter the increment was Rs.500/-. He applies and got selected and the Selection Committee gives him 5 advance increments in the pay scale of Rs.16400/- and his basic pay was Rs.18650/-. When the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission came, the University did not implement the decision that a person appointed directly should be given the minimum basic of Rs.43,000/- in the Professor's scale. The Syndicate did not pay attention to it. His basic was fixed near Rs.40,000/-. But he did not

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

accept it, so there was an issue of salary and of the seniority another. The Committee formed for preparing the seniority did not reply anything. The Committee formed on the issue of salary also did not reply anything. There was no reply from MHRD also. He (Vice-Chancellor) visited the MHRD and raised this issue several times with MHRD but it is not giving any reply and keeping silent, because this thing applies to the College Principals also and they have also to be given the basic of Rs.43,000/-. Those universities which did not implement this decision or the audit of which of the universities did not allow its implementation, those universities are suffering due to it. In that background, how to handle the twin desires of Professor Deepak Kapur, how to give him the benefit of higher salary or how to give the benefit of seniority. He was selected directly during an interview where some of his colleagues who did not get selected but had claimed their promotions because of eligibility from back date. They could wait for their promotions from the back date because practically they have to serve the University a long way through various stages. This gentleman has not gone through those processes. He had been appointed as a Reader. If he had continued as Reader, then in the scheme of 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, 3 years after appointment as a Reader, he would have been eligible for basic of Rs.14,940/-. His seniority would have been somewhere else and he desires his seniority somewhere else citing some reasons. This is his desire. To fulfil his desire of salary, the Syndicate was kind enough and passed a resolution that a person coming from any institution approved by Government regulatory body system, the last pay drawn would be protected. He submitted his last pay drawn certificate from Ghaziabad where his basic salary was Rs.22,940/-. Nobody cared to find that this basic could not be there in that pay scale. He submitted two salary certificates, one of which was when he had applied for the position where his salary was given as Rs.22,440/-. In order to give him the benefit of his salary protection, the University protected the salary and whatever maximal they could do in the system, they did. As on date, they have two problems. One is generic problem that how the seniority list of the University is to be prepared and for that they have no option. They are duty bound to implement the UGC guidelines where the date of eligibility and date of appointment is to be respected and there is no cut-off date from which it has to be implemented. Whether the cut-off date be fixed as 1-1-2009 or 2010, i.e., the date of notification. What should be the cut-off date? Professor A.K. Bhandari has recommended that the cut-off date should be 31-12-2008, i.e., 1-1-2009 or an old resolution of the Syndicate that the date of seniority before 2005 should not be touched and thereafter the cut-off date should be fixed as 1-1-2009. The seniority list of the University should be prepared in such a way. This is the teaser no.1. Teaser no.2 is the issue vis-a-vis Professor Deepak Kapur. His appointment is of the year 2009, it is in that grey area. What to do with Professor Deepak Kapur? Should they let the Court decide and accordingly they would present their viewpoint. Whatever the Court decides in his case, if the Court says that it is specific only to the UBS and if it does not apply to the rest of the University, then it is between Professor Deepak Kapur and his colleagues in the UBS. That is one issue. If the Court says that Professor Deepak Kapur versus his colleagues would apply to the rest of the University also, then the cut-off date of 1-1-2009 as recommended by Professor A.K. Bhandari, it should be redone. Then they come back to the Syndicate and do it. The members are free to express their opinion, could consult each other. Since he could not understand, that is why the matter is before them.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the Vice-Chancellor has a very deep study of the issue.

The Vice-Chancellor appealed to the Syndicate members to appeal to Professor Deepak Kapur that in the larger interest of the University, he should accept the decision of the Syndicate and do not bring the Courts into the picture.

Professor Mukesh Arora said suppose one is eligible under CAS for Associate Professor and the University rejects him. After one year if he again appears and the University again rejects, but when one appears for the third time, he is promoted as Associate Professor from the date of eligibility.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not possible to promote anyone from the date of eligibility after being rejected.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he has been given to understand that many people have been promoted in this way from the date of eligibility.

The Vice Chancellor asked him to give the names of such persons who have been promoted from the date of eligibility after being rejected.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor to provide the names of such persons, Professor Mukesh Arora said that he will give him (Vice Chancellor) the names.

The Vice Chancellor said that Devinder Singh is the only person whose rejection was done but his template was not filled, i.e., score was not filled. The score of the candidate was not filled. A person is required to obtain 50 marks out of 100. Actually, he (Vice Chancellor) was not conscious of it whether the score is to be got filled. Due to this technicality, the Syndicate rejected the unfavourable recommendation of the selection Committee.

Professor Mukesh Arora further said that he has been told that Professor Sehgal of Hindi Department was rejected, but he was given promotion as Professor from the date of eligibility.

The Vice Chancellor said that as per his knowledge, he was not rejected, but if it is so, then he would not have been promoted from the date of eligibility. Professor Sehgal may have been promoted one year after the date of eligibility.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not in his knowledge that he was rejected and he has not received any such data.

However, Professor Mukesh Arora requested the Vice Chancellor to check it. He further said that he may be wrong because he has just heard it. That is why he has requested to check it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he along with Professor A.K. Bhandari considered the entire case with regard to make the master list of seniority. He further said that the Vice Chancellor has explained the whole academic journey of Professor Deepak Kapur.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that the academic journey had to be explained because permission was sought from him and he gave the permission to Professor Kapur to take up matter with higher authority. After that he sent the legal notice that nothing should be done on Item number 12. But he (VC) has brought Item No. 12, thus it was his duty to share everything with them. Perhaps they do not know how many nights he has spent on this. The Vice Chancellor took out from an office bag all the files relevant to this case and showed them to the members. He said whatever replies were made by the Lawyers, he has studied it word by word and line by line.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the Vice-Chancellor has explained Professor Deepak Kapur's academic journey very well. He (Professor Deepak Kapur) remained in Dehradun, then in IMT Ghaziabad and from there, he came to Panjab University. Everyone gave him advance increments. It shows that something must be there in his academic profile that every where he got extra increments. Secondly, if they talk of seniority, in the rules of 20.6.2010, rule 1.3 is very clear that the date of publication of gazette is the final date. He informed that this has not been mentioned after the gazette notification of 18.9.2010. If they take the date of appointment and date of eligibility, they should go for this date, i.e., 18.9.2010. From this, they have to decide accordingly as they could not deviate from University Grants Commission regulations. They should go for that only. Regulation 1.3 is very clear and the date of publication is the final date. Whatever is the procedure of the University that is immaterial. But they have to stick to 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2010.

Referring to the note of Professor A.K. Bhandari, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in 2005, the Senate had taken one time decision that those who are directly recruited, they will be confirmed after one year and those who come through promotion, i.e., Merit Promotion or Career Advancement Scheme, their confirmation will be considered after one year from the date of decision of the Senate and accordingly the seniority list was made. After 2005, no decision was taken and the seniority is pending.

The Vice Chancellor said that some problems have come and due to that seniority list could not be prepared.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they take the seniority list of 2005, it shows that in 2-4 years, all the teachers would either retire or they might join somewhere else. In this way, they would not be having seniority list. Although by convention for Dean of University Instruction, they have been taking the senior-most. As regards appointment of Chairperson, separate rules were framed. In that seniority was not kept as yardstick. In that case, the length of service in the cadre by whatever way one has been appointed, i.e., by recruitment or by promotion. This was done in view of Supreme Court ruling in which they have said that all the three cadres, i.e. Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor are separate. In the departments this problem was being experienced that anyone who is promoted under merit promotion, why he should apply under direct recruitment. The feeling was that by applying under direct recruitment, one would rather prevent others to apply in open category. This was honoured by many people and the promotions were going on. However, with the Supreme Court ruling, this problem

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

came into being which was solved by this University by framing new rules for Chairperson. But for others, seniority list was not made. Seniority was finalized only upto 2005. But now the seniority problem has to be solved. Fortunately, in the new University Grants Commission guidelines which were published on 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2010, it has been mentioned that the seniority may be by way of promotion or it may be through direct recruitment, it should be from date of joining/date of eligibility. But the issue is that of the intervening period, if they see from 1.1.2009 and the date of publication gazette, some of the people preferred their appointment through direct recruitment as they think that direct recruitment persons are senior. But it was clear in 1.1.2009, as to how the promotion will be done. The period for promotion to the post of Professor was reduced from 18 year to 15 years. In the meantime many people became eligible for promotion, but some of them preferred direct recruitment. In view of all these circumstances, he felt that they should go for the date of publication of University Grants Commission gazette notification. If they take the gazette notification, there will be no problem and everything would be resolved. Professor A.K. Bhandari has referred to University Grants Commission Regulation 16.3. On asking by Shri Jarnail Singh, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there were a total of five persons who have come through direct recruitment. Out of these five, one or two are such who have left the CAS promotion and preferred the direct recruitment. He said that the only way to resolve this is that they should fix the date as 18.9.2010 for determining seniority. The other recommendations are very good except for one thing, i.e., confirmation in the cadre. The confirmation in the university should be as an employee and not in the cadre. Confirmation is needed only for seniority. The confirmation in the cadre has already been stopped by the University Grants Commission. He requested to reframe the seniority rules and stop the confirmation in each cadre. This will solve every problem.

On a question, Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that as per the 2005 rules, those who would come through direct recruitment, their confirmation would be after one year from the date of appointment and those who come through CAS, their confirmation would be after one year from the date of approval by the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they do so, it will mean that the persons appointed between 1.12009 to 18.9.2010, 2005 rules will apply to them. The Vice Chancellor asked, what are 2005 rules?

While clarifying the 2005 rules, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that those who have come through promotion, their date of appointment will be from the date of approval by the Senate and they will be confirmed after one year. Those who are appointed through direct recruitment, their date of confirmation will be after one year.

The Vice Chancellor said it means that 2005 rules will apply upto 17 September of 2010.

Professor Navdeep Goyal further said that after 17<sup>th</sup> September, 2010, the University Grants Commission 2010 Regulations will be applicable. He further said that all Syndicate members would request Professor Deepak Kapur to withdraw all the cases. This will solve the problem of all.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the basic issue is that the University Business School people are not ready to accept him (Professor Kapur) in any case. Earlier he was in Chemical Engineering Department. Thus his seniority issue is not clear.

Dr. Dalip Kumar wanted to know as to what has been done regarding the date of publication under Regulations 1.3.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it has already been done.

Professor Pam Rajput asked that Professor Deepak Kapur should withdraw all the cases and desired not to write to the higher authorities to which all the members consented affirmatively.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he has not tried to understand anything what has transpired on this issue nor he would like to know all this. But he wants that before finalizing all this, they should have the reaction of the University teachers whether they want it or not. He said that he is in favour of seniority list, but before finalizing the policy which is to be approved, they should see to it.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that though they have approved it, but it will go to the Senate also.

The Vice Chancellor said the new list will affect only two people and not many people. On being asked by the Vice Chancellor if the new seniority list will be put up to the Syndicate again. They said "Yes" the seniority list would be put on the website and they are not yet to finalize it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Registrar will take a decision as per rules and if any problem comes, only then it will be brought to the Syndicate.

**RESOLVED:** That the fresh seniority list of teachers be prepared in accordance with the decision taken in Senate meeting held on 20.03.2005 to be applicable to the teachers recruited/promoted up to 17.9.2010 and the Regulation 16.3 of UGC notification dated 18.9.2010 would be applicable for the teachers recruited/promoted w.e.f. 18.9.2010 onwards. The other conditions as proposed by Professor A.K. Bhandari with these changes in the recommendations be amended accordingly. The seniority list be put on the Panjab University website and objections, if any, be invited from the teachers within a period of 15 days and the item be again placed before the Syndicate.

**Extension of  
extraordinary leave  
without pay of Shri  
Vineet Punia, DPR**

**13.** Considered if, Shri Vineet Punia, Director, Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News, be granted extension in Extraordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 01.07.2017 to 30.06.2019, to enable him to render PR/media services to the droom/other clients at New Delhi, as requested by him vide application dated 15.05.2017 (**Appendix-XX**).

**NOTE:** 1. Shri Punia has written in his request that he will vacate the University house before June 30, 2017 as decided by the University Syndicate.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

2. Shri Vineet Punia, Director Public Relations, was granted extraordinary leave without pay with permission to retain residential accommodation up to 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2017 vide Syndicate decision dated 27.11.2016 (Para 46) (**Appendix-XX**).
3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XX**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Vineet Punia had applied for joining an organisation without seeking the permission, but he has not gone to a Government organisation. The Syndicate, in its wisdom, condoned everything and let him proceed to that organisation and approved leave up to 30.06.2017. In the meanwhile, they advertised the position and have a DPR in place up to 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2017. If they agree to extension of his leave, then they would not be able to advertise the position. He has asked for leave for two years. Since his (Vice-Chancellor) term is up to 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2018, so he is comfortable for extending the leave for one year and thereafter the matter could be considered.

This was agreed to by the members.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired as what is the decision regarding the appointment which has been made in his place.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, the person would continue till then.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that Shri Vineet Punia was under probation and the confirmation has been recommended w.e.f. 21.01.2017 but the leave was granted much before that in the year 2016.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the leave has been granted after the confirmation.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it is mentioned in the documents that the leave has been granted prior to confirmation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there might be some error in the dates but the leave has been granted after the confirmation.

**RESOLVED:** That Shri Vineet Punia, Director, Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News, be granted extension in Extraordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 01.07.2017 to 22.07.2018, to enable him to render PR/media services to the Droom/other clients at New Delhi, on his request vide application dated 15.05.2017 (**Appendix-XX**).

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the person appointed on temporary basis as Director, Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News, be granted extension during the leave period of Shri Vineet Punia.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

### Assignment of Fellow to Faculties

**14.** Considered that the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against her name:

Ms. Aruna Chaudhary Minister of Higher Education, Punjab, Chandigarh H.No. 951 Minister Complex, Sector-39 A Chandigarh	1. Arts 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts
--	---

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that the following Fellow be assigned to the faculties mentioned against her name:

Ms. Aruna Chaudhary Minister of Higher Education, Punjab, Chandigarh H.No. 951 Minister Complex, Sector-39 A Chandigarh	1. Arts 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts
--	---

### Constitution of Committee

**15.** Considered if, the following Committee, be constituted, to frame rules for compliance with various provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disability Act, 2016 (**Appendix-XXI**), pursuant to the letter dated 07.04.2017 (**Appendix-XXI**) of the Under Secretary, University Grants Commission, New Delhi:

1. Dr. Navleen Kaur
2. Dr. Shalini Marwaha
3. Dr. Swarnjeet Kaur
4. Dr. Paramjit Kang
5. Dr. Dinesh Kumar

**RESOLVED:** That the following Committee, be constituted, to frame rules for compliance with various provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disability Act, 2016 (**Appendix-XXI**), pursuant to the letter dated 07.04.2017 (**Appendix-XXI**) of the Under Secretary, University Grants Commission, New Delhi:

1. Professor Pam Rajput ...(Chairperson)
2. Mrs. Anu Chatrath
3. Dr. Gurmit Singh, Malwa Central College of Education for Women, Ludhiana
4. Shri Prabhjit Singh
5. Dr. Shalini Marwaha
6. Dr. Swarnjeet Kaur
7. Dr. Paramjit Kang
8. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
9. Dr. Navleen Kaur ...(Convener)

### Request of Dr. Monika Nagpal for study leave

**16.** Considered request dated 19.05.2017 (**Appendix-XXII**) of Dr. Monika Nagpal, Assistant Professor (temporary), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, for study leave for pursuing Higher Studies, i.e., for MDS course, from the said Institute.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The decision on this item has been taken on the basis of discussion held together on all the related items, i.e., Items C-4, C-16 and R-(v)

**RESOLVED:** That request dated 19.05.2017 (**Appendix-XXII**) of Dr. Monika Nagpal, Assistant Professor (temporary), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, for study leave for pursuing Higher Studies, i.e., for MDS course, from the said Institute, be not acceded to.

