

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on Sunday, 1st April 2018 at 10.00 a.m. in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

1. Professor Arun Kumar Grover ... (in the chair)
Vice Chancellor
2. Dr. Ameer Sultana
3. Ms. Anu Chatrath
4. Shri Ashok Goyal
5. Dr. Amit Joshi
6. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
7. Dr. Ajay Ranga
8. Dr. Amod Gupta
9. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
10. Professor Anita Kaushal
11. Dr. B.C. Josan
12. Dr. Baljinder Singh
13. Professor B.S. Ghuman
14. Professor Chaman Lal
15. Dr. Dalip Kumar
16. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
17. Shri Deepak Kaushik
18. Dr. Emanuel Nahar
19. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
20. Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi
21. Dr. Gurmit Singh
22. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
23. Dr. Harsh Batra
24. Dr. Harjodh Singh
25. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
26. Dr. Inderjit Kaur
27. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
28. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
29. Professor J.K. Goswamy
30. Dr. Jagdish Chander
31. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
32. Shri Jarnail Singh
33. Dr. Keshav Malhotra
34. Dr. K.K. Sharma
35. Dr. Nisha Bhargava
36. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu
37. Shri Naresh Gaur
38. Professor Navdeep Goyal
39. Dr. Neeru Malik
40. Dr. Mukesh K. Arora
41. Professor Meenakshi Malhotra
42. Professor Manoj K. Sharma
43. Dr. Parveen Goyal
44. Professor Pam Rajput
45. Shri Prabhjit Singh
46. Professor Ronki Ram
47. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

48. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
49. Professor R.P. Bambah
50. Shri Raghbir Dyal
51. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
52. Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mahajan
53. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
54. Dr. Raj Kumar Chabbewal
55. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur
56. Dr. S.K. Sharma
57. Dr. Surinder Kaur
58. Shri Satya Pal Jain
59. Dr. S. S. Sangha
60. Shri Sandeep Singh
61. Dr. Subhash Sharma
62. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
63. Dr. Tarlochan Singh
64. Shri V.K. Sibal
65. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) ... (Secretary)
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Capt. Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister
2. Mrs. Aruna Chaudhary, Education Minister, Punjab
3. Dr. Amar Singh
4. Shri Amanpreet Singh
5. Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu
6. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
7. Professor Deepak Pental
8. Justice Harbans Lal
9. Shri H.S. Dua
10. Shri Harjit Singh, D.H.E., Punjab
11. Smt. Kirron Kher
12. Principal N.R. Sharma
13. Shri Parimal Rai
14. Shri Parmod Kumar
15. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
16. Shri Punam Suri
17. Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, D.H.E., Chandigarh
18. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
19. Professor Rajat Sandhir
20. Dr. Suresh Chandra Sharma
21. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar
22. Professor Shelley Walia
23. Shri Sandeep Kumar
24. Shri Sanjay Tandon
25. Shri Sanjeev Bandlish
26. Dr. Satish Kumar
27. Shri Varinder Singh
28. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

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

- (i) Prof. Yash Gulati, former Chairperson of the Department of Hindi, on February 26, 2018;
- (ii) Prof. Sudhakar Pandey (Retd.), Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, on February 26, 2018;
- (iii) Dr. D.V. Rao husband of Dr. Anju Rao, Associate Professor, Dept. of Botany on March 6, 2018;
- (iv) Mrs Rajesh Bansal mother of Prof. Meenakshi Goyal of Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Instt. of Chemical Engg. & Technology on March 25, 2018.

The Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Prof. Yash Gulati, Prof. Sudhakar Pandey (Retd.), Dr. D.V. Rao and Mrs Rajesh Bansal and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed soul.

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

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mahajan, who is attending the meeting for the first time. He is Principal, DAV College, Abohar.

I. The Vice Chancellor said, "I feel immense pleasure in informing the Hon'ble members of the Senate that –

1. Prof. Manmohan Singh, former Prime Minister of India and PU alumnus, will visit Panjab University to deliver the First Dr. S.B. Rangnekar Memorial Oration, mooted by Department of Economics of PU, on April 11, 2018 at 10 am.

Dr. Rangnekar had taught Dr. Manmohan Singh while he was a Reader at Government College, Hoshiarpur. Later on, at Chandigarh they were both colleagues before Professor Manmohan Singh moved on to Delhi and abroad. He is going to share his perception of how India has evolved since independence. Specifically, he is going to talk to young students to motivate them and the visit will last for 1 hour 30 minutes – interaction with the students and faculty for an hour, lecture for 25 minutes and then a short interaction with the faculty and old friends in the University. He has also offered to donate most of his books to the Panjab University Library which are about 3500 in number and we are looking forward to receive the same on behalf of the University.

2. Professor Darshan Singh, Professor Emeritus. Chair of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies, PU, has donated a Cheque amounting to Rs.4 Lakhs (Rupees Four Lakhs only) for the creation of an endowment in the memory of his daughter Shishu who was Professor in the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), to organize a Memorial Lecture, in the UIPS and Guru Nanak Sikh Studies alternatively, every year.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

3. Dr. Neeru Malik, a Senate member has been invited to be part of a team of technical officials and umpires at Table Tennis tournament being held at Yokohama.
4. I may also share with you that the Panjab University had filed an application for Institute of Eminence which is a kind of competition. Nearly 100 State Universities – Central Universities, IITs, IIMs, the universities which belong to the State and also Panjab University as an Inter State Body Corporate had applied. When the completion was set up, it was said that 30 would be invited for presentation. The day before yesterday, I received a communication that Panjab University has to make a 20-minute presentation on 3.4.2018 in the afternoon and a team of 5 members (from PU) is going. The presentation is to be followed by discussion and we are supposed to articulate the strength of our institution, history and the journey so far, vision plan that we have envisaged, implementation plan for whatever we have put in and a financial plan. Initially it was said that the plan would run for a period of 10 years but not it is said that it would run for a period of 5 years. If successful, the University could receive Rs.100 crores every year. So, let us hope for the best.

RESOLVED: That:

- (1) felicitations of the Senate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Professor Darshan Singh, Professor Emeritus. Chair of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies, PU, for having donated a Cheque amounting to Rs.4 Lakhs (Rupees Four Lakhs only) for the creation of an endowment in the memory of his daughter Shishu who was Professor in the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS);
 - (ii) Dr. Neeru Malik, a Senate member who has been invited to be part of a team of technical officials and umpires at Table Tennis tournament being held at Yokohama.
- (2) the information contained in Vice Chancellor's Statement at Sr. No.1 be noted and approved.
- (3) Action Taken Report on the decision of the Senate dated 10.09.2017, 24.09.2017 and 16.12.2017, as per appendix, be noted.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that since his (Vice Chancellor) statement involves all the persons who have done something that makes them proud. He also wants that one contribution made by one of their worthy colleague Professor Chaman Lal who has been instrumental in setting up the Shaheed Bhagat Singh Archive and Resource Centre at Delhi. He requested to include the name of Professor Chaman Lal in the Vice Chancellor's statement. Continuing, he further said that in his (Vice-Chancellor) statement, last time when the Senate was held, they could not take up the whole agenda which has reference to the Syndicate meeting dated 7.10.2017. In his statement he had said that there was a mention of some Chandigarh Rattan Award. He just wants to know who has conferred this award.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not remember what he is referring to.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that Dr. Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examinations and Dean, College Development Council had been honoured with the Chandigarh Rattan Award for his contribution to streamline the online examination system, online fee deposition and online disposal of complaints. The award was presented to him by the Finance Secretary, U.T., Chandigarh. This is his (Vice Chancellor) statement. He wished to know whether it was an official award and who has conferred it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not prepared to answer this. This was based on factual things. He just does not see the relevance of his raising this issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the facts are that the award was conferred by Ram Leela Dussehara Committee and requested the Vice Chancellor to listen to him. This is a very august House. They have the right to know.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not have the details of this and they can talk about it later on. When Dr. Rabinder Nath wanted to say something, the Vice Chancellor said, sorry, he did not want to enter into any discussion and he is not entertaining any such thing.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is not fair. He (Controller of Examinations) has not been honoured by the U.T. Administration but this honour was given by the Dussehara Committee.