**Estimate of Rs.6.24 lacs for roof treatment**

**17.** Considered if, an estimate of Rs.6.24 lacs submitted by Executive Engineer-I (**Appendix-XXIII**), for roof treatment of Vice-Chancellor's Office in Panjab University Campus, Sector-14, be approved out of budget head 'Development Fund'.

**RESOLVED:** That the estimate of Rs.6.24 lacs submitted by Executive Engineer-I, **as per Appendix**, for roof treatment of Vice-Chancellor's Office in Panjab University Campus, Sector-14, be approved out of budget head 'Development Fund'.

**Writing off Department Biochemistry articles, of**

**18.** Considered recommendations of the Committee dated 04.05.2017 (**Appendix-XXIV**) that the following articles/Items costing more than Rs.1,00,000/- at Sr. No.95-97 (Annexure-I) in Department of Biochemistry, New South Campus-Block II, Sector-25, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be written off, as these items are very old, obsolete & irreparable:-

Sr. No.	Particulars	Quantity	Date of Purchase	Cost of Article (Rs.)	Tentative/ Existing Cost (Rs.)
95.	Spectrophotometer Speckol with accessories	1	05.08.2003	Rs.1,48,271/-	2,00,000/-
96.	Rotera rotary evaporator with motorized light rotation speed 30 to 270 RPM digital water-cum-oil bath temp.8763 consisting of glass parts	1	15.06.2010	Rs.1,45,000/-	2,00,000/-
97.	Ice machine allied frost model TC-50	1	31.03.2009	Rs.1,35,000/-	2,50,000/-

**NOTE:** As per P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 appearing at pages 450-51, the competent authority to write off losses is as under:

1.	Vice-Chancellor	Up to Rs.1 lac per item
2.	Syndicate	Up to Rs. 5 lac per item
3.	Senate	Without any limit for any item

**RESOLVED:** That on the recommendations of the Committee dated 04.05.2017 (**as per Appendix-XXIV**), the following articles/Items costing more than Rs.1,00,000/- at Sr. No.95-97

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

(Annexure-I) in Department of Biochemistry, New South Campus-Block II, Sector-25, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be written off, as these items are very old, obsolete & irreparable:-

Sr. No.	Particulars	Quantity	Date of Purchase	Cost of Article (Rs.)	Tentative /Existing Cost (Rs.)
95.	Spectrophotometer Speckol with accessories	1	05.08.2003	Rs.1,48,271/-	2,00,000/-
96.	Rotera rotary evaporator with motorized light rotation speed 30 to 270 RPM digital water-cum-oil bath temp.8763 consisting of glass parts	1	15.06.2010	Rs.1,45,000/-	2,00,000/-
97.	Ice machine allied frost model TC-50	1	31.03.2009	Rs.1,35,000/-	2,50,000/-

**Issue of Reviewing and Accepting Officer relating to Annual Confidential Reports**

**19.** Considered minutes dated 22.11.2016 (**Appendix-XXV**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to issue of Reviewing and Accepting Officer in Rule relating to the Annual Confidential Reports of the non-teaching/teaching departments/Colleges/Institutions/ other offices and amend the relevant rules, accordingly.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the Annual Confidential Reports of the Finance and Development Officer should go directly to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Annual Confidential Reports of all people in the grade pay of Rs.10,000/- should go directly to the Vice-Chancellor.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that how the 'outstanding' could be evaluated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the reason for giving the outstanding remarks have to be given. This is the case in the Central Government

**RESOLVED:** That recommendations of the Committee dated 22.11.2016, **as per Appendix**, be approved with the modification that the Reporting Officer in the case of the Finance and Development Officer would be the Vice-Chancellor.

**Conduct of election of various non-teaching staff associations on common date**

**20.** Considered if, the elections of various Non-Teaching Staff Associations of the University, be conducted together on the common date, in order to streamline and smooth functioning of University system.

**NOTE:** An office note containing the observations of the Registrar, along with constitution of PUSA and PUCSSA enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

**RESOLVED:** That the elections of various Non-Teaching Staff Associations of the University, be conducted together on the common date, in order to streamline and smooth functioning of University system.

**Major penalty for guilty of sexual harassment**

**21.** To determine the major penalty to be awarded to Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration on having been found guilty of Sexual Harassment.

**NOTE:** 1. A copy of Syndicate decision dated 30.04.2017 (Para 30) is enclosed **(Appendix-XXVII)**.

2. As per Regulation 1 appearing at page 116 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, Assistant Professor is a Class 'A' employee of the University and the appointing authority in this case is the Senate as per Regulation 3.1 at page 117 of the said calendar.

3. As per Regulation 3.3 appearing at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the appointing authority shall be the punishing authority.

4. As per Rule 3 (B) appearing at page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, the following are the major penalties:

3(A) xxx xxx xxx

3(B) Major Penalties

(iv) Reduction to a lower post or time-scale; or to a lower stage in a time-scale;

(v) Removal from service of the University which does not disqualify from future employment;

(vi) Dismissal from service of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are supposed to think over it and his suggestion is that they go in the reverse order. Does he (the Assistant Professor) deserve dismissal from service? Do they agree on not dismissal from service?

Professor Pam Rajput said that it should be removal from service but otherwise the person deserves dismissal

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that either the punishment of demotion or increments could be awarded.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are going in reverse order. It meant that the dismissal is not being done.

Professor Pam Rajput suggested that the punishment of removal could be imposed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the next is “removal from service of the University which does not disqualify from future employment”.

Professor Pam Rajput said that it should be removal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since Professor Pam Rajput is recommending removal, do the members agree on it. He said that the other punishment is reduction to a lower post.

Professor Pam Rajput while saying ‘no’ objected to it and they have to send a strong signal.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is another complaint against that person.

Professor Pam Rajput said that then the punishment of removal from the service should be imposed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the complaint is the latest one.

The members suggested the punishment of removal from service.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the counselling of the person should be done as everyone knows that he is in the habit of consuming very much liquor.

Professor Pam Rajput said that then this is all the more a reason that the person should be thrown out. No teacher has a business to come to the class having liquor. It is a shameful thing.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the person had come to him and told that some action is to be taken and he should stop drinking and undergo some treatment.

Professor Pam Rajput said that a period of two years has passed in taking the decision and it is a violation of the Act.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the demotion could be done with a clause that in future no incidence of liquor should happen.

Professor Pam Rajput said that the punishment of removal from service should be imposed and no other consideration.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the person is mentally disturbed and the punishment of demotion could be imposed and the counselling should be done.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had sent the person for counselling. He has written in the files that till the time person is not medically fit, he should not be allowed to join.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are complaints of this nature.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested the punishment of demotion, otherwise it is for the members to take a decision.

Professor Pam Rajput said that a strong signal has to be given.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that others could also get a lesson from it.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the person is having small kids.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is for the Senate to take the final decision.

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that major penalty, i.e., removal from service of the University which does not disqualify from future employment, be awarded to Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration on having been found guilty of Sexual Harassment.

## Report of PUCASH

**22.** To examine and suggest action on the report of PUCASH (**Appendix-XXVIII**) on complaint of sexual harassment.

**NOTE:** The report of PUCASH on complaint of sexual harassment was accepted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.04.2017 (Para 33).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is clearly written that the complaint is false and malicious and is the recommendation of PUCASH. In case any complaint is false and malicious, then as per the Act, one has to take disciplinary action. Since the complainant is a student, the matter be referred to the Students Disciplinary Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Ph.D. registration of the student should be cancelled.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this recommendation should come from the Student Disciplinary Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as per the DoPT guidelines in case of any false complaint, the law of the land is that FIR is to be lodged. The Ph.D. registration should be cancelled and the police should be informed

**RESOLVED:** That the Ph.D. registration of the student be cancelled and a DDR be lodged against her for making a false complaint of sexual harassment.

**Minutes of the Committee dated 19.04.2017**

**23.** Considered minutes (Item No. 1 & 2) dated 19.04.2017 (**Appendix-XXIX**) of the Committee, under the Chairmanship of Dean

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

of Science Faculty comprising the Chairpersons of Science departments (as per authorisation given by Faculty of Science).

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes (Item No. 1 & 2) dated 19.04.2017, **as per Appendix**, of the Committee, under the Chairmanship of Dean of Science Faculty comprising the Chairpersons of Science departments (as per authorisation given by Faculty of Science), be approved.

At this stage, Professor Mukesh Arora pointed out that some of the Chairs are vacant for want of appointment of Professors on these Chairs. He requested that the matter should be placed in the next meeting.

**Minutes dated 10.5.2017  
of the Committee  
regarding making  
University vehicle free**

**24.** Considered minutes dated 10.05.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the discussion held in the Syndicate meeting dated 20.03.2017 (Para General Discussion (14)) to make University vehicle free.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there are 19 recommendations of the Committee, but there is no discussion about spreading the awareness which is mandatory. The College teachers visit the University at least for three purposes, namely for evaluation which is about two-month process, meetings of the Board of Studies and Faculties. Would those be required to have a temporary pass each time, whenever they visit. There is an apprehension in the teachers that first they would have to wait at the gate for taking the temporary pass, only then, they would be able to enter the campus. The teachers are coming daily for the evaluation duty.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a solution could be that whenever any duty is assigned, the temporary pass could be issued with the duty letter.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he had raised this issue. They all wanted to make the University vehicle free, but could not able to do so. He had requested that a Committee, including the Registrar, be constituted and they would work on it. Thereafter, he had discussion with the Registrar. Later on, when the Committee was constituted, the Chief of University Security was made as the Chairperson of the Committee. The Committee also comprises members of the Senate and Syndicate. He did not mean to say that he be made a Member of the Committee. He suggested that, instead of getting insulted, he would request not to make him a Member of the Committees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Chief of University Security is a Professor and is performing the additional duties.

Shri Varinder Singh said that when the discussion on the issue took place, at that time it was said that the Chief of University Security would be made a Member of the Committee, but not as the Chairperson. He is a Syndic and he would not have any objection if some other Syndic would have been made the Chairperson of the Committee and no discussion regarding making Chief of University Security as Chairperson of the Committee took place. That is why he did not attend the meeting and did not want to be a part of this Committee. There could be politics in it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the issue of vehicle-free University was raised by Shri Varinder Singh.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Shri Varinder Singh said that due to politics, he felt insulted and did not attend the meeting and did not want to become a part of this Committee.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the recommendation No.4, a fee of Rs.10/- is proposed. The public visit the University only for some work. Secondly, there is a recommendation regarding issuing of challans, the authority of which is only mentioned in the Motor Vehicles Act. Therefore, the definition of 'challan' should be reviewed. They could not use the word challan. He said that he agreed with Shri Varinder Singh that a sub-Committee should review the guidelines before finalisation.

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested that Shri Varinder Singh should be made the Chairperson of the Sub-Committee.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he did not want to become the Chairperson of the Sub-Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said, alright, a Sub-Committee would review the guidelines. He suggested that the Sub-Committee could consist Professor Promila Pathak, Shri Deepak Kaushik, one of the Deans, Student Welfare or nominee, Shri Varinder Singh to Chair the Committee and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that the awareness camps should be organised.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that it should be mentioned in the Handbook of Information that no vehicle of the students would be allowed.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Varinder Singh to submit the report by 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2017.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that there is a great rush at the already existing three gates. He suggested that the gate near the Law Department should also be opened and the parking could also be created there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would request the Chandigarh Administration in this regard.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they authorise the Vice-Chancellor to approve the recommendations of the Sub-Committee.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they should organise traffic awareness campaign.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Varinder Singh to submit the report by 15<sup>th</sup> June because the permission from the Chandigarh Administration is also to be sought.

Professor Pam Rajput suggested that a long-term solution of the problem should be thought over.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that the area near Gurudwara could also be utilised.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Varinder Singh to suggest all the alternatives and he would accompany him to meet the DGP.