Dr. Amit Joshi while showing some documents said that here is the proof.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not entering into any dialogue and it is demeaning to raise such things at this stage of the meeting.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is demeaning for the whole House to pass this statement. This was also endorsed by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not permitting him (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) to speak. It is the part of the Vice Chancellor's statement and it is not the part of the Senate's statement. If he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) does not want to accept the Vice Chancellor's, it is alright. Nobody has written to him, so that is it, it remains as a Vice Chancellor's statement. It is not an endorsement by anyone of them and there are no guidelines what would go into the Vice Chancellor's statement. At least, that much of freedom for the Vice Chancellor is there.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that facts should be there.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that then why it is presented in the House. He can keep his statement to himself only.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not want to answer and requested them to sit down and allow him to proceed with the agenda.

Dr. Amit Joshi said, this is not fair.

The Vice Chancellor said, alright, fine, it is recorded, it is also to be minuted that some members said that such things are not fair. It is fine with him.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is not a personal accusation on him (Vice-Chancellor). He meant to say that the procedure is not fair.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not discussing the procedure and he is not permitting him (Dr. Amit Joshi) to speak and requested him to allow him to proceed. There is no need to have a discussion on Vice Chancellor's statement.

Shri Raghbir Dayal said that he wanted to discuss the Vice-Chancellor statement.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no need to have a discussion on the Vice-Chancellor statement. What is it that he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) wants to dispute?

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he wanted to discuss on a statement where the Vice-Chancellor has said that a Senator has captured the constituency.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not the part of the discussion.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired as to on which grounds the Vice-Chancellor had given that statement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not answering him (Dr. Raghbir Dyal). This is Senate meeting at the moment

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested to listen to him, and what is the basis of that statement.

Shri Naresh Gaur asked the Vice Chancellor about the source of statement which he had given in the newspapers.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not answering and requested the members to allow him to proceed. It is a serious meeting. They have a huge agenda at their disposal.

Shri Naresh Gaur requested the Vice Chancellor to disclose the names of those Senator who had plotted in the stone-pelting incident. This the statement of the Vice Chancellor published in the 'Jagran' Newspaper.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not answering and requested the members to allow him to proceed. He is not permitting him (Shri Naresh Gaur) to speak.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he (Vice Chancellor) used to give any type of statement and accuse all the the Senators.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said if he (Vice Chancellor) likes to go, he may go, but he has to listen to them. Sometimes he calls the Senators a 'mafia' and sometimes that a Senator has 'capture it a constituency'.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor adjourned the meeting.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that this is reflective of his (Vice-Chancellor) mindset towards certain Senate members to which the Vice-Chancellor said, sorry and left the Hall but the members continued to discuss amongst themselves.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

When the Vice-Chancellor entered the House, Shri Ashok Goyal was speaking and continued speaking.

When Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he wanted to tell all the Senate members something to which the Vice-Chancellor said that he wanted to proceed with the agenda, then Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could not do so as this is also a part of the agenda.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that it is a question of the dignity of the Senators.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would like to put it to the members of the House, do they proceed with the agenda or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, no, that means he (Vice Chancellor) wants to test the patience of the members to say on their own voluntarily that they are not bothered about the allegation which the Vice Chancellor has put against them. Why the Vice Chancellor does not name those Senators who are responsible for stone pelting. If the Vice Chancellor is so courageous, if he is so bold, if he is so sure, then what stops him for giving the names of those Senators. Why he (Vice Chancellor) talks outside the House, if he has the courage, should talk face to face so that they can also reply to him.

The Vice Chancellor said that anyone who wish anything to be to discussed, please submit it and he would take it to the next meeting of the Syndicate and then it will come to the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Naresh Gaur said that it is not a question of placing the matter before the Syndicate, it is the dignity of the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he wish to put to opinion of the House whether they proceed with the agenda or not.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that an interview of Professor Grover has appeared in Global Punjab.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not a matter on the agenda at the moment.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the statement of the Vice-Chancellor whether given in the House or outside has the same value.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma requested the Vice Chancellor to respond.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will not respond and he does not want to set up new precedents.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) has already set new precedents. No Vice Chancellor has ever criticized any member of the Senate what to talk of Senate as a whole.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as several members started speaking together.

The Vice Chancellor announced Item C-1 but Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Naresh Gaur continued speaking and said, 'no'. The Vice-Chancellor asked if there is any

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

objection to Item C-1. Then the Vice Chancellor announced Item C-2 for discussion of the members to which some members said, no.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it is very unfortunate that he has to come to the well of the House.

The Vice Chancellor then placed Item No. C-3 for discussion.

Shri Raghbir Dyal while standing in the well of the House continued to say that this is the mindset of the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Raghbir Dyal to sit down and said that he is not permitted to speak.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice-Chancellor has got the licence to say what he wishes.

The Vice-Chancellor announced Item C-3.

Shri Naresh Gaur while standing in the well of the House said that he has become a member of the Senate after winning the election and first wanted the answer from the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor announced to have discussion on Item No. C-4.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the Vice-Chancellor is becoming a dictator.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice-Chancellor has to say that the Senate members have captured the constituencies.

Then the Vice-Chancellor announced Item C-5 to which a few members said, 'no.'

Professor Rajesh Gill asked whether it is the way to conduct the proceedings.

Then the Vice-Chancellor announced Item C-6 but Shri Raghbir Dyal, Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Naresh Gaur continued speaking which was not clearly understandable.

The Vice Chancellor said that he wish the members to tell him whether they wish to proceed with the agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Naresh Gaur said that they are also the members.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice-Chancellor has to answer to which the Vice-Chancellor said that he is not to answer. He said that the Vice-Chancellor has time and again gone to the Press mounting allegations on allegations against the members.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he wanted an answer from the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor has no guts to answer.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that this is not only the financial mess but administrative which the University has been brought into.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor left the Hall but Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Naresh Gaur, Shri Raghbir Dyal, Professor Ronki Ram and Mrs. Anu Chatrath continued speaking.