**RESOLVED:** That the following Sub-Committee including Syndics be constituted to review the recommendations of the Committee and suggest implementation plan by 14<sup>th</sup> 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    |

**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.

When the meeting resumed after the lunch before taking up item No. C-25, the Vice-Chancellor briefed the members about the fire incident that happened on 14<sup>th</sup> May, 2017.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has made available to the members a kind of document which has an index and the documents attached. They are well aware that the fire happened in the early hours of 14<sup>th</sup> May. When is it that the fire was noticed and how the things happened. Many of them must have seen on the You Tube. This is a document which gives them in sequence as to who noticed it first and how rapidly the action happened. They are lucky that the police responded to the call made to it between 3.00-3.08 a.m. Two calls were made. A call went to the fire office, within 2½ minutes of the call received on No.100. The police van was already there where the fire tender arrived. There is a student who put a photograph at 3.13 a.m. and one-minute video. This video revealed as how rapidly the fire spread. Once the fire reached the windowpanes and the windowpanes got shattered, it is the noise of the shattering of the windowpanes that alerted the guard who was in front of the building. They asked the guard as to how he came to know of it, who said that there was a crackling sound. A chronology of the incident is mentioned in the document. It is based on the inputs that this guard gave and the input that they got from the students who were going on motorcycle. One of them had made a phone call to the police at 3.08 a.m. and before that the University security had already made a call to the police. The police received two calls within a time of 2-3 minutes. The timing of the video which he himself checked from the phone is 3.13 a.m. In this video at 3.13 a.m., when the fire spreads, the police van enters. Then the next person to arrive was Professor Ashwani Koul, the Chief of University Security and when he reached

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

here, by then the fire tenders had also arrived. When he (Vice Chancellor) along with the Registrar reached at 3.38 a.m., two fire tenders had exhausted their water. The hoist had not come as yet, it came a little later. The fire tenders were not successful in putting the water where the fire was the maximum. The hoist put the water from one side. The security staff had put off all the lights. When the Registrar came and went inside and took together the fire staff as he knew about the fire hydrants. The water was being put from both sides, only then the fire started to get contained slowly. It took nearly two hours to douse the flames. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal along with Shri H.S. Lucky came around 5.45 a.m. Shri Sanjay Tandon also arrived after half an hour later. The forensic team had been called by the Fire Officer. The steel almirahs were still red hot even up to 11.00 a.m. Since the keys of the almirahs were not available, these had to be broken open. Only then, the forensic people could enter. The forensic team also visited the next day. The document given to the members is a report that the forensic team has given on 26<sup>th</sup> May. Then he called Professor Manoj Arora to check the strength of the building who called IIT Roorkee and managed to convince them to make a visit soon. The team of IIT said that the things at the fire site should not be disturbed as the team would like to see the things as in situ. That gentleman arrived and he has sent a report. They gave a press release at 8.30 a.m. and by then it was reported in the media and TV. They gave the press release as soon as the fire was well under control. They called a press conference at 12.00 noon and whatever he knew at that time, he shared it with the media. They had informed the Advisor, U.T. Administration, the insurance company and the Chancellor's office and others. Then it was thought that some enquiry has to be ordered. Justice Narang's name was suggested to him and he contacted him who immediately responded that he would take up the responsibility. When he went to meet Justice Narang, like every citizen in the city, he was also very concerned and had many questions of how and why of the fire. When they framed this notification as to what should be the scope of the enquiry. Most of the scope is just paraphrasing what Justice Narang told. He paraphrased these things what Justice Narang wanted to be investigated by the team. Justice Narang did not want to lose the time and immediately came and visited the site. It was clear that Justice Narang has a deep knowledge of the quality of construction because he was the first founder Director of Chandigarh Judicial Academy and the construction of the building was done under his supervision. This was told by the officers who had been involved in that process. He is continuing with the enquiry and has asked for 3-months time and would submit an interim report in about a month. It is not just an enquiry but there has to be certain recommendations as to how to prepare the community in fire fighting. Prima facie, everybody could be educated while they are a part of the University as to how to deal with a disaster. It should be taken as a lesson and at the end of this enquiry there should be some recommendations that the University should be better prepared in case such mishaps occur in future on how to prevent. Justice Narang would give all these things. They have to start educating even before the report comes in. The Registrar, being from army background, is already preparing a Fire Manual. Once they have some relief from this, they have to put into the awareness, training, drills, etc.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it is already a part of the syllabus of environmental education.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to prepare and do it like a campaign.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired whether the structure of the building is safe.

The Vice Chancellor said that all this has been mentioned in the document provided to the members.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired about the damage to the records.

The Vice Chancellor said that all the record has been burnt.

Shri Varinder Singh enquired whether the fire fighting system/sprinklers did work or not.

It was informed that the fire alarm system did not work.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired whether the fire systems were new ones or the old ones had been installed.

The Vice Chancellor replied that these were installed in the year 2014.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that then the fire system should have worked.

Shri Varinder Singh enquired whether there was any guarantee from the company which installed the system.

It was informed that the company has reviewed.

Shri Varinder Singh enquired whether the cameras were installed or not.

It was informed that the cameras were not installed. There are no cameras installed in the accounts branch where these should have been installed.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are many-many lessons to be learned from this. That is why a Fact Finding Committee has to be comprehensive and they have to constitute a Committee on behalf of the campus separately for various buildings like University Institute of Engineering & Technology and UILS. UILS is a small building where the population density is high having about 1200 students, faculty members. Some buildings require really good care.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that a day or two ago, there was a news in the newspaper about the fire.

It was informed that the fire was outside the building in the wild bushes growth. It was contained immediately.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma enquired about how much currency got burnt.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

It was informed that an amount of about Rs.2000-4000/- of old adjustment was pending.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it has been reported that many of the service books have got burnt.

It was informed that normally the service books are not kept in the accounts branch. Most of the service books are in the custody of the concerned departments. Only those service books are sent to the accounts in which some payments have to be made.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the benefits of the retiring persons should be cleared.

It was informed that they are preparing the service books of those employees who have retired or are nearing retirement, on priority basis from the personal files of the employees available in the departments as also the Establishment branch.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that as pointed out by Shri Varinder Singh, those persons retiring in this month, the NOC should be issued to those persons so that their retirement benefit including the provident fund could be released and an undertaking could be obtained from those employees.

It was informed that the NOCs are being issued and the retirement benefits would be released.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that in the case of Assistant Registrar (Secrecy), some amount is advanced by the University for making the payments. All the bills had been submitted which got burnt and the office has not kept the office copies. What would be the solution to such a problem?

It was informed that a solution to such problems has to be worked out. Lot of records could be recovered from the building itself as the CFSL has given the clearance just two days ago.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the Assistant Registrar (Secrecy) is nearing retiring, perhaps the next month, in such cases, the employees could face the problems.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that perhaps the record related to pension scam by Ms. Pooja Bagga is safe.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that since he was in the University on that day and had seen that the efforts made by the employees and the authorities are marvellous. Even the Vice-Chancellor was also in the Guest House at 3.35 a.m. Even all the employees were helping, it being a holiday. Therefore, they should think positively. As has been reported in the newspapers that some mischief must have been done, they should not believe it as nothing such had happened. They should put it on record that it was not done intentionally. It is just a rumour to malign the image of the University. They should be together on this issue. He said that he had talked to about 10 newspapers and asked them to publish positive news on this issue, but the newsmen say that they publish the news which is of interest to the public. He, being a

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Syndicate member, and on behalf of Dr. Dalip Kumar, had requested to publish a positive news, but none of the newspapers accepted it.

Shri Varinder Singh praised the Registrar for having made good efforts in helping control the fire, being an army officer.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal requested the Registrar to find out the clues behind the fire in a similar manner.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested that a reserve fund corpus account should be created immediately.

It was informed that a Committee on the issue has been formed by the Vice-Chancellor in the last week and a meeting would be held soon. As per the Government guidelines, no autonomous body could create a corpus with the permission of the Government.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that as said by Shri Varinder Singh that there are rumours. They should resolve that the fire was caused due to some electrical technical fault but it was not caused intentionally.

The Vice-Chancellor said that still the forensic team and Justice Narang have to submit the report. The Syndicate expresses concern on the speculations and the stories based on speculations in the media. The Syndicate desires that the public must wait for the enquiry to get completed and the report from the Fire Department and CFSL to be finalised. The Syndicate appreciates the formation of Enquiry Committee immediately after the fire incident.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they should take precautionary measures to prevent the fires. Whenever any renovation is to be carried out, plastic and other inflammable material should not be used.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they should take up the issue of non-working of the fire sprinklers with the company.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Justice Narang is asking and piecing everything together. He is asking each and every officer to come and answer his questions.

Shri Varinder Singh said that since they have spent a lot of money on the fire-fighting system, the company should be imposed a fine for non-functioning of the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Justice Narang, even being aged 75 years, came the same day when the Enquiry Committee was formed.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu enquired whether they would be able to restore the data.

It was informed that out of the total 22 budget heads, only 7 are affected.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they should work towards paperless work.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice-Chancellor said that the MHRD has also suggested to go paperless and keep scanned record of everything.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there is a rumour and an irresponsible talk that some special audit was to be conducted and before that the record has been burnt.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a meeting was held on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2016 with the MHRD and UGC and the University was asked to give certain inputs, the same were given and those were to be examined. MHRD gave those inputs to UGC and a court case was going on. At some stage, the UGC was to file their assessment of the inputs that the University had given. One of the discrepancies that the UGC thought is that it was told that there are so much number of employees, but later on the number of employees has become larger. It was unhappy with these two numbers and asked why some information was not provided to it in a complete form. In that assessment, there is one line which says that they recommended that independent audit of the University should be done for the last year. This observation was made by the UGC to MHRD. But after that, they had a meeting with the MHRD and it has not taken cognisance of any such thing and has not given any such direction. Then another meeting was held and after this meeting, the matter is at the final stage in the sense that the MHRD has to tell as desired by the High Court as to how money the University would be given for the year 2017-18. Informal contact with the MHRD is that whatever assessment it had asked from the University, which amounts to over next 3 years, if the University does not increase the number of employees and are in a stagnant way with the projections that the University has made, it amounts to demand on the Central Government if there is no 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, something like 6-7% annual increase. Over the figure of 2016-17, they need 6-8% increase every year from the Central Government over the next 4 years. They are given to understand that the MHRD is okay with such a projection and now it has to tell the court as to what is its stand. In the Supreme Court, the Solicitor General of India said that they would do it by 4<sup>th</sup> July and said that the concerns of Panjab University would be attended to because the MHRD's directive was that whatever it has paid as first instalment (Rs.41 crores) for the year 2016-17 whereas an amount of Rs.20 crores was released. The UGC received Rs.200 crores as the first instalment from the Centre and 10% of that was given whereas over the last 3 years, the University has been paid with an upper limit of 9.3% of the budget head from where the grant is given to Panjab University. Last year, when the figure was Rs.198 crores and 10% of that was only Rs.19.8 crores in spite of the fact that the University's share in the MHRD budget head is less than 10%, the UGC gave the University Rs.20 crores out of Rs.200 crores that it got from the Government. When he met the MHRD Secretary 4 days ago, Shri K.K. Sharma reminded his junior colleague that the Panjab University has to be given the funds, he had asked to provide a grant of Rs.40 crores, why the same has not been released. Then the official explained that they have not yet released the monthly instalment of the grant to the UGC. This year, all payments on behalf of Central Government are monthly instalments and not quarterly. He expects that there is no problem in the release of an amount of Rs.20 crores which would be released in the month of June and by 4<sup>th</sup> July, the Centre would tell in the Supreme Court as to how much money is to be released. The next date of hearing is fixed on 11<sup>th</sup> July

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

in the High Court and on 4<sup>th</sup> July in the Supreme Court. In the last hearing in the Supreme Court, the Central Government counsel was very friendly. He personally met and thanked the Counsel who said that the summer bench of the Supreme Court has said that if the University has any concerns or difficulty, it could approach it. The Counsel told that such a problem would not arise and he would personally come to the Court if the concerns of the University are not addressed to. But the Centre wants to be kept informed of everything because they did not want to know about the things via the newspapers. That is why he visited Delhi and a summary on the issue has been provided to the members and a copy of it has been provided to the Advisor to the Administrator on Friday evening. The Advisor is away to Delhi but he has sent a message that he has got it and would inform the Administrator. They gave a copy to the Advisor to inform the Administrator also. If the Central Government desires a more comprehensive enquiry, they have written to it that they are open to whatever it wishes because after all it is public money, whether it is from the taxpayers or from the students in the form of examination fee and tuition fee.

When Item No. C-25 was taken up for consideration, the Vice-Chancellor absented himself from the meeting. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma proposed the name of Professor Pam Rajput to chair the meeting for this item only which was seconded by others. Accordingly, Professor Pam Rajput chaired the meeting.

**Letter received from  
Chancellor's office**

**25.** Considered the letter (**Appendix-XXX**) received from the Chancellor's office.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this issue is also a matter which is part of the discussion for long. The issue is that the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 is a Government of India Act and envisages formation of a Sexual Harassment Committee. As and when any organisation forms this Committee, it is for the entire system. It is not that the people who have participated in that discussion while the session was on, that they are out of it. When the Parliament forms the rules, those rules also apply to the Prime Minister of the country. So, they had some confusion. Someone said that a new Committee should be formed, they formed a Committee and sent the same to the Chancellor who was given the freedom either to accept or form a new Committee of his own. Some of the documents are dated one month earlier but were received only last week and have been provided. Now the Chancellor has categorically stated that the PUCASH, if it has been formed in accordance with the Act, he approves this Committee in accordance with the law pertaining to this thing and whether the person is a Senator or Syndic, the Committee is competent to handle all the matters.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the envelope related with this should also be opened with the envelope related to the item I-(xi).

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this is what he had said they should go by the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 at that time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have PUCASH, the term of which is going to expire and the new PUCASH is to be formed.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the present PUCASH has to do its work and whenever the new PUCASH is formed, it would work further.

Shri Varinder Singh requested that this issue should be sorted out at the earliest and should not be lingered on.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could refer this matter to the PUCASH.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if the complainant files the same application in the court which she has given to the police that the police is not taking any decision, this matter would again get complicated. They should try to understand it and they should try to solve the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter is already with the police.

Shri Varinder Singh said that still the matter is with the police, if the complainant goes to the court and the court gives the direction to the police to investigate the matter, the matter would again get complicated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is the duty of everyone to obey to the orders of the court.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that this matter should be sent to the Chairperson, PUCASH tomorrow itself.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that a timeframe should be given.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they should make efforts to solve the matter and it could be solved.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if the Vice-Chancellor thinks proper, whatever discussion is taking place on this issue, if it could take place in his absence.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay and absented himself from the discussion to be held on this issue.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma proposed the name of Professor Pam Rajput to chair the meeting for this item only which was seconded by Dr. Dalip Kumar and Principal B.C. Josan. Accordingly, Professor Pam Rajput chaired the meeting at this moment.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the complainant has given a complaint to the Committee which is formed at the University level. Another complaint has been given in the police station. If the complainant goes to the court, then her statement would be taken to be recorded under section 164 from which one could not backtrack. Sometimes, in many cases, the Court directly gives the direction to register the FIR while in other cases, the Court directs the police officers of the level of IPS to investigate the matter within a timeframe. They could try and every matter could be solved with negotiation and it would also be solved in such a way. Even the matter could be lingered on for a period of up to 20 years.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that they should refer the matter to PUCASH.

Professor Pam Rajput said that as far as lingering on the matter is concerned, the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act does not permit it.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he meant to say that such matters are of a kind that in the Indian system, such matters could be lingered on as there are so many commission, courts and the matters could be appealed in these forums. Finally, the matter has to be decided here only with negotiations. Today, the Vice-Chancellor is in a position and tomorrow if the Vice-Chancellor is not in a position, the administration and the police would not waste even a single second to take action. Since the Vice-Chancellor is in power, so the people try to avoid take action. After a year, this matter could take another shape. Therefore, they should try to resolve the issue on their own.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this case should be given immediately to PUCASH and a timeframe should be fixed. Without waiting for the minutes, it should be immediately sent to PUCASH.

Professor Pam Rajput said that the points are well taken. The letter from the office of the Chancellor has gone to MHRD and already a Committee has been formed. Do they need to wait from a communication from MHRD or the House should directly refer this to PUCASH because there are so many bodies involved in it. This is for the House to decide because the communications started from there (Chancellor's office).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was directed by the MHRD that if PUCASH is not taking the decision, another Committee be formed and the same should be got approved from the Chancellor. Obviously, the approval of the Chancellor was the main thing.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the Chancellor approved the Committee and sent to the MHRD.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Chancellor has said that the matter be sent to the already existing Committee (PUCASH).

Professor Pam Rajput said go through the letter dated 4<sup>th</sup> May where the Chancellor's office says that "I am therefore directed to request the Department of Higher Education to issue necessary instructions pursuant to the directions".