When the Vice-Chancellor re-joined the meeting, Mrs. Anu Chatrath was speaking and continued speaking and some other members also started speaking simultaneously.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the statement had been given by the Vice-Chancellor on 21st March just 10 days prior to the scheduled meeting of the Senate and on that day it was known to him that the Senate is meeting on 1st April, 2018. Could he not wait to give the statement in the Senate? Is it not mudslinging on the names of members of the Senate or the whole of the Senate? Now they are talking of calling a special meeting, now they are talking to proceed with the agenda, now they are talking about important time of some people who have come from distant places.

Professor Ronki Ram intervened to say they have to see as to why they have reached at this stage where such things are being said.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor should say so and that is what he is asking.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that if the Vice-Chancellor had given the statement on 21st March, the persons who have read the statement and who have seen the interview on the YouTube.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Naresh Gaur said that they have seen it today.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that they must at least give the Vice-Chancellor sufficient time to give the reply.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor already knows the facts. That means did he give the statement without verifying the facts. He already knows the facts. He is the one to share it with the House.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath asked whether they have to discuss this agenda or the other important agenda items.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is the most important.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that before discussing the agenda, they would discuss it.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that they continue with this agenda, they would not be able to discuss the other agenda items.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the tempers are very high and the issue could be resolved in a very simple way. If they all agree or if they all know that there are lot many fake news in the newspapers. The Vice-Chancellor should clearly say that he has not said that and should contradict. Secondly, suppose if he has said so, then he could say that he stands on his statement or apologize to the House. Then, the matter could be resolved within a minute and why they are spending so much time on it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested the Vice-Chancellor to explain as to how he has captured his constituency. Time and again the Vice-Chancellor has come out with more irresponsible statements. He had heard his (Vice-Chancellor) interview in which he had said that he has inherited a financial mess. Now he would say that the Vice-Chancellor has augmented it with an administrative mess to the University.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that with full responsibility, he would say two things. Firstly, he requested the Vice-Chancellor, being the head of the Government of the University as also the Panjab University family, is presiding the House and should not leave the House. Leaving the House would not lead to a solution to the problem. He pointed out that in the year 1978, the then Vice-Chancellor, Professor R.C. Paul once left the House and Shri Pritam Singh Goraya, the Hon'ble member occupied the Chair. After requests by the members, he did not vacate the chair and then the Vice-Chancellor while standing at the entrance of the Hall had to announce the agenda as a whole and got approved the agenda. This was covered by Dr. Gurmeet Singh at that time. He requested the Vice-Chancellor and the members not to take his viewpoints otherwise. Secondly, using unparliamentary language by anyone is wrong. The Senate is the Parliament of the University. They see the proceedings of the Vidhan Sabha and the Parliament. One could oppose each other but should not humiliate or incite. Everyone has the right to speak. In the Parliament also everyone expresses his/her viewpoints in a civilized way. Unparliamentary language could not be justified. The position of the Vice-Chancellor in the University is double, first one as the Speaker of the House and the other one as Chairman. The Senate has its own procedure. If anyone thinks that the Vice-Chancellor has said something which seems to be wrong, there are two ways that either one could file a defamation case which is permissible under the law if one felt humiliated. If one wanted that the House should take up that, then there is also a procedure. A written resolution should be proposed which first would be taken up in the Syndicate. The members have the right to say even to the extent that this House condemns the statement of the Vice-Chancellor and they want him to apologize or whatever they wanted, that is their right to move the resolution. Therefore, the members could give a resolution in writing, then it is the prerogative of the Syndicate to consider that and ultimately it is the prerogative of this House whether to accept or reject that. But if 2-3 members do not allow the House to function and talk in the equally objectionable language on which they are objecting to the Vice-Chancellor, then nothing would happen. He requested the members to submit a resolution in writing. As Shri Ashok Goyal was talking that the rules and regulations have supremacy, it is right. One should talk according to the regulations and the members could talk in favor or against. Earlier also such moments have occurred in the House when tempers were high and opinions differed. If an intellectual body could not differ, then where would be the difference of opinion. Everyone has his/her opinion. Thereafter, the House could take the decision. He had earlier also complimented Shri Raghbir Dyal, a member from Muktsar that he is one of the members who are well read. Everyone uses the words in his/her own way as Shri Raghbir Dyal is raising an objection on the use of the word 'capture'. The elections are held, when the Congress won the elections, the headline in the newspapers is 'Congress captures Punjab'. Similarly, when the BJP won the elections in Himachal Pradesh, the headline is 'BJP captures Himachal Pradesh'. Then it is used in a positive sense. If someone captures a polling booth, then it is in negative sense. A word is used in different context in different sense. He cited the example that in the Courts if it is said that the service is not complete, it means that the summons to the other party have not been issued. If they use the same word that the service is not complete in the House, it means that refreshment service is not good. The word used by the Vice-Chancellor was desirable or not, let the members adopt a mid-way and let the House function. Even special meetings had been convened to complete the agenda and they know how much

agenda they could complete in the special meetings. He requested the members to submit a resolution in writing as per rules and regulation. Even if the members wanted to say that they condemn the Vice-Chancellor or other things, they should act as per the rules and regulations. He suggested that they should take up the items as there are so many important items as sometimes there are items of appointments and promotions. Everyone is ready to listen to the other members. Everyone has a right to speak but one should not try to impinge upon the rights of others. If some members in the Parliament create a ruckus, do the people like them. If in such a way there is a momentarily appreciation, but it would affect the institution. Everyone is elected from different constituencies. There are members who have been elected for 5-8 times in the Parliament and even they sometimes they are defeated. It could not be said that word 'capture' has been used in a negative sense. It shows a person's mentality. Sometimes there are such issues that the persons loose the election. Anybody even if having worked good could loose the election. He cited the example of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee, Shri L.K. Advani that they had also lost the election. Even Mrs. Phoolan Devi had also won the election. Therefore, the winning or losing does not matter. He requested the members that let the proceedings of the House continue. He requested to submit the resolution in writing and the House would consider that.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that Shri Satya Pal Jain is a very senior Parliamentarian and Senator. He would like to respond what he has said. As far as giving in writing is concerned, he has been writing to the Vice-Chancellor for the last about more than 6 years, but till date no reply has been given. About a month ago, he had written to the Vice-Chancellor that the people of the area of the Regional Centre want to contribute for its development, he had requested to provide the building plans. In response to it, the Vice-Chancellor had given a message that he would write back to him. Even after a lapse of period of 1½ months, the Vice-Chancellor has not responded. Secondly, whether it is the Vice-Chancellor, the Chairman of the House or the Prime Minister of the country, whoever gives a statement whether in the House or outside, he/she is answerable for that. According to him, perhaps such is the mindset of the Vice-Chancellor. He said that perhaps he might be talking in harsh words having connection with a rural area and someone might not like it but the Vice-Chancellor is more competent than him. In the epics like Mahabhart, there is a mention that the Brahmins are the most competent persons. Since the Vice-Chancellor is occupying the highest position in the Senate, does he ever consult the members of the Syndicate or Senate before issuing any statement? When the Vice-Chancellor had called the Senators as vultures as also when he had named him and said that Shri Raghbir Dyal, Lecturer is a mafia of the Government College, had he taken the permission of the Syndicate or Senate. It is very easy to condemn later that he had not used such words. The Vice-Chancellor in an interview on the Global Punjab TV Channel the Vice-Chancellor is saying that the Senate member has captured the constituency. It should have been told at that time itself as to how the constituency has been captured. This tone is reflective of the mindset of the Vice-Chancellor. For the last one year, he is attending very few meetings due to idea of issues. Who are those Senators to whom the Vice-Chancellor regularly accuses and defames? According to him, the Vice-Chancellor looses no opportunity to defame the Senate members. Whether the House takes note of it or not, but it is his duty to take up the issue. According to him, the Vice-Chancellor is taking him with contempt and is insulting them. This is not for the first time that the Vice-Chancellor has insulted them. The Senators have never gone to the Press against the Vice-Chancellor. While raising the issues, they have not hijacked the Senate. They have just asked the Vice-Chancellor about his opinion on the statement. If the Vice-Chancellor does not reply, then what could they do. This is not for the first time. He did not come to the last meeting and had not stopped from completing the agenda and this could be seen happening for the last two years. According to him, this is reflective