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the directions have been issued because the case started from there itself.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that a Committee of some respectable persons including Professor Pam Rajput who could negotiate the matter with both the parties and resolve the issue to which a few of the members said that it has already been tried. He said that as a last resort, they could try it again. If the Court gives the directions to the police to investigate the matter then the other Committees would have no option.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Principal I.S. Sandhu requested Shri Varinder Singh to suggest the names for the Committee. He himself and Professor Shelley Walia had once shouldered this responsibility but could not succeed. If it is being said that the matter should be resolved here only for which they have only PUCASH.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he meant to say that they themselves could solve the matter. The investigation by the external agencies is done in some other way.

Principal B.C. Josan said that they could make efforts in this regard.

Professor Pam Rajput said that there are two issues – one is that the complaint was initially referred to PUCASH. As far as she remembers, the Chairperson, PUCASH perhaps could not do.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in fact he was of the opinion that Chairperson, PUCASH is not perhaps interested. Then it was said the University is not making it clear as to who is the employer of the Vice-Chancellor. When the letter from MHRD was received from which it is clear that the Chancellor is the employer. This has repeatedly been an issue as to who is the employer. Whenever communication is to be sent to PUCASH, it should be clearly mentioned that PUCASH has to take up the issue and secondly for the purpose of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, the employer of the Vice-Chancellor is the Chancellor.

Professor Pam Rajput said that earlier it was not clear whether PUCASH was competent or not. Now in the light of letter dated 4<sup>th</sup> May, should they wait for a communication from MHRD and then send the case to PUCASH.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is not clear whether any communication from MHRD is required or not.

Professor Pam Rajput requested the members to read the letter of 4<sup>th</sup> May.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Chancellor has written that the University could forward the matter to the existing PUCASH. Accordingly, they could refer it to PUCASH.

Professor Pam Rajput read out from the letter where it is written that “I am directed to request the Department to issue necessary instructions”. This is the language of the letter. So, they have to wait for that.

It was clarified that in the letter it is mentioned that it (PUCASH) is fully empowered.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that if they direct the PUCASH to look into the matter, there would be no harm.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they should follow the diktats of the Chancellor's office.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there is no need to wait for the communication and if any communication arrives, they could act accordingly.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that Professor Pam Rajput must know about the timeframe.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it is 90 days.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could authorise the Registrar to talk to the OSD to the Vice-President of India and if necessary with Ms. Ishita Roy also and if they ask to go ahead, then they should move forward.

Professor Pam Rajput said that the consensus seems that the PUCASH should deal with this case, but to be on the safe said, they authorise the Registrar to talk to the OSD and if necessary with the Joint Secretary and seek clearance from them and then since the House is in agreement that they should forward the case to PUCASH, on that basis they forward the case to PUCASH.

This was agreed to by the members.

Shri Varinder Singh said that a last attempt to resolve the matter on their own could be made.

Professor Pam Rajput said that she respects this but nothing could be done as she understands it from the discussion with Professor R.P. Bambah. Professor S.S. Johl Committee also could not succeed.

Shri Varinder Singh said that sometimes when a FIR is lodged, in some cases some sections are deleted.

Professor Pam Rajput said that the point raised by Shri Varinder Singh is well taken.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if in some organisation, Internal Complaint Committee like PUCASH exists and it is investigating the matter properly, could the police interfere in it.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the Court could interfere in the matter.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that nobody could stop the Court in interfering in the matter.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that sometimes the Court also does not entertain on the basis that the matter is under consideration.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it is for the Judge to look into the facts.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if the case is proved wrong, then it could be otherwise also.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Professor Pam Rajput said that from the points discussed, it seems that the consensus is that the House decides to refer the matter to PUCASH. But before that, they authorise the Registrar to talk to the OSD and the Joint Secretary to seek direction and then proceed accordingly.

This was agreed to by the members.

**RESOLVED:** That there being unanimity on referring the matter to PUCASH, the Registrar is authorised to seek directions from the Joint Secretary, MHRD and OSD to the Vice-President of India and act accordingly.

After having taken a decision on the item, Professor Pam Rajput vacated the chair occupied particularly for taking a decision on this item only and hereafter the Vice-Chancellor chaired the meeting.

**Confirmation of faculty members**

**26.** Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that the following faculty members, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, subject to CWP No.17501 of 2011 and CWP No.24115 of 2014:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
*1.	Dr. Sunaina	Assistant Professor in Law, PUSGRC, Hoshiarpur	19.11.1979	01.12.2014 (A.N.)	29.11.2015
*2	Dr. Ritu Salaria	-do-	18.01.1979	01.12.2014 (A.N.)	30.11.2015

\* Their appointment is subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court in CWP No.24115 of 2014 vide which their appointment have been challenged by Ms. Rajni Nanda, who was one of the candidates for the said posts. Therefore, their confirmation will also be subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court CWP No.24115 of 2014.

- NOTE:**
1. The Senate in its meeting dated 09.10.2016 (Para XI) **(Appendix-XXXI)** while confirming certain faculty members had also extended the probation period of Dr. Sunaina and Dr. Ritu Salaria, Assistant Professor in Law, SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur by one more year.
  2. A detailed office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XXXI)**.

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that following faculty members, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, subject to CWP No.17501 of 2011 and CWP No.24115 of 2014:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
*1.	Dr. Sunaina	Assistant Professor in Law, PUSGRC, Hoshiarpur	19.11.1979	01.12.2014 (A.N.)	29.11.2015

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

*2	Dr. Ritu Salaria	-do-	18.01.1979	01.12.2014 (A.N.)	30.11.2015
----	------------------	------	------------	----------------------	------------

\* Their appointment is subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court in CWP No.24115 of 2014 vide which their appointment have been challenged by Ms. Rajni Nanda, who was one of the candidates for the said posts. Therefore, their confirmation will also be subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court CWP No.24115 of 2014.

- NOTE:**
1. The Senate in its meeting dated 09.10.2016 (Para XI) (**Appendix-XXXI**) while confirming certain faculty members had also extended the probation period of Dr. Sunaina and Dr. Ritu Salaria, Assistant Professor in Law, SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur by one more year.
  2. A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXI**).

**Request of Principal I.S. Sandhu for extension in probation**

**27.** Considered request dated (**Appendix-XXXII**) of Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu, Principal, P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for extension in probation period for one year.

- NOTE:**
1. Dr. I.S. Sandhu, Associate Professor, DAV College, Abohar was appointed as Principal of the above said College vide Syndicate decision dated 15.05.2016 (Para 75) (**Appendix-XXXII**) on one year probation. The appointment was also approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 09.10.2016 (Para VIII) (**Appendix-XXXII**).
  2. Dr. Sandhu assumed as Principal on 01.06.2016 at P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala and his probation period is going to complete on 31.05.2017.
- (xii) Regulation 5 appearing at page 118 P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 reads as under:

“Every appointment whether by direct recruitment or by promotion or by any other method approved by the Senate, shall be made on probation for a period of one year, which may be extended by the appointing authority for a period not exceeding one year. The appointing authority may, however, grant exemption in exceptional cases.”

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he withdraws his request for extension of probation period otherwise it could create problems and he would not want such things to happen.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that since Principal I.S. Sandhu has withdrawn his request for extension of probation period, he be confirmed as Principal.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice-Chancellor said that Principal I.S. Sandhu be confirmed and requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to give a write-up of the activities done by him during the last one year.

**RESOLVED:** That on a request made by Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu, Principal, P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib, he be allowed to withdraw his request dated 23.05.2017 (**Appendix-XXXII**) for extension in probation period for one year.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That it be recommended to the Senate that Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu, Principal, P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib be confirmed as such on his post w.e.f. the due date i.e. 01.06.2017, after completion of one year probation period subject to the acceptance of the self performance appraisal report by the Vice-Chancellor to be submitted by Principal I.S. Sandhu.

**Minutes  
Committee  
17.11.2016**

**of  
the  
dated**

**28.** Considered minutes dated 17.11.2016 (**Appendix-XXXIII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to Senate decision (Para VI) dated 27.03.2016 (**Appendix-XXXIII**).

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he had made the request for extension of probation period. He is thankful to the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate for approving his appointment as Principal. Whatever he wanted to improve for the functioning of the College as Principal, he is not getting that kind of help from the University. He had made the request for extension because he might have to return back to his previous College. He shared with the Vice-Chancellor that his case of pay protection with one increment which was approved by the Selection Committee has not been done for the last one year. The letter issued regarding pay protection is not clear whereas the decision of the Syndicate is attached with the letter but the increment has not been given. When he brought it to the knowledge of the Finance and Development Officer, he scolded the dealing person but even then the increment has not been given.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the officials to put up the file.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he had sanctioned an amount of Rs.1.5/2 lacs from the Government for laying the pipeline in the College. He said that he himself had driven the tractor to level the ground of wild bushes. He wanted to do all the developmental works in the College during vacation. A Committee for spending this money was to be approved but even after his pointing out, the Committee has not been constituted for the last three months. He could not take any decision on his own like the Principals Gurdip Kumar Sharma and B.C. Josan take.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University is maintaining 6 Constituent Colleges and 3 Regional Centres and one Rural Centre. They would form a Cell in the Administrative building which would specially look after the demands of all these because the persons from there could not come every now and then. The cell would look after all the issues of establishment, financial concerns and accounts.

Principal I.S. Sandhu requested that the 4 Constituent Colleges earlier running should not be clubbed with the two new

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Constituent Colleges as there are different issues. The Syndicate had earlier taken a decision that with the approval of the Principals, there would be no Coordinator for the Constituent Colleges. But still a Coordinator is working. It is a humiliation for the Principals.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person is no more a Coordinator.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the person is also a member in the Selection Panel, other issues related with fee structure and other matters. He has brought this to the notice of the Registrar also.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that it is correct.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he feels humiliation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he needs a Coordinator to help him.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that some other person could be appointed as Coordinator.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he is ready to join back at Abohar but could not tolerate the humiliation. If that person is to be appointed as Coordinator, he could be appointed for the two new Constituent Colleges where there is no Principal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue of those two Constituent Colleges has not been settled till date with the Punjab Government.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that his issue is not that, that person should not be appointed as Coordinator but the Coordinator could be appointed for these two new Constituent Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could put somebody else.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that in the Constituent Colleges, where there is no Principal, a Coordinator could be appointed there.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if a person has worked as a Coordinator for a very long time, it would be better to change that person.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the teachers do not accept the Principals as the head of the College but the Coordinator.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that whatever Principal I.S. Sandhu is saying is correct. Secondly, he said that the 4 Constituent Colleges are running smoothly with the appointment of the Principals but due to the lack of cooperation from the administration side, they are facing problems.

Principal I.S. Sandhu brought it to the notice of the Syndicate that in his College, there is no student of PGDCA or BCA but a teacher for these subjects is appointed every year. Is it not known to the Coordinator? They are spending Rs.3.30 lacs per year.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Principal N.R. Sharma said that in his College, computer courses are being run but there is no computer whereas in the College of Principal I.S. Sandhu there are 50 computers where there is no course of computer. He had relieved the teacher of computer on 5<sup>th</sup> May with the ending of the academic session. He even had sent in writing that the course should not run.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whenever new NIT/IIT is opened, the existing NITs/IITs take the responsibility to run. There are two new Constituent Colleges, the responsibility of running one College is assigned to Principal N.R. Sharma while the other to Principal I.S. Sandhu to which both the members agreed. Principal N.R. Sharma would look after the College where the Coordinator is from his College and similarly Principal I.S. Sandhu would look after and they have to run the Colleges till the matters is not finalised with the Punjab Government. They would create a Cell which would look after the issues of the Constituent Colleges.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that the College which is the nearest one be assigned to a Principal so that there is no wastage of time in commuting between the Colleges.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that a panel of Principals or Fellows for the appointment of the teachers be appointed so that there is no delay in appointment and the Colleges are run smoothly. If the Principal has a panel of experts, he could make appointments in case of urgent requirements.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to send a proposal and it would be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that none other than the Principals have to run the Colleges. The Principal is head of the College and has just to obtain the approval from him (Vice-Chancellor). All such matters have ultimately come to the Syndicate and they should use him as an intermediary. He requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to again meet the Education Minister and get the information whether the Punjab Government wanted to run the two new Constituent Colleges or not. If the Punjab Government did not want to run these Colleges, then these could be closed down from the next session and if it is interested to run, then resources for the next year be provided. At the moment, they are having some money and with that the students would be admitted for the next session and appoint guest faculty for teaching the students. The Punjab Government should clearly make its decision known as the University has to appoint the Principals for these Colleges and also regular faculty for the Colleges where the regular Principals have been appointed. Therefore, a MoU is required so that the regular faculty could be appointed. Till the time the grant is not given, how could they appoint the faculty. He repeated that the responsibility of running one College is assigned to Principal N.R. Sharma while the other to Principal I.S. Sandhu.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested to name the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the nearest College would be looked after by each one of them.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the teacher from his College is at Ferozepur and it is also nearest to him and the College at Dharmkot be assigned to Principal N.R. Sharma. He said that he would not claim TA/DA for this purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that TA/DA is a minor thing.

Professor Pam Rajput suggested that the TA/DA and honorarium should be taken and be put in a corpus.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that Ferozepur is near to his College.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal N.R. Sharma and Principal I.S. Sandhu to decide it on their own and tell him about their decision. They would have a meeting of the two Coordinators with Principal N.R. Sharma and Principal I.S. Sandhu.

Shri Jarnail Singh raised the issue of leave of Principal Kuldeep Singh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has no issue regarding the continuation of Principal Kuldeep Singh.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that Principal Kuldeep Singh has to go to attend World Punjabi Conference.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the NOC would be issued and nobody would be deprived for academic purposes.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there is a latest letter of the UGC dated 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2017. As the appointment of the Principals is being made for a period of 5 years, in the letter it is mentioned that the lien could also be maintained for this period. He handed over a copy of the letter. He said that if a Lecturer is appointed as Principal which is for a period of 5 years, the lien could be kept on the Lecturer's post. He requested that the required formalities in this regard be done.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the lien could be maintained otherwise the people would suffer.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that a Committee could be formed to look into it.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, it is fine.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that if a person is appointed as Principal for a period of 5 years, so many private managements do not allow to retain the lien.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that his is the first case that the DAV management has allowed him to retain the lien.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu requested that it should be ensured that the teachers should be allowed to retain the lien.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the lien should be given.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

**RESOLVED:** That recommendations of the Committee dated 17.11.2016, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, **as per Appendix**, be approved. The same Committee would further look into the issue of deputation on appointment as Principal for 5 years in a College.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That Principal I.S. Sandhu be assigned the duty to look after the affairs of the Constituent College at Ferozpur and Principal N.R. Sharma for the Constituent College at Dharamkot in addition to their own duties.

**Proposal of the Dean of University Instruction regarding power of condonation of shortage of lectures**

**29.** Considered proposal (**Appendix-XXXIV**) of Dean of University Instruction that the power of condonation of shortage of lectures under the Rule 3.3.1, be vested with the Syndicate only and addition in this regard be made in the said rule.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 25.02.2017 (Para 22) (**Appendix-XXXIV**) has considered and approved the recommendations of the Committee dated 30.01.2017 with regard to examine the grounds of extreme hardship cases for condonation of shortage of attendance.

2. As per recommendations of the Committee, addition of Rule 3.3.1 is to be made in P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 at page 263-264 which now available at page 305-306 of new edition of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016

Shri Varinder Singh said that there were some students who were having shortage of lectures in some of the subjects, as in the case of students of University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS). If they could allow such students after imposing fine of Rs.25,000/- or Rs.30,000/-.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that a golden chance could be provided to such students.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there might be some students who would not be able to appear in 1-2 subjects due to shortage of lectures and if the golden chance is provided, it could same a year to those students. In the case of medical, the leave is recommended only for 15 days by the CMO which is wrong because the medical problem could persist for a very long time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if there is a genuine case, that would be taken care of.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the criteria of the validity of a medical certificate should be asked for from the CMO.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the CMO is very liberal.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the students coming rural areas have to suffer.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Varinder Singh to point out any specific case which would be taken care of.

**RESOLVED:** That proposal of Dean of University Instruction that the power of condonation of shortage of lectures under the Rule 3.3.1, be vested with the Syndicate only and addition in this regard be made in the said rule, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Proposal  
26.5.2017**

**dated**

**30.** Considered proposal dated 26.05.2017 (**Appendix-XXXV**) with regard to implementation of five days working in a week and for extending the period of extension for one year to the Daily Wages/Temporary/Contractual employees of Panjab University (except the 193 staff who appointed for seasonal work and presently working over and above from the authorized sanctioned strength) only and addition in this regard be made in the said rule.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> January, 2017 he had raised the issue of 5-day in the Colleges and it was decided to approach the Punjab Government, but till date the letter has not been written to the Punjab Government in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the letter has been written to the Punjab Government. As the new Government has taken over, they would again approach in this regard.

Shri Jarnail Singh enquired whether these employees would be given the salary for full month or not. The salary issue should be taken care of.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the salary is to be given for 30 days.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested to write a letter to the Punjab Government on the issue of 5-day week in the Colleges. This was also supported by Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the U.T. Administration is not accepting it.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the University follows the 5-day week including the Regional Centres. They could take a plea that the Colleges are affiliated with Panjab University which has a 5-day week. The 5-day week should be followed in the Colleges also.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma opposed the introduction of 5-day week and he has been opposing it since 1992. Keeping in view the work culture of the Colleges, 5-day week should not be introduced.

**RESOLVED:** That the proposal dated 26.05.2017, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Proposal  
26.05.2017  
the issue of 193 Daily  
Wages/Temporary/  
Contractual employees  
(Class 'C')**

**dated  
regarding**

**31.** Considered proposal dated 26.05.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVI**) with regard to implementation of five days working in a week of 193 Daily Wages/Temporary/Contractual employees (Class 'C') of Panjab University and presently working over and above from the authorized sanctioned strength.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

**RESOLVED:** That the proposal dated 26.05.2017, **as per Appendix**, be approved and “(a) if the post is filled on regular basis” under clause (iv) be deleted.

**Confirmation of Dr. N.R. Sharma**

**32.** Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor (**Appendix-XXXVII**) that Dr. N. R. Sharma, Principal, P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur be confirmed as such on his post w.e.f. the due date i.e. 15.7.2017, after completion of one year probation period.

- NOTE:** 1. Dr. N.R. Sharma, Principal, Guru Gobind Singh College of Education for Women, Gidderbaha, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib was appointed as Principal at P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur vide Syndicate decision dated 15.5.2016 (Para 75) on one year probation. His appointment was also approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 9.10.2016 (Para VIII).
2. A copy of self performance appraisal report accepted by the Vice-Chancellor is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVII**).
3. Regulation 5 appearing at page 118 P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 reads as under:

“Every appointment whether by direct recruitment or by promotion or by any other method approved by the Senate, shall be made on probation for a period of one year, which may be extended by the appointing authority for a period not exceeding one year. The appointing authority may, however, grant exemption in exceptional cases.”

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that Dr. N. R. Sharma, Principal, P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur be confirmed as such on his post w.e.f. the due date i.e. 15.7.2017, after completion of one year probation period.

**Proposal for the Finance and Development Officer dated 25.5.2017**

**33.** Considered proposal dated 25.05.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) of the Finance and Development Officer with regard to budget estimates of P.U. Constituent College, Dharamkot and Ferozepur, for an amount of Rs. 1.16 crore, for the year 2017-18.

At this stage, some discussion took place, which is related to Item No.C-34 and the same has been inserted there.

**RESOLVED:** That proposal dated 25.05.2017 of the Finance and Development Officer with regard to budget estimates of P.U. Constituent College, Dharamkot and Ferozepur, for an amount of Rs. 1.16 crore, for the year 2017-18, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Proposal for the Finance and Development Officer dated 22.5.2017**

**34.** Considered proposal dated 22.05.2017 (**Appendix-XXXIX**) of the finance and Development Officer with regard to amendment in Account Manual of Panjab University, pursuant to the General

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Financial Rules as notified by the Government of India dated 03.05.2017.

It was informed that the papers related with this item have been circulated on the table. The item relates to certain amendments which have been proposed in the Accounts Manual in pursuance of the amendments in the General Financial Rules which they are following. The earlier power to purchase items without quotation was Rs.15,000/- which has now been revised to Rs.25,000/-. The Government has implemented an online procurement portal by the name e-market, they are following it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the U.T. Administration in collaboration with the Finance Department has recently organised a workshop. He requested that a presentation could also be done in the meeting of the Chairpersons.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be taken care of.

**RESOLVED:** That proposal dated 22.05.2017 of the finance and Development Officer with regard to amendment in Account Manual of Panjab University, pursuant to the General Financial Rules as notified by the Government of India dated 03.05.2017, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

It was suggested by the members that Item I-(xvii) be taken up as an item for consideration.

**Panel for selection of Assistant Professor at RSD College, Ferozepur City**

**35.** Considered if the panel for the selection of Assistant Professors in R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City, be approved and sent to the College.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 31.07.2016 (Para 32) (**Appendix-XL**) resolved that the request of Principal RSD college Ferozepur city for providing a panel for making selection of Assistant Professor in Physics and Commerce be not accepted.
  2. The said issue was also discussed during General Discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 (**Appendix-XL**) and the Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into the circumstances in which the Syndicate took this decision.
  3. An office note containing detailed history of the case is enclosed (**Appendix-XL**)

**RESOLVED:** That the panel for the selection of Assistant Professors in R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City, be approved and sent to the College.

**Routine and formal matters**

**36.** The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(xii)** on the agenda was read out, i.e.,-

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has deputed Shri S.S. Sangha, Principal,

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Dashmesh Girls College of Education, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib to Dashmesh Girls College, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for a period of one year w.e.f. the date of joining. During the period of deputation the lien of his post of Principal at Dasmesh Girls College of Education, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib shall be retained. Further the period of deputation can be extended beyond one year if the Management deems fit.

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the eligibility conditions (**Appendix-XLI**) for the Entrance Test of PULEET-2017.

**NOTE:** 1. The Vice-Chancellor while approving the eligibility conditions for the Entrance Test of PULEET-2017 has also approved the syllabus for the Entrance Test PULEET-2017.

2. Minutes dated 31.03.2017 of the Committee are enclosed (**Appendix-XLI**).

- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has condoned the shortage of lectures of the following students of various teaching Departments (**Appendix/Annexures-XLII**):

Sr. No.	Department	Name of the Student/Courses	Appendix/Annexure
1.	Department of Chemistry & Centre of Advanced Studies in Chemistry, P.U.	Mr. Rajinder Singh Verma (B.Sc. 2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester (H.S.))	<b>'A'</b>
2.	Department of Computer Science and Application, P.U.	Mr. Ankit Sharma M.Sc. (H.S.) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester	<b>B</b>
3.	Department of Botany	Ms. Sakshi Thakur M.Sc. (H.S.) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester	<b>C</b>
4.	University Business School, P.U.	1. Mr. Arun Kumar 2. Ms. Akriti 3. Mr. Aman Gupta	<b>D</b>
5.	Department-cum- Centre For Women's Studies & Development, P.U.	1. Mr. Dharminder Singh 2. Ms. Amanjeet Kaur	<b>E</b>
6.	Department of Chemistry & Centre of Advanced Studies in Chemistry, P.U.	Ms. Garima Garg	<b>F</b>
7.	Department of Music, P.U.	Mr. Sunil Kumar Kamal	<b>G</b>
8.	Department of Geography	1. Ms. Surnandini Sharma 2. Mr. Albel Singh Dhaliwal 3. Ms. C. Beipakhaisa	<b>H</b>
9.	University Business	Ms. Vanshika	<b>I</b>

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Sr. No.	Department	Name of the Student/Courses	Appendix/Annexure
	School, P.U.		

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XLIII**) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Florida Polytechnic University, USA.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved that Dr. Monika Nagpal, Assistant Professor on temporary basis at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, be granted exemption in fee for higher study (MDS), from the said Institute, and permitted to retain her seat on payment of token amount of 10% of the tuition fee, if, she gets a seat in MDS course.

**NOTE:** Request dated 11.5.2017 of Dr. Monika Nagpal containing orders/observation of the Vice-Chancellor is enclosed (**Appendix-XLIV**).

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

(i) extended the term of appointment of following as Assistant Professor (temporary), University Institute of Hotel & Tourism Management, P.U. upto June, 2017 on the same term and conditions with one day break as usual:

1. Mr. Gaurav Kashyap
2. Mr. Abhishek Ghai
3. Mr. Manoj Semwal
4. Mr. Amit Katoch
5. Ms. Lipika Gullani

(ii) re-appointed above persons (in terms of decision dated 31.05.2015 of Syndicate) as Assistant Professor, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 11.07.2017, for the academic session 2017-18 against the vacant posts of the Institute, or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP plus allowances under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of appointment of Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor (temporary), Centre for Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering, Institute of Emerging Area in Science & Technology, upto 30.06.2017 with one day break on 01.05.2017, purely on temporary basis or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules



Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

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

- (viii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes dated 27.04.2017 (**Appendix-XLV**) of the Committee, for finalization of Admission Guidelines (affiliated Colleges of Panjab University) for the session 2017-18.

**NOTE:** A copy of Circular No. 4030-4279/ R&S dated 02.05.2017 issued in this regard is enclosed (**Appendix-XLV**).

- (ix)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved that the nomenclature of Bachelor of Clinical Optometry (B.Optom) course being run at Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh, be amended to Bachelor of Optometry (B.Optom) from the admission batch 2017-18, as per UGC specifications of degree.

- (x)** The Vice-Chancellor subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has approved the promotion of the following incumbents in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400/- with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, w.e.f. the date they reports for duty, against the following vacant posts in the Department of Physics:

Sr. No.	Name of the Incumbent	Promoted as
1.	Shri Rup Lal Bhardwaj, Sr. Technician (G-II)	Senior Technical Assistant (G-I)
2.	Shri Dinesh Kumar, Sr. Technician (G-II)	Senior Scientific Assistant (G-I)

- (xi)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has allowed to introduce the paper/topic “Drug Abuse: Problem, Prevention and Management” having 2 credit/50 marks (40 theory+10 internal) at undergraduate level, as a fourth part of the paper “Environment, Road Safety Education and Violence against Women and Children” from the academic session 2017-18.

**NOTE:** 1. The examination (one hour duration) would be held along with the paper on “Environment, Road Safety Education and Violence against Women and Children”.

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

- (xii)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the Syndicate has approved that the fee-fund structure to be followed by the Degree Colleges affiliated to Panjab University for the session 2017-18 would remain same as prevailed in the year 2016-17.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

**NOTE:** A copy of letter No. Misc./A-6/85015-85185 dated 22.05.2017 issued by D.R. (Colleges) in this regard is enclosed (**Appendix-XLVII**).

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the information contained in **Items R-(i) to R-(xi)**, be ratified; and
- (ii) the information contained in **Item R-(xii)**, be ratified with the addition that this decision would be applicable to the Constituent Colleges also.

**Routine and formal matters**

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

- (i) In partial supersession to office order No. 2005-12/Estt.I dated 30.3.2017, the Vice-Chancellor has allowed Dr. Vijay Nagpal, Professor Department of Laws to continue in service as professor w.e.f. 1.2.2017 without any break, and avail the salary benefits, which he was drawing as on 31.1.2017 excluding HRA, subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjusted against the final dues to him for which he has to give an undertaking on the attached format giving reference to his own court case.

**NOTE:** It was mentioned in the decision of the Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 (Para 41 I(i)) (**Appendix-XLVIII**) that as per interim direction of the Hon'ble High Court in CWP No. 3435 of 2017 Dr. Vijay Nagpal will be permitted to continue to work as Professor in the Department of Laws, P.U. and would be released financial benefits as applicable, as per the rules and service conditions till further orders.

- (ii) To note the letter dated 06.05.2017 of President, Punjab Government College Principal Association.
- (iii) To note the recommendation (No.5) of the Sub-Committee dated 31.3.2017 (**Appendix-XLIX**) that the nomenclature of the M.Sc. (Honours School), be changed to M.Sc. (Honours School System) as per specimen (**Appendix-XLIX**).
- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employee:

Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
Shri Bhawnesh Bhargava S.D.E. (Civil) Construction Office	23.06.1983	31.05.2017	Gratuity as admissible under the University

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

			Regulations.
--	--	--	--------------

**NOTE:** The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

(v) In pursuance of orders dated 06.04.2017/25.04.2017 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 7196 of 2017 (Dr. Aneel Kumar Raina 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.26187 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) was fixed for hearing on 20.07.2017, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Aneel Kumar Raina, Professor, Department of English and Cultural Studies, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.05.2017 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 he was drawing as on 30.04.2017 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 shall 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).
- (iii) The office orders regarding re-employment already issued vide No.1781-1788/Estt.-I dated 20.03.2017 have been treated as withdrawn.

(vi) To note the orders dated 24.4.2017 (**Appendix-L**) of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in LPA -1651-2016 (O&M) Dr. Vijay Chopra versus Panjab University others.

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Doctors working in Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Health Centre, P.U. upto the dates on which new doctors joins their duties after afresh appointment, on the previous terms & conditions:-

Name of Doctor	Designation	Earlier term upto	Date of break	Further extension upto date on which new Doctors joins

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Dr. R.V. Suri	Medical Officer (Full time)	} 02.03.2017	03.03.2017	w.e.f. 04.03.2017
Dr. Satish Sambher	Medical Officer (Full time)			

- (viii)** The Vice-Chancellor has given a week's extension, to Dr. Monica Nagpal, Assistant Professor (temporary), for joining MDS course at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, as requested by her vide request dated 19.05.2017 (**Appendix-LI**).