of the mindset of the present Vice-Chancellor. Time and again, the Vice-Chancellor has gone to the Press to say very unpleasant things about the Senate members and with those members he is running the affairs of the Syndicate and the Senate. So, he has different parameters for different Fellows. Come what may, he (Vice-Chancellor) should take up with him in the Senate and what is the need to go to the Press.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that Shri Satya Pal Jain is a senior member and a good lawyer. According to him, a lawyer comes to a decision in an impartial manner. As far as giving in writing is concerned, perhaps Shri Jain might have attended the meeting of the Senate, he had raised an issue of the affiliation of a College. In the meeting he had asked the Vice-Chancellor that he could say that no letter had been written by him (Shri Gaur) to him. As Shri Jain is saying that whatever is to be discussed should be given in writing, but if he has written any letter to which no reply is given by the Vice-Chancellor then what could he do and he is also not allowed to discuss the issue in the Senate. He requested Shri Jain not to say that some members do not allow the House function. If someone feels hurt, he/she would raise the issue. He felt hurt and that is why he has stood up to raise the issue. He had told this in the last meeting of the Senate also that he has not got any reply to the 7 e-mails sent by him to the Vice-Chancellor. At that time Professor A.K. Bhandari was the Registrar and Professor Naval Kishore was the Dean College Development Council. He has sent the e-mails to all including the Deputy Registrar but till date he has not got any reply even after the lapse of a period of 5 years. Then at what platform he could raise the issue. It is good on the part of Shri Jain to make the members understand, he also understood this as he is a member of the employees union and works with the managements. But he should have made the members in a good manner. If the Vice-Chancellor says that whatever statement was given is wrong, the meeting could start. He is not disturbing the meeting but has come to attend the meeting as there are so many important issues. But he wanted to know whether this statement was issued or not. Then there is no issue at all.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he has come here by travelling a distance of 500 kms. not to hijack the Senate meeting. It could be seen from the record as to on how many issues he has given his suggestions and which issues have been raised by him in the Senate. The Vice-Chancellor who is from TIFR is a more learned person than him. If they could look at the Vice-Chancellor's statements given during the last 4-5 years, he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) might get the benefit of doubt, but the Vice-Chancellor would not be getting it because he is more learned than him. The Vice-Chancellor is more responsible and has to be more responsible than him (Shri Raghbir Dyal) and is seen to be more responsible. So, all these things do not behave a person of his stature. He has no issue whether the members should condemn the statement or not. He has no problem with functioning of the Senate. But the Vice-Chancellor on number of occasions has added on his statement. This is not just a financial mess but an administrative mess also which has been created during the tenure of the present Vice-Chancellor. It is his opinion and the members could differ with it. It is very easy to give an interview and statement but it is very difficult to work and perform on papers. Shri Satya Pal Jain has been a former Member of Parliament and they could see that the Parliament is not functioning for the last one month. There must be some reasons behind it also. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to avoid such things as his stature is higher than the members. But the Vice-Chancellor should not issue such statements at the fag end of his term and adopt such an attitude where it becomes difficult to see eye to eye.

Professor Ronki Ram said that Shri Satya Pal Jain has talked very well that everyone could not be flawless at any issue. The members or even the Chair could be at

fault. There could be some issues but a solution has to be there and they have to listen to each other and a solution has to be found out.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to move a proposal on the floor of the House that the House has taken note of the statement made by the Vice-Chancellor before the media on 21st March and this House wholeheartedly appreciates the statement of the Vice-Chancellor given about the conduct of the Senators relating to the stone pelting which took place in Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor announced Item C-1.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has moved a proposal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not permitted him (Shri Ashok Goyal) to move a proposal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice-Chancellor) is nobody to permit because the allegations are against him.

Shri Raghbir Dyal seconded the proposal moved by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice-Chancellor) is nobody to allow to conduct an enquiry against himself.

The Vice-Chancellor again announced Item C-1.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first the Vice-Chancellor abuses and then does not allow to discuss as if he has got the sole authority to say anything that he likes.

The Vice-Chancellor again announced Item C-1.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first the Vice-Chancellor should answer to the statement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would not answer and announced Item C-1, C-2 and C-3.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then he would also not allow the Vice-Chancellor to proceed with the agenda. With due apologies and respect to Shri Satya Pal Jain, he would like to tell the House that what happens in the Parliament or the Assembly where there are the same rules, what happens there when such statements are given on behalf of the Prime Minister or the Chief Minister. He said that then the proposal made by Professor Ronki Ram that a special meeting be convened on this issue be accepted. He said that Mrs. Anu Chatrath has also made a proposal that this issue be discussed during the Zero Hour today itself. He said that out of these proposals, the Vice-Chancellor should accept any proposal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the House has assembled to discuss the agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the House has also assembled to discuss the dignity of the House.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that they are mature enough to analyze the things and they should proceed.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

The Vice-Chancellor announced Items C-4, C-5 and C-6.

At this stage, a pandemonium prevailed as few members, namely, Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Naresh Gaur, Shri Raghbir Dyal and Mrs. Anu Chatrath started to speak simultaneously.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it is shame on the part of the Vice-Chancellor for conducting the meeting in this way and requested the Vice-Chancellor to give a one line answer on what he had said in the media.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not responding to him and announced Item C-6.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that what is this way?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it means that the Vice-Chancellor is not attending to any suggestion of any of the members of the Senate including the senior members who are equally concerned about the dignity of their self respect, dignity of the House, dignity of the Senate. The Vice-Chancellor is not above the law and he is not above what the Chancellor had said in the recent Convocation.

The Vice-Chancellor announced Item C-6.

Shri Ashok Goyal said no to it and asked first to tell.

The Vice-Chancellor again announced Item C-6.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it would be the darkest day of Panjab University where the Senators have become so shameless that they are not bothered about their dignity.

While discussing Item C-6, Shri V.K. Sibal said that the UGC is the best source whether these guidelines apply to this case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue of grant of five increments has become a mess because they were supposed to seek a clarification from UGC. But before they could seek a clarification, the RAO has written to the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the way the meeting is being conducted by hijacking the most important agenda, he under protest walks-out of the meeting.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she had been sitting quietly. It is right that there are groups and affiliations in the Senate but an issue which affects every Senator who have their own self respect, how could it be ruled by groupism that a statement made by the Vice-Chancellor does not affect the people, it affects all of them. Even then by force, this agenda is being taken up.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him answer on Item C-6.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, 'no, and they have observation on all the other items also starting from C-1.