**NOTE:** Her case for exemption in fee for Higher study is also on the Syndicate Agenda (Item No.4) dated 28.05.2017 for consideration.

- (ix)** The Vice-Chancellor, has extended the validity of Advertisement No. 2/2016, upto 15.07.2017 in respect of two posts of Assistant Registrars (one for PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur and one for PURC, Ludhiana), so that the posts could be filled up.

**NOTE:** 1. The posts of Assistant Registrars were advertised vide No. 2/2016 (**Appendix-LII**) and the validity of the said Advertisement was upto 15.05.2017.

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

- (x)** To note the recommendations dated 25.04.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding complaint of Ms. Sapandeeep Verma against Guru Nanak College of Education, Gopalpur, Distt. Ludhiana.

- (xi)** To note the letter No.VPS/15/2/2012 dated 10.04.2017 (**Appendix-LIII**) received from the Chancellor office.

- (xii)** To note the interim report (**Appendix-LIV**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding facts or errors which occurred in conduct of examination, for session 2016-17.

- (xiii)** To note the complaint received from a Principal of an affiliated College of Panjab University (**Appendix-LV**), by the Vice-Chancellor.

- (xiv)** The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that admission at B.A.-I level be restricted to 200 students at Department of Evening Studies-MDRC for the year 2017-18, in view of low pass percentage in the 1<sup>st</sup> year and the facts that only about 100 students have passed out at B.A.III level.

**NOTE:** A chart showing the number of students admitted/appeared and passed in various courses from the session 2012-13, 2013-14 and

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

2014-15 of Department of Evening Studies (MDRC) is enclosed (**Appendix-LVI**).

- (xv) The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following as Assistant Professor at P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, Distt. Moga, purely on temporary basis for one month i.e. upto 31.05.2017 (with one day break) on the same term and conditions on which they are working earlier vide letter No. 7618-27/Estt.I dated 14.07.2016, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>
1.	Dr. Parminder Singh	Punjabi
2.	Dr. Harjeet Singh	English
3.	Dr. Shashi Kant Rai	Hindi
4.	Ms. Rajni Bhalla	Commerce
5.	Ms. Monica	Commerce
6.	Mr. Sandeep Buttola	Sociology
7.	Ms. Ritu Mittal	Economics
8.	Mr. Ashim Kumar	Mathematics
9.	Mr. Rajiv Kumar	Political Science
10.	Mrs. Simarnjit Kaur	Computer Science

- (xvi) The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of following Assistant Professors purely on temporary basis at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Una Road, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur to work as such up to 31.05.2017, with one day break as usual against the vacant post of the centre or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/-, plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of Assistant Professor</b>	<b>Branch/Subject</b>
1.	Shri Kanwal Preet Singh	CSE
2.	Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur	CSE
3.	Ms. Shama Pathania	CSE
4.	Ms. Monika	ECE
5.	Shri Anish Sharma	ECE
6.	Ms. Harman Preet Kaur	ECE
7.	Shri Gurbinder Singh	I.T
8.	Ms. Divya Sharma	I.T
9.	Mrs. Ritika Arora	I.T
10.	Ms. Tanvi Sharma	I.T.
11.	Mr. Ajay Kumar Saini	Mech.
12.	Mr. Gurwinder Singh	Mech.

- (xvii) To note that the Vice-Chancellor, has allowed to send the panel, for the selection of Assistant Professors in R.S.D. College, Ferozpur city.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 31.07.2016 (Para 32) resolved that the request of Principal RSD college Ferozpur city for providing a panel for

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

making selection of Assistant Professor in Physics and Commerce be not accepted.

2. The said issue was also discussed during General Discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 and the Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into the circumstances in which the Syndicate took this decision.
3. An office note containing detailed history of the case is enclosed.

**Referring to Item I-(x)**, Dr. Dalip Kumar pointed out that the necessary annexures have not been provided with the item. They could not consider the item without the annexures. He suggested that this item be deferred.

This was agreed to.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the information contained in **Items I-(i), I-(iii) to (ix), I-(xi) to (xiii), I-(xv) to (xvi)** be noted;
- (ii) the information contained in **Item I-(ii)** be treated as withdrawn;
- (iii) **Item I-(x)** be deferred in the absence of the required annexures;
- (iv) The information contained in **Item I-(xiv)** be noted and the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to take decision on the number of seats; and
- (v) **Item I-(xvii)** be treated as an item for consideration **C-35**.

### **General Discussion**

1. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he had to talk on two-three issues and his first important issue was that they (Panjab University) had given the extension of 5 years to the Principals. Firstly extension was give under the system 2+2+1 years and in the last meeting it was done under the system 3+2 years. But, time and again that opportunity had been denied to the teachers. He wanted that the teachers, working in any college, be given extension on the full scale and on the same terms i.e. 3+2 years. As the Principals of the Colleges were valuable, the teachers of the colleges were also equally valuable, because an institution runs on the basis of teachers, of course the Principal has a role, he works as the head of the institution. But, if any institution does not have good teachers that institution will not have any name, they will not get any good product from that institution. Any teacher who had experience of 25 years, 30 years or 35 years, if their experience had been utilized little more, so that their future, the students be given good education.

The Vice Chancellor said that what can the University do?

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said if the University could do that for the Principals, it can be done for the teachers also.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said this should be brought as an item for consideration.

Principal Gurdip Sharma also suggested that it should be brought as an item.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that his (Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu) issue was that it may get priority as in the case of Principals.

The Vice Chancellor said that how the University can do that.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he had already told him (Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu) that the teachers in colleges will not get extension as the Management will not give that. But his (Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu) issue was that when the posts had been advertised, if they don't get a suitable person then the teachers should get extension. But, there was a lot of unemployment, a lot of teachers are available, Colleges can get the teachers easily.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the system should be uniform. Everyone should get the extension, there should be no pick and choose.

The Vice Chancellor said that there will be uniformity if 3+2 years extension system to Principals be cancelled.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that what Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu was saying right.

The Vice Chancellor said that we must deserve something which had significance.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he was fighting for his right, he was not saying to cancel their (Principals) extension. They should get their right.

Principal B.C. Josan said they cannot give, there was Management for that.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the item of the Principals had come in the last meeting and he had raised the issue. They can do that they can bring the item as resolution. Post was advertised, in many situations, candidates were not eligible.

The Vice Chancellor said that give him statistical data, don't talk like that. Give detail that so many positions were advertised and 30% eligible person not found, only then there was sanctity. They should have some data.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if they had not eligible candidates, they had to see the suitability.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it was not easy for them to collect and provide data.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu) should tell him (Vice Chancellor) on behalf of any Management, take the DAV Management, take the Khalsa College Management, take the S.D. College Management, how many positions were there. In U.T., Management of S.D. and they have more than 100 people; two DAV had 300-400 teachers. Tell him (Vice Chancellor) subjects whose positions were advertised in the year and at the end of the day, the candidate not suitable or the candidate not eligible, give him (Vice Chancellor) some statistics, then some case can be made. Otherwise, no parallel case can be made. It was better to continue the fight that the age of retirement should be 65 years. If the Court, in future, gives 65 years date of retirement to the University teachers, the Court will not give just to University teachers; it will be given to College teachers also. That was the case worth fighting. They should fight there that why the court distinguishing. If the Court gives 65 years in future, what the concession would be given to University teachers, the same concessions it must necessarily would have to be given to the College Teachers. They should fight for that, fight collectively, he (Vice Chancellor) was not opposing that. He had done in the University from 63 to 65 age of retirement.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the College teachers had already gone to the Court. The Court had separated College teachers' case and had already relieved them.

The Vice Chancellor said that they were not having the scheme of re-employment, that's why they were relieved. Neither there was any pension in colleges.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that that's why re-employment scheme be started in colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that why there was no pension in the government-aided colleges, why they were not fighting for that. In Maharashtra all the private colleges who had grant-in-aid position, were given pension by the Maharashtra Government.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that in Haryana also they were given pension.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that there were more than 25 states in India, which had been giving pension to Government aided Colleges. Unfortunately, their governments were not giving pension to them.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they were trying and they had filed a case in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that they should fight for that.

2. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that in the last meeting they had taken a decision to send a letter to the College Principals regarding the teachers who were working on contract basis should be given their maternity and all other types of leaves. He thinks that communication has not been sent.

The Vice Chancellor said that that has been noted. His main concern was that when he looked into all that fee structure businesses, they should on behalf of the Syndicate check college per college to those who were taking Rs. 1940 or Rs. 2000 the teachers.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu asked that money for gratuity?

The Vice Chancellor said that which were those colleges who were taking money for gratuity?

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu and Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that all the colleges were taking.

The Vice Chancellor said that all those were giving their benefit or not?

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they were not giving.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that those who were not giving be pointed out.

The Vice Chancellor said that take an agenda that during the next 12 months, all the colleges would be visited on behalf of the Syndicate, either that Syndicate do or Syndicate of January do. Syndicate should accept the responsibility, particularly, the college teachers and the college Principals in this Syndicate, they should accept the responsibility. They should take the authorization from him (Vice Chancellor) and go to the nearby colleges and file a report that during the last 3 years the teachers who had been retired, had been given the gratuity or not. Assessment report to be filed with the University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that your (Vice Chancellor's) concern was very good. There may not be need for that. He wants to say that persons in the Senate, who had come winning from the teachers' constituency, tell them, they will bring the lists for the purpose.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that that was absolutely right. They can bring the lists.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said they will bring everything there. If they (Vice Chancellor) want to know the facts, they will bring.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was going in a personal way. It was the directive by the Vice Chancellor with the approval of the Syndicate that they will go and check it in every college. They will do that work in 12 months. There were around 190 colleges and if he gets 10 volunteers, each one will have to go to 20 colleges. Find colleges in their neighbourhood and they would physically visit there, find out and file a report.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that first of all put someone on duty, he had also told in the last Syndicate meeting, some efforts were done that Principal of D.M. College of Education, Dr. Sushma had been retired and she had not been given any benefit. Her all the benefits including provident fund had not been released from the college and that was the aided college.

The Vice Chancellor said that get the status report.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that that college was very near; send someone there to get the report.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that get the status report from all.

The Vice Chancellor said that write a general letter, general letter will go that the Syndicate desires status report of that be filed and the Syndicate will carry out a surprise check on behalf of the Syndicate. Syndicate's special check will be carried during the next 12 months to validate the status.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the due payment of Rs. 45 to 50 lakhs had to be given to her (Dr. Sushma). It was said that she had not given adjustment of Rs. 2-3 lakhs as lecturer in the Department of USOL. Her dues be refunded by retaining Rs. 2-3 lakhs. She had problem of her children. Remaining money should be given to her.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should make sure that the retirement benefits should be given to them.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he will repeat again, earlier also the issue of Principals and teachers was raised in the same meeting. The decision of Principals had been notified, but the decision of the contract teachers, already done, has to be notified yet. They had the regular grant-in-aid-posts; they get the posts through Court. Due to financial matter, the Government had done it on contract basis for 3 years and posts were against their regular posts. Those teachers should get the priority as of regular teachers; they should be given all type of leaves. The decisions should be notified. He appreciates Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal for giving the leaves to the contract teachers, but others are not giving. Those were the regulars posts, the persons were working against regular posts. He would request Principal B.C. Josan that the colleges of Panjab University were giving them one month frothing summer vacations to those teachers, but the colleges of Punjabi University were not giving vacations of one month. Those were the regular posts; just name of

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

contract had been given to those posts, the persons were working against the regular posts. They should issue the notification at the earliest so that they may avail the vacations. Earlier also that decision had been taken

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that earlier also the issue was raised but the contract word was not used.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that a copy of the notification be also sent to the DPI (Colleges).

The Vice Chancellor agreed to this.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he want to add regarding gratuity. There was a rule in the provision of gratuity that any college, that they were talking about deduction of Rs. 1960, an account in Bank will be opened in which there will a Principal and other person will be DCDC, it will be joint account. He doesn't think that there will be such an account in more than 5% colleges. That account should be on record.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he (Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu) was saying right.

Principal Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they can ask for update of the account from the colleges.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he want to submit that in 2009, the fee of Rs. 350 had been taken which had become Rs. 1940 and at that time a noting regarding fee was also there and that latter on noting was removed by the college branch, which (noting) had now again been attached. That noting was that there should be a separate head, the money will be deposited in that separate head and that money will not be utilized by the college for any other purpose. The money will remain that separate head and whenever any teacher will retire, he/she will get money from that head. That head have not been maintained by the colleges.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that that had not been done.

The Vice Chancellor said that don't take up the issue individually. Take that issue on behalf of the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they were looking after that issue specifically in the Affiliation Committee. They take the balance sheet and it clearly shows in the balance sheet whether they (colleges) had created the head or not. They had sent the observation to the many colleges that they should correct that immediately. That number was about 50% colleges comply.

The Vice Chancellor said that if only 50% colleges were complying; let them enhance that 50% to 90%.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that that need to have a check.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that there should be a separate account.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Principal Gurdip Sharma said that account should not be separate.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that head should be separate.

3. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he had two issues, one was that the peon of his college had resigned and his (peon's) resign had not been accepted. Basically resignation related to establishment branch and the Registrar may note that. It had been 3-4 months that he (peon) had given resignation. He (Peon) had to get his P.F. etc. His (Peon's) resignation may immediately be accepted. His name was Gurjinder Singh and was working as peon in my college.

The Vice Chancellor said that okay that will be done.

4. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that his second issue was that Principal Khosla had been given a show-cause notice. He had some previous inquiries. A Committee was formed there and he doesn't think that the said committee had paid any visit to that college. Dean of University Instruction was heading that committee. He had reports of an inquiry dated 25.5.2016 done by DSP. . That inquiry was in favour of Principal Khosla. After that an inquiry was done on 5.9.2016 by AIG Intelligence. That inquiry was also in favour of Principal Khosla. He will read two words of that inquiry report, which were "As per my inquiry, the allegation of Shri Kuldeep Singh regarding saying caste remarks had been proved false. Shri Kuldeep Singh with his friends has levelled false allegation against Principal to tease him and slur his dignity. Therefore, she recommends that action under IPC 182 (for complaint of false allegation) be taken against Shri Kuldeep Singh. Therefore, if accepted, SSP of the SBS Nagar, be given in written to take action under IPC 182 against Shri Kuldeep Singh." That Committee had given report in favour of Principal Khosla and the Registrar had sent show-cause notice to him (Principal Khosla). It was a wrong thing to send show-cause notice. The inquiry had been done by an AIG who was an IPS level Officer. The show cause notice should be taken back against Principal Khosla and a case be registered against the complainant for levelling fake allegation.

Principal Gurdip Sharma and some other members said that that was quite right.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him (Principal Khosla) reply to the show-cause notice. He has to reply the show-cause notice.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that as per his knowledge, show-cause notice should not have been sent to him (Principal Khosla).

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that all right it was his (Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu) thinking, fine.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that first give the decision on his that issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was not going to give his answer there.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that had put that issue in the Syndicate, not in front of him (Vice Chancellor). That was zero hour.

The Vice Chancellor said that that was not the matter of consideration, let all the facts come and then the matter will be taken up.

5. Shri Varinder Singh said that he had earlier also talked that this year results of the sports had come very good. The Director Sports had been residing in E-1/50 since his joining, which was a small house. Some other officers/official has been allotted big house and he (Director Sports) was also entitled for big house. He (Director Sports) looks after the sports of colleges in Punjab as well as sports at University Campus. Like that Shri Nirmal Singh Jaura, Director, Youth Welfare should be given big house.

The Vice Chancellor said that when the new sets of houses will get made and get allotted at that stage it will get considered. He had told to both of them. Right now a number of houses which were falling vacant of the big size, were so small because the person who had to vacate the houses on retiring at 60, were not going to retire. At that moment, the big houses were not adequate in number which was available to him. He had explained it to both of them. When the new houses in Sector-25 will be constructed, which would be of larger size, at that stage he will be able to consider their request.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if any big house was vacated then, they may be allotted.

The Vice Chancellor said that no, he will not go out of turn at that stage. He had already allotted them houses out of turn.

Shri Varinder Singh said try if they can be given big houses.

The Vice Chancellor said that he can only do that much.

6. Shri Varinder Singh said that the ex-servicemen working as Security Guard in the University should be regularized.

The Vice Chancellor said that no, at the moment they cannot be regularized. There was a procedure for regularization and for the procedure the post has to be advertised and he was not in a position to do that.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Shri Varinder Singh said that they (Security Guards) were working for a long period.

The Vice Chancellor said that he cannot do anything; they were living in India which had those complications. As a Vice-Chancellor, he does not have any authority. If as the Syndicate they pass anything, they can do that, but they should be rest assured that anything which has the financial implications, without the approval of the Central Government, at the moment nothing can be done.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they may be given some promotion.

The Vice Chancellor said that how he can give promotion?

Shri Varinder Singh said that upgrade them and increase their salary.

The Vice Chancellor said that there was a suggestion to make them from C level to B level or do some such thing. All those things had financial implications.

7. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in previous meeting also he had talked with him (Vice Chancellor) and he (Vice Chancellor) had told to give in writing regarding the courses of D.P.Ed, B.P.Ed, M.P.Ed. One course of B.P.Ed that was being taken back from Universities by the NCTE and had been given to the SCERT and the SCERT was not running that course. That course was being run in Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar. He had requested that Panjab University should also run that course till that can be run and when that will be run by the SCERT then they will shut that course. He (Vice Chancellor) had told at that time to give in writing and he had given him (the Vice Chancellor) the name of three colleges in which that course had been running. What was the position of that?

It was informed that it was allowed last year, the University can do that.

The Vice Chancellor instructed Controller of Examinations to get it allowed.

8. Professor Mukesh Arora said that he had a request that he think perhaps the last date for LL.M entrance test was Thursday. But two students had applied on Friday. If they can be given a chance to apply for the entrance test, they may be allowed. Two-three students had come from Delhi, Thursday was the last date and they had sent him E-mail on Friday. He had also requested to the Controller of Examinations, if possible allow them.

The Vice Chancellor directed the officials to look into that.

9. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang that the College of Education had applied for Diploma in Yoga of B.Ed. That permission may be granted. The College Branch had given a letter that it comes

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

in the courses of NCTE, but that don't come in NCTE courses. He (Vice Chancellor) may recommend that issue to the Affiliation Committee and that committee will give the decision on that issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was right.

10. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that the paper checking Centre of Abohar was being closed. There were 7-8 colleges in Abohar, teachers from Malout also come there for paper checking, and therefore, that centre (Abohar) should not be closed.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that that was separate district.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that why that centre was being closed?

11. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he (Vice Chancellor) should check that how the course of NCTE can be given to Education College?

The Vice Chancellor said that that course (Diploma in Yoga) was not the course of NCTE.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang also said that that course was not the course of NCTE.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said if it was NCTE course, it cannot be given to the Education College.

Principal B.C. Josan said that B.Ed in Yoga was of the NCTE course, but Diploma in Yoga was the course of the University.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he wanted to say for their (members) kind information that only those courses were being run in the Education Colleges which had been approved by the NCTE. If there had been any objection, they had put that objection rightly that how the Yoga course can be given.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that that college was affiliated to the University and the course was being related to education.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that of course the college was affiliated to the University. It was beyond his understanding. Education College cannot take that course.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal also said that the course (Diploma in Yoga) cannot be taken by the Education College.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that that course (Diploma in Yoga) had been running in the Punjab University, Patiala.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Punjab University Patiala do not get funds from Delhi. The complaints of their

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

University go to Delhi, whereas the complaints of Punjabi University, Patiala, come to the Secretariat.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he needs a clarification that in future can Degree College demand for a course which may not be approved by the University Grants Commission. That may not be done. Education Colleges get the courses which were approved by the NCTE.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang) should talk him later on.

12. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that there is a rumour regarding advance payment due to fire in the Administrative Block. Whether that payment will be sent or not?

The Vice Chancellor said that appropriate action will be taken.

13. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that an item had been put in information regarding panel to R.S.D. College, Ferozepur. It would be suitable if instead of information that item be put in ratification or consideration. They accept that item had been allowed in consideration.

The Vice Chancellor confirmed that was that panel for RSD College?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that yes, the item had already come in the information and same had been approved by him (Vice Chancellor). But instead of information let that be as consideration item. They accept that as consideration item and approve that item.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they allow it.

It was agreed.

14. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that item (ii) was related to the incident which happened over there. That matter had already been resolved to an extent. A letter had been written by the Principal of a Government College regarding what happened actually in the Syndicate. That matter should not have come from the Government College and the issue should have been resolved there (in the Syndicate). That letter from President, Punjab Government College Association was related to Shri Varinder Singh with regard to Professor Parvinder Singh. He thinks they had already resolved that issue.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the item was for information.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had given that letter to the Standing Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that but the information item may be withdrawn.

The Vice Chancellor said that that item 1(ii) be withdraw.



Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it was wrong to bring that letter there. If the President of Association of Government Colleges is condemning a member of the Syndicate and that condemnation had been put there as such. Very strong words had been used in the condemnation letter. He thinks the members of the Syndicate can take decision there. He would also request that what the unpleasant incident happened on that day was unfortunate, they all understand the said unfortunate incident. Therefore, he first of all says to Shri Varinder Singh that he should express regret to Principal Gurdip Sharma and Professor. Parvinder Singh. He (Shri Varinder Singh) had already expressed regret to Professor Parvinder Singh.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would withdraw the item I (ii).

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that no, if he had withdrawn earlier that would have been right. The issue had come in the newspapers, everything had happened. They had a lot of organizations like Government College Teachers, Ex-Servicemen and there were different organizations and in future, if they were sending condemnation letter and the same had been printed as that was, that was not good from any angle and it had no justification and in future that type of mistake should not be repeated. He said that the details of letter have come in the agenda and the entire language is objectionable. The Press had also covered the details of the letter. Such a thing is very unpleasant. The Principal of that college is very close to him, he is also his friend, but whatever has happened is not likeable. In future, if some ex-service person would have some issue with the Registrar, ex-servicemen organizations will come there and some other organization may also come in favour of their members, then what would happen. It was the sanctity of the agenda, if there is an outside agency condemning any incident, they don't have any problem because they have their autonomy, but putting their condemnation in the agenda papers totally unpleasant.

The Vice Chancellor said that nobody was condemning.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said he (Principal of Government College in his letter) had condemned.

The Vice Chancellor asked that what has happened by his condemnation.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they (Panjab University) has made that as the part of agenda papers.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has been told that the blunders had been happening in the University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the question was not that, the question was for that episode.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that that issue was condemnable.

The Vice Chancellor said that everything comes here.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that no, it has never happened. That type of issue had never appeared in the agenda papers

The Vice Chancellor said that he, as Vice Chancellor has been accused for the last two years. That comes in the newspapers, who had condemned that, had anyone condemned it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that that had never come in the agenda papers.

The Vice Chancellor said that such accusation had come in the agenda.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that what had come.

The Vice Chancellor said that there had come thousand times.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that since he has been there, he had not seen.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if any other organization sends a letter against him (Vice Chancellor), will he (Vice Chancellor) bring that as an agenda item.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that nobody was with her in that case against him (Vice Chancellor).

Shri Varinder Singh said that he accepts his mistake for what he had spoken against Principal Gurdip Sharma.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that first he should feel sorry to both (Principal Gurdip Sharma and Professor Parvinder Singh).

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma also said that he (Shri Varinder Singh) should feel sorry.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it was a wrong thing that when Minutes had not been recorded, how that Principal comes to know whatever happened in the Syndicate meeting.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that that was the point.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that how that Principal was condemning the incident. Rather Syndicate should condemn that how the Principal had done that. You should condemn him (Principal).

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that yes, they should condemn that Principal.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if that had come in written, that was not good.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that that was not appropriate from any angle.

The Vice Chancellor said that officers of the University are accused in a meeting. Nobody comes in the defence of these Officers. After one week, he receives a letter from the two Senators, accusing C.O.E. that they went in the Office of the COE, where this and that happened. What was that? He was presiding over such a University?

Shri Varinder Singh said that what he had to do with that.

The Vice Chancellor said that please understand.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if someone had a written letter, then what link he had with that.

The Vice Chancellor said that please understand. The Senators of the University were writing a letter accusing an Officer of the University, what he should do?

Shri Varinder Singh again said that what he had to do with that.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that get an inquiry done.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had sent the letter to the Standing Committee. There (in the Syndicate), the item was just sent for information.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that that issue was different one.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they were in the full support that the dignity of the Officer should be maintained at all level. They are in favour of that.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he and Controller had talked on the incident and he had felt sorry from the Controller and he said it that day to Principal Gurdip Sharma and earlier also he told him.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that then the issue was over.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they all have family relations; they don't have any grudges with one another.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he (Vice Chancellor) can ask Shri Varinder Singh whether any one asked him (Shri Varinder Singh) that he had done the right they. Everyone had said that he (Shri Varinder Singh) was wrong.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Principal Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that that was right, everyone said his (Shri Varinder Singh) behaviour was not good.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that every member had told him (Shri Varinder Singh) that his behaviour was not good, if he (Shri Varinder Singh) had to talk, he should have talked properly.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that on that day also, they had told him (Shri Varinder Singh) to behave properly.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he feels sorry whatever had happened in the previous meeting, but what that appeared in the newspapers regarding that incident was politics. In future anyone can also write regarding Vice Chancellor, and then will he (Vice Chancellor) bring that in the Syndicate.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that read that in the letter, "Such type of behaviour by a person occupying a responsible seat was condemnable". That was condemnable for the member of the Syndicate. All the words had been used. If the issue had happened in there (in the Syndicate), it should have been resolved there. He (Shri Varinder Singh) had felt sorry to both the persons. But where that had been written a letter of any organization be made as the item of the agenda. What was that organization. There are so many organizations, everyone will do that.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (President, Punjab Government College Association) should be warned for that.

Shri Jarnail Singh and other member said that yes, that was right

The Vice Chancellor said that the issue should not have come as item in that. He sincerely regrets.

The members thanked the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they had family relations, there was no issue then.

The Vice Chancellor said that the incident happened there (in the Syndicate) and he had left the issue there. Some days after he received another letter.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he does not know about that.

The Vice Chancellor said that after ten days he received another letter. What does he find?

Principal N.R. Sharma said that if the issue had been resolved there on that day, perhaps no letter would have come there.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had also received letters of two more Senators.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Shri Varinder Singh said that he doesn't know those things.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that where those letters are?

The Vice Chancellor said that he had asked the Registrar to give those letters for information to the Syndicate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they should be apprised of those letters.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he had marked the letter to the Standing Committee and he asked whether that (letter) has been given to them (members) or not.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he will tell them about that letter, but he doesn't know much about that.

The Vice Chancellor again asked that whether they had been given that letter or not, which had been referred by him to the Standing Committee.

The members said that they had not been given that letter.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had intended that letter be given to the members only on the day of the next (Syndicate) meeting.

Dr. Dalip Kumar and other members said that they don't have that letter till then.

The Vice Chancellor asked from the Registrar that where was the letter of Shri Amit Joshi marked to the Standing Committee. He had sent that letter to be given to the members in a sealed cover during the meeting and not to be given otherwise.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he (Vice Chancellor) can tell then about letter.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he requested him (Vice Chancellor) that that matter will also be resolved very soon.

Professor Pam Rajput said that that should have been told to the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that that letter was supposed to be attached with that (another) letter and was supposed not to come there (in the agenda) like that. It was to be a part of the deliberations before Standing Committee for that thing, (i.e., complaints against COE). He (Vice-Chancellor) would have kept quiet about the incident (on April 30 in the Syndicate), also if more letters had not come, saying that the COE was not doing his job properly, COE was irresponsible.

Shri Varinder Singh said that what that those letters have to do with their incident (on April 30).

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Varinder Singh) also had raised the same COE issue.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he had not told that there, his issue was separate and their (Senators) issue was separate. He doesn't know about their (Senators) issue

The Vice Chancellor said that the Office of the COE was being attacked by the Senators of the University. What does he do? It is a serious matter.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that Vice-Chancellor can tell that.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he would like to say something in general. What he (Shri Varinder Singh) had spoken; he had felt sorry for that. He (COE) was their elder brother and respectable for them like all other officials, if they (members) had any issue with their functioning, working or conduct, they ought to try to say that personally. Just now, he has an issue with the Registrar and he (Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu) said that he would talk with him (Registrar) personally. He would humbly request to their (University) officials, they were respectable for them, that they should not make any prestige issue of anything, that come to them. If any issue arises regarding Conduct or conduct of examination, Secrecy Branch or College Branch or any other Branch then it was their (Syndicate Members) duty to discuss that and the problem was they had platform there (in Syndicate) to discuss that. It should not be understood that on pressurising, the issue is to be snubbed. Earlier one incident had also happened with him, he had not talked about that and issue was to conduct. That incident was so managed and one, the President of Non-Teaching raised the issue against him in the meeting. He (Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu) told that he had not said anything like that. He will tell then that if anything happens regarding conduct of examination that should not happen. He would say that at any platform. So, it was humbly requested to officials that should not snub the members of Syndicate.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he was saying right (Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu). They wholly respect the Officers.

The Vice Chancellor asked (the officials) where was that bundle of four sheets that was to be given in a closed cover on the Syndicate meeting day. The letter (of Principals) too was supposed to be part of that bunch, which was related to the complaints against the Office of the COE.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he had no complaint against COE, work in COE Office was going on very well and he (COE) had online system, which was working very well.