The Vice-Chancellor said that those items have already been passed.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Shri Naresh Gaur and Professor Rajesh Gill said that who have passed those items. Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is like a dictatorship that the agenda is approved.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to what is the observation on Item C-1.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that there are issues also before Item C-1 to which the Vice-Chancellor is not responding.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the Vice-Chancellor has to answer those issues.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired from Professor Chaman Lal whether he has anything to say on Item C-1.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the agenda is to be discussed properly and not like announcing the items.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not allowing the discussion on the items beyond what has been projected to them.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he has been telling so many things dispassionately. But the Vice-Chancellor is neither able to contradict the statement or following the sane advice of Shri Satya Pal Jain.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is following what Shri Satya Pal Jain has said and he has said that the members have the options and they could exercise those options. A resolution be brought and let that go to the Syndicate and let the resolution be discussed there and if the Syndicate forwards that to the Senate, he could only assure them that this is not the last meeting of the Senate during his Vice-Chancellorship. He has already marked in his diary that there would be one more meeting of the Senate before 22nd July, 2018.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested that the whole agenda be completed today itself.

Professor Ronki Ram said that this is not groupism and people should not divide the House by saying groupism. All the time, majority and minority is being talked here. The people who are sitting silently are not a group. They should not divide the House in groups. Senate is one and there is no groupism. All of them are brothers and sisters. Groupism divides the Senate and they do not want this word to be used.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he respects Professor Chaman Lal and reads his articles and also compliments. He has been in the student politics and in the Parliament also and this is his 10th term in this House. If some people decidedly have come not to allow the functioning of the House, then it is a separate issue as it also happens in the Parliament that whenever the Speaker sits on the chair, some members create a ruckus and walk out. But there is a lot of difference between the Senate and the Assembly and Parliament. In Parliament, the Prime Minister is of the party which has the majority in the House and if he/she has no confidence, then he/she has to resign at that moment itself. But the Senate is neither the Assembly, Parliament nor the Corporation but it is an academic body. Their work is to take academic decisions and not to follow the nuances of Parliament or the Assembly. He has been twice a member of the Parliament (Lok Sabha) and saying it with full responsibility, which he had earlier also said during the term of Professor M.M. Puri, that the level of the debate of the Senate is not below the level of Parliament but could be of higher level on some

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

issues. There are so many items on the agenda which is voluminous. C-1 to C-5. He also requested the Vice-Chancellor that They are discussing the items since 10.00 a.m and (time now is 11.15 a.m). The agenda is being discussed and the members could submit their resolution in writing which would be considered. The Vice-Chancellor has announced the items from since he has already announced those items, he should move further with courage. If the Vice-Chancellor has asked the members to discuss, then the members should also put forward their viewpoints. He requested the members to proceed with the agenda. They have not been elected to the Senate for playing politics. He also belongs to a political party but when he comes to attend the Senate meeting, he keeps aside his party affiliation. Their concern is to consider the academic agenda. If the Vice-Chancellor had said something wrong, then as Shri Arvind Kejriwal had said something against Shri Arun Jaitley he filed a case but did not create a ruckus in the Parliament, Shri Kejriwal apologized and the matter ended. If the Vice-Chancellor says the words vulture, capturer or mafia, could one become a vulture, capturer or mafia. In the political circles, there are regular allegations. But if the members do not allow the House to function, with all respect, they would not be able to justify their existence in the Senate. He requested and appealed to proceed with the agenda and the members could express their opinion in favor or against the same and let the agenda be completed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if the Vice-Chancellor did not want to reply, he would stage a walk-out.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Items C-1, C-2, C-3 and C-4 were the appointments under Career Advancement Scheme and if nobody has any comment, he proceeded to C-5 which is an item concerning the confirmation of employees.

II. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-1** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-1. That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (stage-3) to Associate Professor (stage-4) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/-+AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Dr. Vikas (w.e.f. 02.06.2016)	Chemistry
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(ii))		
2.	Dr. Arvind Kumar Assistant Professor in ECE (w.e.f. 26.09.2016)	University Institute of Engineering and Technology
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(xv))		
3.	Dr. Rani Mehta (w.e.f. 26.08.2016)	Sociology
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(xvi))		

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Sr. No.	Name	Department
4.	Dr. Jagtej Kaur Grewal (w.e.f. 30.01.2016)	Art History and Visual Arts
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(xvii))		
5.	Dr. Tirthankar Bhattacharya (w.e.f. 30.01.2016)	Art History and Visual Arts
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(xviii))		
6.	Dr. Sudhanshu Kumar Sarangi (w.e.f. 27.12.2016)	V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(xix))		
7.	Dr. Chanchal Narang (Assistant Professor of English) (w.e.f. 06.07.2016)	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(xx))		
8.	Dr. Parampreet Kaur (w.e.f. 07.11.2017)	Geology
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(xxi))		
9.	Dr. Kashmir Singh (w.e.f. 01.07.2017)	Biotechnology
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(xxii))		

- 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 second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 4. The letter of promotion has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-1 on the agenda**, be approved.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

III. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-2** on the agenda was read out, viz-

C-2. That the following persons be promoted from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/-+ AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	*Dr. Luxmi (w.e.f. 29.06.2016)	University Business School
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(ii))		
2.	Dr. Navdeep Kaur (w.e.f. 07.03.2012)	University Business School
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(iii))		
3.	**Dr. Malkiat Chand Sidhu (w.e.f. 09.10.2017)	Botany
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(xxiii))		

- 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 selections have been made in compliance to (*)third amendment and (**)fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 4. The letters of promotion have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-2 on the agenda**, be approved.

IV. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-3** on the agenda were read out, viz. –

C-3. That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs. 7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Dr. Tammanna R. Sahrawat (w.e.f. 11.03.2016)	Centre for System Biology & Bioinformatics
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(iv))		
*2.	Dr. Sakshi Gautam (w.e.f. 15.12.2016)	Physics
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(vi))		
3.	Er. Manish Dev Sharma (w.e.f. 29.07.2015)	Physics
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(vii))		
*4.	Dr. Maninder Kaur (w.e.f. 28.02.2017)	Anthropology
*5.	Dr. Ramesh Sahani (w.e.f. 06.06.2017)	
*6.	Dr. Jagmahender Singh (w.e.f. 03.05.2017)	
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(viii))		
7.	Dr. Kuldeep Singh (w.e.f. 20.07.2014)	Centre for Police Administration
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(ix))		
*8.	Dr. Shiv Kumar (w.e.f. 20.03.2017)	Library & Information Science
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(x))		
9.	Shri Rahul Jassal Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Applications (w.e.f. 07.11.2015)	Panjab University S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(xiii))		

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Sr. No.	Name	Department
10.	Dr. Vishwa Bandhu Singh (w.e.f. 19.03.2017)	Geography
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(ii))		
11.	Dr. Paramjit Singh (w.e.f. 28.07.2015)	Economics
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(v))		
12.	Dr. Anu H. Gupta (w.e.f. 22.12.2015)	University Institute of Fashion Technology and Vocational Development
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(vi))		
13.	Dr. Anju Goyal (w.e.f. 21.03.2017)	Statistics
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(viii))		
14.	Dr. Simran Preet (w.e.f. 20.03.2017)	Biophysics
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(ix))		
15.	Dr. Rohit Kumar Sharma (w.e.f. 27.09.2015)	Chemistry
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(xi))		
16.	Mr. Mohinder Kumar (w.e.f. 01.07.2016)	P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(xiii))		

- 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 second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.*(4th Amendment 2016)

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

4. The letters of promotion have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-3, on the agenda**, be approved.

V. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-4** on the agenda was read out, viz: –

C-4. That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them.