The Vice Chancellor repeated that four-five sheets were together which were to be given on the day of the Syndicate meeting.

Shri Varinder Singh said that argument had taken place on that day (in the previous Syndicate), otherwise there was no issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him read the complaint letter (from Senators) of 11<sup>th</sup> May, "I wish to bring to your kind notice unruly and derogatory behaviour of Professor Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examinations with additional charge of DCDC. The incident pertains to today morning at 10:30 a.m. when I along with one of my fellow colleagues Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu went to the Office of DCDC for seeking clarification on the criteria for assigning some examination duty related work. Dr. Sidhu enquired from him the guidelines for assigning Central Superintendent duties. Dr. Sidhu pointed out to him some issue pertaining to this in a college in Punjab. All the time during the discussion he was avoiding to answer the queries raised by Dr. Sidhu on one pretext or the other. Dr. Sidhu requested him to answer the queries as early as possible as it is already delayed. He reminded him that the matter is already a week old and he has already sent the SMS to him in this regard. To this the Officiating DCDC got furious and started yelling at us. The DCDC started talking that I do not have time and I will do whatever I deem fit and we you have any problem, we can give it in writing. I intervened at this stage and requested him to be polite. He did not listen to me and also continued using abusive language and making baseless allegation. He started passing derogatory remarks against both of us to which I objected and requested him to take back his words. I reminded him that he is sitting on a constitutional and responsible position, and it is his duty to provide answers to our queries to which he again refused. He replied that he doesn't have time for us. I requested him that whether this kind of behaviour is selectively meant for only us only or it is generalised to all the Fellows. We were not there to seek any favours from him. We were there just to enquire whether his office is conforming to the guidelines of the University. Why he is acting in a furious, abusive and derogatory way. If he has not committed any wrong, why does he not register FIR against us. What wrong we have done? Is it justified to threaten a Fellow who wants to seek answers to his/her queries, filing an FIR/police complaint against a Fellow. Both of us went there in the capacity of a Fellow and tried to seek answers to our questions as per the Panjab University Calendar guidelines. This behaviour is simply not acceptable as it lacks objectivity. He may agree or disagree with us. But he should be conscious about behaviour, language and choice of words. All the time during the entire discussion, neither of us used or uttered even a single provocative or abusive word. Finally, his threatening of FIR and his behaviour crossed all the civilised and acceptable limits. We walked out of his room under protest. We did not say even a single word to him except for walking out. We request you to kindly look into the matter and may take suitable action against Professor Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examinations with additional charge of DCDC. Hope you will give due priority to this mail and will uphold protect the sanctity of this important organisation". When this letter came to him, he had already in the back of his mind whatever happened in the Syndicate meeting, he looked

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

at the video twice again. Then he felt that he has to be seen to be protecting the officers also. Let the Standing Committee, which looks into the complaints against the officers, look into what is right or wrong. In the Syndicate meeting, the Controller of Examinations (COE) gets attacked, few days later, the COE again gets attacked. What should he do? Then he got this letter. This letter was supposed to be attached with the letter and the noting which he gave to the Standing Committee to look into the matter. The Standing Committee has actually summoned him (Vice-Chancellor) to give evidence before it on 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2017 at 4.00 p.m. Since on 31<sup>st</sup> May, there is a stamp releasing ceremony, he is supposed to give the evidence on 1<sup>st</sup> June at 4.00 p.m.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma enquired as to on which issue the Vice-Chancellor has been summoned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that on this complaint and the one of Shri Varinder Singh that he handed over to the Standing Committee.

Dr. Dalip Kumar enquired whether the Vice-Chancellor had received some reservations or comments from Dr. Parvinder Singh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has referred the matter to the Committee. The way the Standing Committee has summoned him, it could also summon Dr. Parvinder Singh.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that if the matter has been referred to the Standing Committee, it would be more appropriate if the Vice-Chancellor could have certain comments pertaining to this and he could not have one-sided observations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Dr. Parvinder Singh) had given him only four lines in writing at that stage.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that, according to him, Dr. Parvinder Singh could not talk like this. It could be that sometimes, in annoyance, one could say something but it could not be that one uses such a language. He enquired as to what is Standing Committee for.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a Standing Committee which is supposed to look into the complaints against the officers of the University. It is a three-member Committee headed by Professor Rajat Sandhir, Professor Ameer Sultana and Professor Anil Monga. He has given the complaint to the Committee few days ago. The Committee had done anything so far. He had requested the Committee to provide something as the Syndicate meeting is to be held shortly.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there is no role of the Vice-Chancellor vis a vis Standing Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has been summoned.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that is it in the purview of the Standing Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the purview of the Standing Committee is to look into the complaints against the officers of the University. If this is not a complaint against an officer of the University, what else is the complaint against the officer of the University.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that is it the purview of the Standing Committee to summon the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has written to the Standing Committee that he was a witness to incident no.1 which happened in the Syndicate.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that today's issue is resolved.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that today's issue should be withdrawn.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma also said that it should be withdrawn. He said that the other issue should also be resolved in the same manner after hearing both the parties. He is ready to help in the matter.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the matter should be resolved so that the Vice-Chancellor does not have to appear as witness and why the Vice-Chancellor should face that situation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the letter which he received on 11<sup>th</sup> May, he had forwarded it on 12<sup>th</sup> regarding the serious allegations by the members of the Syndicate/Senate against the senior officers of the University in the Syndicate meeting held on 30.4.2017. In this regard the members of the Standing Committee would like to meet him (Vice-Chancellor) and record his statement on 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2017 at 4.00 p.m. in his office.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it is wrong.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not know what is right or wrong. He has no ego and he would give his statement. The matters which have been referred to the Standing Committee, were supposed to be delivered in a sealed cover at the Syndicate meeting. The item I-2 should not have been provided with the agenda as it was supposed to be in a sealed cover which however, he could not see.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the compromise should be sent to the Standing Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had ignored the matter. When the letter was received on 11<sup>th</sup>, what could he do? How could he know that it is not orchestrisation of complaints against the COE?

15. Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he had raised the issue in the case of Shri Parveen Gupta in the Syndicate meeting held on 21.1.2017. The University wrote a letter on 14.2.17 to the PGIMER. Thereafter no communication has been received from the PGIMER.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would talk to Dr. Amitabh Awasthy in this regard as he is going to attend a meeting there and would ask for the status and would Dr. Dalip Kumar let about it. The job to the dependent son would be provided.

16. Dr. Dalip Kumar said that whenever a holiday is declared in Punjab, the University issues a notice that the Colleges located in Punjab would observe a holiday on that day. Again, another notice is issued that the Colleges of Chandigarh would also remain closed. This should be avoided and only a single notice should be issued to avoid any kind of confusion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Colleges of Chandigarh follow the U.T.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the notice was uploaded that this would apply to the Colleges of Chandigarh also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that until the holiday was accepted for the campus, they could not declare it for the Chandigarh Colleges. When it was accepted for the campus, the same was applicable for the Chandigarh Colleges also.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there are some holidays which are declared by the Punjab Government which the U.T. does not accept. In that case, the notice would go to the Colleges of Punjab.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the Colleges of Chandigarh do not follow the calendar of U.T.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whenever the University accepts any holiday, only then the notice could be sent to the Colleges of Chandigarh.

17. Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the CAS cases of the teachers of Homoeopathic College are pending out of which there is a case of Dr. Reeta Bagga. Some of the issues related with her case have matured to a large extent.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there was a case of change of subject.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was supposed to have a meeting with the Principal of the Homoeopathic College but could not do so. He would hold a meeting and the matter would be sorted out.

18. Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang has talked about and it has also come to his knowledge that an official of the University is deputed at the Evaluation Centre at Abohar and his services are being withdrawn. If that official is withdrawn, then the Centre could close down.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that the official be allowed to continue.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if the official is withdrawn, the evaluation would be close down. Therefore, the official be allowed to continue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Registrar could look into it.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the work at that Centre is going on very smoothly.

It was informed that there are complaints against that official.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would be resolved.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the official should not be withdrawn mid-session. He said that the complaint on which the official is being withdrawn is that in the first instance the NSS incharge had recommended the form. If an officer had recommended the form, it is wrong to say that in the absence of the official, the office work is suffering. Only after the recommendation and with the approval of the authorities, the person had proceeded on duty. The work at the Evaluation Centre could be over within a period of about 10 days, let the official continue this time. But in future, the official may not be deputed.

19. Principal N.R. Sharma said that the extension to the non-teaching staff has not been given for the last two months due to which the salary has not been paid.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the extension would be given.

It was informed that the extension would be given for one year at a time.

20. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the M.Phil. candidates have been given the exemption from course work. All the departments are following this except the University Business School. He requested that a letter should be sent to the Department that whatever has been approved, should be followed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the letter would be sent.

21. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that earlier he had raised two issues. He wanted to know whether those issues had been resolved or not. One of which was regarding the journey day, but the letter in this regard has not been issued till date. One journey day has to be given to those coming to attend the meetings beyond a distance of 150 km.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

The Vice-Chancellor said that the letter would be issued by the Dean College Development Council.

22. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the salary of Ms. Ranjana Sharma has not been released for the last 7 months. Earlier, he had made a request to the Registrar for the release of the salary.

It was informed that a Committee had been formed to look into the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Jarnail Singh to fix the date of the meeting.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the date for holding the meeting has already been fixed.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Committee has to look into some other issue. But the salary has to be released for the period she has been continuously marking her attendance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the salary should be released.

It was informed that the Principal is not submitting the attendance.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to why the Principal is not submitting the attendance.

Shri Jarnail Singh informed that the meeting of the Committee has been fixed on 7<sup>th</sup> June.

23. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired about the case of sexual harassment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that while he was working in the office, he received a telephone on 3<sup>rd</sup> from Dr. Parvinder Singh that he has received the information that something has happened with a Principal. It was very disturbing. He contacted Professor Pam Rajput, Dr. Ameer Sultana and sent them to the Principal along with Dr. Parvinder Singh, the very next day. She confirmed to three of them whatever she wanted to say. On the evening of 4<sup>th</sup>, he got a letter, then he contacted her. He told Dr. Parvinder Singh to ask Dr. Harjodh Singh, Senator not to attend the meeting of the Senate fixed on 7<sup>th</sup>. After the Senate Meeting, he contacted the Senator, but till then he had gone to Mumbai and returned on 11<sup>th</sup> May. When he met Vice-Chancellor on 11<sup>th</sup> he tried to say something like that he has apologized. He (Vice-Chancellor) did not want to interfere in the matter and asked him to go and meet her, but he said that today, he would not be able to go on that day. Then, he (Vice-Chancellor) contacted the Principal and her husband asking them to come to the University. They said that they would not be able to come on Friday and Saturday. Then he (Vice-Chancellor) asked them to come on Sunday. Then he called Dr. Harjodh Singh who admitted that something wrong had happened. Then he (Vice-Chancellor) said that if she accepts, but under the circumstances it is not

appropriate for him (Dr. Harjodh Singh) to continue in the Senate as it would bring a bad name to him as well to Governing Body. So if he (Dr. Harjodh Singh) voluntarily resigns from the Senate, the matter would remain under the wraps as he would be resigning for personal reasons; he (Vice-Chancellor) would not say anything and the matter ends. So, they had a meeting on Sunday and Dr. Harjodh Singh resigned. The next day, Dr. Harjodh Singh withdrew his resignation and the Principal restored her complaint. He had no option and sought a meeting with the DIG and told him everything. He (Vice-Chancellor) had told the Registrar that this matter should be informed to the law enforcement agencies. Thereafter, he (Vice-Chancellor) did not know what happened.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he had got a phone from someone informing that the FIR has been registered as was reported on the PTC New Channel.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired whether this case could not be referred to the PUCASH.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter is of abduction and so on, this is a serious matter. No one of the involved persons is an employee of Panjab University. He (Dr. Harjodh Singh) is an employee of Punjabi University.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he has already read about it in the newspapers.

24. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that last time Principal I.S. Sandhu had discussed the matter of Principal Khosla. In that case, show cause notice has been issued. There are so many implications of that because again those persons are going to the SC Commission with this letter that the University had issued a show cause notice to Principal Khosla for uttering the casteist remarks. It is a serious matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what he could do. He is having that report.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Committee which had been headed by the Dean of University Instruction, how could it envisage that these words must have been used. Two Committees have enquired into it. One Committee headed by SSP, Nawanshahr took 6 months and submitted its report by recording all the evidences including counter-evidence of the staff, this report was not accepted. Again an appeal was filed. This time the enquiry was handed over to AIG (Intelligence). The lady IPS officer took 3 months to record the evidence again. She has written in her report that those persons are harassing the Principal for some time as has earlier been read over by Principal I.S. Sandhu. The real issue was of closing the office that those persons wanted it at 3.00 p.m. instead of 4.00 p.m.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would have to see to it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested all the related papers should be submitted.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to hand over the papers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let them sit together after the meeting to look into it and resolve the issue.

25. Principal B.C. Josan said that in the last meeting he had requested for MBA programme. But no Committee on that issue has been formed. The AICTE has granted the approval and the College has applied in time. He requested for the formation of an Inspection Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would check it.

26. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there is an unpleasant issue. It is a public issue and he is a responsible representative of the University. The examinations which are going on now-a-days are in such a bad taste. Wherever he had gone on flying duty 2-4 times, he heard only one thing that what has happened to the University. The papers are being sent on e-mail, got photocopied. What is the secrecy and sanctity of the papers? The time of the commencement of the examination is 9.00 a.m. but the paper is being conducted late due to opening of some other question paper. There is a mention of 4 papers in the report. He has documents which show that it has happened in 8-10 cases.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to give it to the Controller of Examinations.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that since the Vice-Chancellor says that not to talk against the officers, it is his also his (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) duty being a public representative to bring to light what is happening.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to provide all such documents.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that in the report no such thing has been mentioned that what is the condition of the answer sheets. He had gone to Mukerian where he came to know that there are different numbers on the answer sheets. It was said there that 47 answer sheets should be condemned and thrown away because the answer sheets contained 28 pages instead of 36 or 40 pages. These answer sheets are asked to be wasted. He could not understand what kind of anarchy is there in the whole examination system. He has read and taught in the University, but he has not seen throughout his life such an anarchy which is presently going on. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to listen to him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is just telling Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that he has to provide evidence and submit the documents.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said by raising voice that first he should be listened to and he would also give the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2017

evidence as he has never said anything without evidence in his life nor would he do so. Neither has he any vested interest.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) has not said or done any such thing (without evidence), are the others doing otherwise.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he is not talking of others, the Vice-Chancellor is also not otherwise. The Vice-Chancellor should not take it as personal to him. He continued to remain agitated

The Vice-Chancellor therefore, adjourned the meeting at that moment.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is not the way, the Vice-Chancellor ought to listen to him and not wind up the meeting.

( G.S. Chadha )  
Registrar

Confirmed

( Arun Kumar Grover )  
VICE-CHANCELLOR