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Dr. Veena Puri (w.e.f. 01.09.2015)	Centre for System Biology & Bioinformatics
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(v))		
2.	Dr. Inderdeep Kaur Assistant Professor in Information Technology (w.e.f. 31.12.2013)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
3.	Ms. Roopali Assistant Professor in Information Technology (w.e.f. 31.12.2013)	
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(xii))		
4.	Dr. Yajvender Pal Assistant Professor in Electrical & Electronics Engineering (w.e.f. 31.12.2013)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(xiv))		
5.	Dr. Meenu Saihpal Assistant Professor in Economics (w.e.f. 09.03.2016)	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(xv))		
*6.	Dr. Akwinder Kaur Tanvi (w.e.f. 18.07.2016)	School of Punjabi Studies (Lexicography)
(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 2(xvi))		

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Sr. No.	Name	Department
7.	Dr. Navneet Kaur (w.e.f. 01.07.2017)	Geography
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(i))		
8.	Dr. Ashu Pasricha (w.e.f. 21.06.2016)	Gandhian and Peace Studies
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(iii))		
9.	Dr. Manish Sharma (w.e.f. 03.11.2014)	Gandhian and Peace Studies
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(iv))		
10.	Dr. Samarjit Sihotra (w.e.f. 02.07.2016)	Physics
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(vii))		
11.	Dr. Navneet Kaur (w.e.f. 02.06.2017)	Chemistry
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(x))		
12.	Dr. Amarjit Kaur (w.e.f. 03.11.2014)	Chemistry
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(xii))		
13.	Dr. Mamta Juneja (w.e.f. 01.10.2017)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 2(xiv))		

- 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 second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010 *(4th Amendment 2010).

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

4. The letters of promotion have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-4, on the agenda**, be approved.

VI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-5** on the agenda was read out, viz: –

C-5. That the following faculty members, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

(i) University Institute of Engineering & Technology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Krishan Kumar	Professor	29.10.1972	08.09.2016	08.09.2017

(ii) University Institute of Applied Management Sciences

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Monika Aggarwal	Associate Professor	19.05.1975	19.07.2016	19.07.2017

(iii) Department of Laws

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Jyoti Rattan	Associate Professor	22.01.1971	04.07.2016	04.07.2017

NOTE: The confirmation of the above faculty members are subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, CWP No.17501 of 2011.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 2)

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-5, on the agenda**, be approved.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

On the request of Professor Rajesh Gill and some other members, **Item C-36** which also relates to grant of Ph.D. increments was taken up for consideration with **Item C-6**.

VII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-6** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-6. That minutes dated 31.07.2017 of the Grievance Redressal Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, on the pattern of Standing Committee (in terms of authorization given by the Syndicate vide Para-49 dated 27.02.2016/14.03.2016), to examine the representation dated 24.08.2016 of Dr. Rajnish Saryal, Assistant Professor, P.U.R.C., Ludhiana regarding grant of non-compounded advance increments on account of Ph.D. degree, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 3)

C-36 To consider representation dated 17.02.2018 (Appendix) of President & Secretary, PUTA and President & Secretary, Distt. Council PCCTU, regarding Ph.D. increment to teachers working in P.U., campus and its affiliated Colleges.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 24.02.2018 (Para 39) has resolved that the Finance and Development Officer be requested to write a properly worded letter to the UGC and Punjab Government for seeking clarification.
 2. A copy of Resolution (Appendix) was also supplied to the members by Dr. Keshav Malhotra during the Syndicate meeting dated 24.02.2018.
 3. A copy of e-mail dated 26.3.2018 & 27.3.2018 of Professor (Mrs.) Rajesh Gill with regard to Resolution which was supplied to the members during the Syndicate meeting is enclosed (Appendix).

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 39)

The Vice-Chancellor said that this item relates to the issue of non-compounded five increments to the teachers. He gave the background of the item. The issue of non-compounded increments to the University teachers is going on for a very-very long time. Ever since the nation recognized that the research is an essential duty of the teachers, the Government of India has been encouraging people to do research. To do research and guide the students, it is essential that one should obtain a Ph.D. To encourage a teacher in service to do Ph.D., the Government used to give two increments. If one entered the service as a Lecturer without M.Phil. and thereafter did the M.Phil., then one increment was given. If someone did Ph.D. while in service, two increments were given. If someone had done Ph.D. before joining the service, he/she would get four increments. This system had been going for a very-very long time giving benefit to the teachers so as to encourage them to push the frontiers of knowledge. As a part of the 6th Pay Commission, the Government wanted to liberalize this. So, the Government said that instead of 2 and 4 increments, it should be made 3 and 5 increments but to check the quality of Ph.D. degrees in India, certain regulatory conditions were imposed

that if someone had done the Ph.D. via M.Phil. then the person must have done the course work, etc. To encourage everyone that they should broaden their knowledge during their period of Ph.D. they should learn research methodology and some other things as a part of the thesis work. The thesis was on a narrow topic but in order that the people have a broader knowledge of the subject and write the thesis in a competent manner, they should learn the research methodology and some other tools. Then the Government said that the Ph.D. should be via the course work and so on. But whenever the Government came out with the regulations, there is always a transitory stage that some people are already registered and have gone through a process. Suddenly, it could not be said that they should redo it. So, some grey areas came in when someone had done the Ph.D. before and after a certain date as to how many increments are to be given. This matter could not be resolved at various institutions. Many institutions were liberally and accepted the spirit in which the recommendations had been given. The spirit was to give 2, 4 or 3, 5 increments to the faculty but not to deny. But due to some technicalities, it arose that some people were being denied the benefit at all because they were falling in some period. This caused lot of problems and in the case of the University, the audit person wrote to the UGC that the University has not followed in making the recommendation for the Ph.D. The letter was written to the UGC without the University asking the auditors that they should write such a letter. But the letter was written and the UGC said that if something had not been followed, nobody is permitted to this. It is in that background that the matter has become a mess and court cases are pending. So writing to the UGC at this stage is not making much sense. He has taken up this matter with the U.T. Administration which is the authorized authority to grant increments in the Colleges. In the Colleges, some teachers have been given the increments but their counterparts in the University campus have not been given the increments. He has pointed out it to the U.T. Administration and three days ago the Special Secretary, Finance told him that after 1st April he would get a meeting convened where this matter would be discussed with the Finance Secretary, U.T. because he is the overall incharge including the audit. The situation has become so complicated that if the audit is allowed to prevail, then the people who have been given the increments and payments have been made to them, all that has to be recovered. So, this is causing concern even at the level of the Administrator, U.T. and the Governor of Punjab who is the Chancellor of two universities of Punjab. So, it could not be that as a Governor of Punjab and the Administrator of U.T., there is an inconsistency across his entire domain. He also called up Professor B.S. Ghuman yesterday to give an update about the status in Punjabi University, Patiala. So, this is a mess and writing to the UGC is not helping them at the moment. If the matter has to be resolved, it has to be resolved internally either with the U.T. Administration or they have to wait for the Court to give a directive. The Panjab University and the auditors have been made parties and it is in that context that the auditor had written to the UGC. The University office had given a statement which was not considered appropriate by the teachers. So, they have withdrawn that part of the statement and they are trying their level best to address to the concern of a large number of teachers in the campus who at the moment stand denied the benefit of these increments. This is the whole background.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he had discussed in the Syndicate also that there is a similar case of Mrs. Meera Nagpal, PURC Ludhiana who had done the Ph.D. after undergoing the course work. The person under reference and Mrs. Nagpal had approached the Court and she is ready to withdraw the case. He requested that if Dr. Rajnish Saryal is to be given the increments, then Dr. Meera Nagpal should also be given the increments.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is for increments to everybody and it is fine. He is fighting his level best to see that the teachers are not denied the benefit.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that technically it is right that there is no need to seek the UGC clarification. The case is very simple that those who have done the Ph.D. before the year 2009 through M.Phil. and as per the requirements of the UGC like admission, registration, course work and external evaluation, would be granted the increments. In the Regulations of 2009, it is mentioned that those who have done Ph.D. through M.Phil. and have done the course work in M.Phil., there is no need to do the course work in Ph.D. In the Regulations of 2009, it was mentioned 'M.Phil./Ph.D.' The objection was that the oblique (/) in M.Phil./Ph.D. should be interpreted by the UGC. In the month of May, 2016, new Regulations came into being where it is clearly written as 'M.Phil. or Ph.D.' The candidate again took up the case and it was said that it would be implemented after the year 2016. Then the matter was placed before the Syndicate where the Vice-Chancellor had also expressed his viewpoints that the candidate is 100% right and should be given the benefit. Then it was said that the matter be placed before the Senate. Then officially the audit says that a clarification on the issue be sought from the UGC. Now, whether they should seek the clarification from the UGC or not. Generally, it happens that whenever any letter is written to the UGC, it says to follow the regulations of 2009 or 2016. But no clear reply is received that Dr. Rajnish Saryal or Dr. Meera Nagpal be granted the benefit. They should go by the documents and if they go by the documents, there would be no violation. There is no mention that it needs the clarification from the UGC. The issue of M.Phil./Ph.D. has been clearly specified in these regulations at clause 10 of Regulations of 2009 where it is mentioned that admission to the Ph.D. programme would either directly or through M.Phil. programme. The discussion in the Syndicate took place that clause 13 of Regulations of 2009 is the same as clause 7.6 of Regulations of 2016. So, both these are clear. The issue of 'oblique' (/) in clause 13 is clarified by clause 10 of Regulations of 2009. The candidate had filed a case in the Court. Thereafter, the candidate kept on approaching the office and in the last it was informed by the Establishment branch and the Registrar office that the person should withdraw the case and the case of increment would be forwarded. The candidate has also given an affidavit appearing at page 191 of the agenda that where it is written that if he gets the non-compounded increments, then he would withdraw his case. Anybody who gets frustrated could file a case. He suggested that there is no need to seek the UGC clarification.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Dr. Parveen Goyal as to how to get it cleared from the audit.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the higher authority of the auditors is the U.T. Administration and could take up the issue there.

On a point of order, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that all including the Vice-Chancellor are concerned that the Ph.D. increments should be granted. The RAO is an employee. As they have discussed the issue that no employee could write directly to the Chancellor, does this not apply to the RAO. What authority the RAO has got to write directly to the UGC bypassing the office, Syndicate and the Senate and why the Vice-Chancellor is not taking the action against him. He proposed that the RAO be relieved and asked to go back to the U.T. and a new RAO be sought in his place.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is talking to the U.T. Administration. The Vice-Chancellor said that he does not accept what Shri Prabhjit Singh is saying but if the House accepts that, then he is bound by it.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that RAO is creating the problems and the teachers of the Colleges and the University are not getting the Ph.D. increments whereas it is allowed by the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that till now he has not got any resolution to get in confrontation with the RAO. The RAO is not an employee of the University.

Shri Prabhjit Singh reiterated that the RAO be relieved and a new RAO be sought in his place.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the RAO has said that the matter be got approved by the Syndicate and Senate and perhaps it might also raise an objection that the UGC clarification be sought. It is very simple and they should seek the clarification.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was ready to write to the UGC but he (Dr. Parveen Goyal) did not accept it.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that there could be some misunderstanding. He said that they could write a letter to the RAO that since the matter has been approved by the Senate and if no clarification from the UGC is received within a timeframe, the matter would be treated as final and five non-compounded increments would be given to the candidate. If no clarification is received from the UGC, then why the candidate should suffer.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested the Vice-Chancellor to take up this item along with Item C-36 as it would save the time to which the Vice-Chancellor said, yes. Accordingly, the discussion on Item C-6 and Item C-36 commenced. She said that PCCTU has submitted resolution and PUTA is grateful that this resolution was taken up in the Syndicate meeting and passed, but somehow the minutes did not carry the resolution whereas it should have been a part. At least it should be in the Senate proceedings. As far as seeking clarification from the UGC is concerned, they requested the Vice Chancellor not to write to the UGC again which was acceded to by him. It was like this, they are saying that the R.A.O. wrote to UGC. She would like to confirm whether it was R.A.O. who wrote to UGC or the U.T. Administration to which the Vice Chancellor said that it was R.A.O. who wrote to the UGC.

Professor Navdeep Goyal that he does not remember as such, but what he knows is that a letter was shown by the Special Secretary Finance to the team that went from Panjab University to meet him.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was shown in the Court. It is the R.A.O. who has written.

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill said that she still have doubts because in the Board of Finance meeting on 28th November, when a decision was taken a joint committee would be constituted comprising members from Panjab University faculty and U.T. Administration. After that this process began, but somehow that Committee could not meet. Somewhere in January or February, when they were called by the Special Secretary, Finance, they were told that this letter was written. As far as she knows this letter was written by the R.A.O., but the R.A.O. is not an employee of the U.T. Administration, Finance Secretary. The issue was going on at the level of Special Secretary, Finance. They also had a couple of meetings, which they, probably, should have followed, but somehow there was a gap.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that he has been following and he spoke to the Special Secretary, Finance day before yesterday.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that is fine, but at that moment, that letter should not have issued for clarification to the UGC. She still would request the Vice Chancellor to confirm whether it was written by the R.A.O. or the U.T. Administration. To the best of her knowledge this letter was issued on the instructions of Special Secretary, Finance. So, this letter was sent for clarification. Now, when the reply comes from the UGC, it says that, 'no' they (teachers) are not entitled whatever the queries were made. After that it was bolt for the teachers who have been in the Court also. In the last Syndicate, they came to know that a decision was taken that another clarification would be sought from the UGC. There was a panic among the teachers that once the UGC has given a stand, it is not going to change. Therefore, it would be confirmed and if the UGC says it second time that the teachers cannot get it, they would be nowhere. Therefore, she wrote a letter to the Vice Chancellor requesting him not to write to the UGC.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not written, but he is continuously in touch him (Special Secretary Finance) and he told him two days ago that he is convinced that either they should apply 2 & 4 formula or 3 & 5 formula of giving Ph.D. increments and it cannot be zero as it would be unfair to make it zero for anybody.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she wanted to bring his attention to the discussion of the Syndicate meeting held on 23rd September, 2017 where a note has been written that the Vice Chancellor has observed as under and she read out the relevant portion:

“The spirit of the UGC notification is that those have been permitted/were permitted to proceed to complete their Ph.D. via the M.Phil. route are not to be denied any benefit that accrues to those who do Ph.D. via course work, as course work became mandatory. There is no need to seek UGC clarification. Let the matter be sent to Syndicate and Senate”.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, that should have been the stand even in this case. She requested that the Vice Chancellor to tag this case along with the Item No. C-36. Let the resolution be passed and the whole resolution should come in the proceedings. She requested everybody to pass the resolution proposed by the PUTA and PCCTU so that the teachers can benefit out of that. As far as the meeting of the Vice Chancellor with the Special Secretary, Finance, they can take it parallel and simultaneously.

On being asked by some members, the Vice Chancellor said that C-36 item is in the supplementary agenda.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that this issue has already been passed and the Estt. Branch, on the basis of that decision, has issued letters to all the teachers with regard increments and the formula of 3&5 increments would be applicable on them. Though the letters have been issued, but they are not being given increments because of the objection raised by the R.A.O. First, it meant that the R.A.O. is above the Syndicate and Senate. He is unable to understand as to what is the reality. Secondly, it has already been discussed that the R.A.O. of Panjab University and R.A.O. of colleges of Punjab come under the Finance Secretary, U.T., Chandigarh. The Ph.D. increments in the colleges are being given.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are saying to withdraw the increments to which Dr. Ranga said that it is their problem.

Continuing, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there are numerous Universities in the country and in maximum of the Universities, these increments have been given without any ifs and buts. The persons who have done Ph.D. from IITs or from the University Business School and whose course work has been one year's duration, in spite of that if the UGC refuses to give the increments. There is an arbitrary conditions imposed by the University that a certificate must be furnished by the Registrar only. This condition has also been imposed by the UGC also, but in other Universities, the Deputy Registrars are permitted to furnish the said certificate. Just due to small technicality, a certificate issued by a competent authority from a University is not accepted by the R.A.O. Even if the Registrar gives a certificate to the effect that the person fulfils all conditions as per the 2009 regulations, they ask to show the roll number, result of the examination, Detailed Marks Card etc and such things then create problems. He wanted to say as to what the Committee formed in this regard has done so far in this direction, the doubts of R.A.O. should also be clarified with the U.T. Administration. He further said that this issue is very clear and there is nothing like ifs and buts.

The Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Ranga to conclude as he has not added anything new to the issue.

Continuing, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that as per the 2009 regulations, they have mentioned two conditions for the award of Ph.D. degree. Whatever the objections were raised, the clarification was given in the notification issued in 2016.

The Vice Chancellor said, what is new in it. This has already been stated and they have already moved on from it. What is new that he is adding.

Dr. Ajay Ranga requested that those who have been registered for Ph.D. before 11th July, 2009, should be given increments.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said whatever Dr. Ranga has said that is alright. It is not necessary that only the Registrar should verify the Registrar award of Ph.D. The UGC says that it could be verified by either the Dean University Instruction, Registrar or the Dean Research etc. If it is certified, it is okay.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is what he has said saying. It is the spirit which has to be respected.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that he would like to add one thing to which Dr. Ranga and Professor Rajesh Gill has said. They are facing problem in their colleges regarding the 2009 guidelines for Ph.D. Those who have completed their Ph.D. in 2006 or 2007, the Director Higher Education, U.T. is asking for a certificate from Panjab University to the effect that their Ph.D. is as per the guidelines of UGC. When the Panjab University had followed the UGC guidelines in toto, then asking every teacher to get a certificate from Panjab University is not fair.

The Vice Chancellor said that this not a big issue the University office is not far away, bring the certificate to him and he would sign it.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that there is large number of teachers who have to come here to which the Vice Chancellor said there should not be any problem in it. Dr. Mehta suggested that it would be better if a letter from the Registrar is issued to the D.H.E. in this regard.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it cannot be done like this. This is a very small job. He said how the Registrar could certify that the Ph.D. done after 11th July, 2009, is valid.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta requested that the persons have got registered before 11th July, 2009 should be allowed.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the financial autonomy of all the Universities in India has pledged with the R.A.O. The Vice Chancellor, Syndicate or any other governing body are just for name sake. Only that happens which the R.A.O. wants. In different Universities, he acts with different names. The things which are very clear like sun-light, the R.A.O. puts objections even on that. So, this needs to be viewed seriously. He suggested that the audit should also be subject to some check.

The Vice Chancellor said, that is why in the case of Panjab University, the D.H.E. U.T. and D.P.I., Punjab are supposed to attend Syndicate and Senate meetings, but nobody turns up. What they can do? The Advisor U.T. is also a member of the Senate. Even if he cannot get come, the minutes of the Senate meetings are sent to him. Minutes are also sent to the Chief Minister. If the people did not take any cognizance of it, what anybody can do about it.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the mess has been created by the UGC itself as they have made different types of Ph.Ds.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Chaman Lal to speak if he has something new to add.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the 4th amendment of July, 2016, the para which is causing problem to the audit, that is important which states: 'provided further the award of degree to candidates registered for the M.Phil. and Ph.D. programme prior to July 11, 2009 shall be governed by the provisions of the then existing ordinance/by-laws regulation of the institution awarding degree and the Ph.D. candidate shall be exempted from the requirement of NET/SET for recruitment and appointment of Assistant Professor or equivalent Professor'. He said that he had talk with the accounts people. They say that this exemption is only for the recruitment purpose. So, he thinks that there is a requirement to have a debate that they should deliberate on this particular para to clarify each and everything. Nothing is there in the situation. If they are able to deliberate on this particular line, to his mind, the whole issue would be solved.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what is to be deliberated upon it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar while clarifying said that the UGC has notified that NET is mandatory for the recruitment process. Later on when there is chaos all across the country, the Ph.D. degree holder also became eligible, but they have mentioned that it is only for the recruitment purpose. In lieu of this exemption, one is not entitled for five non-compounded increments. It is a situation which they have to clarify to the officers concerned that it is not only for the recruitment but this benefit of five compounded increments could also be given to them.

The Vice Chancellor said, what he (Dr. Dalip Kumar) is trying to say is that if one has done Ph.D. and he has not done NET along with it, then, is he not entitled for five increments. Is this correct? When some members objected to it, the Vice Chancellor said that this is what he (Dr. Dalip Kumar) is trying to say.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that if one could be recruited, he could get increments also.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he is not saying like this. What he is saying is that this line is creating problem for the audit.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that clause 7.6 of UGC regulation 2009 relates to the admission in Ph.D. Course work. This has been interpreted 2016 guidelines.

Professor Ronki Ram said it has been further written in the clause read out by Dr. Dalip Kumar, that for recruitment and appointment or the Assistant Professor or equivalent position in the University/College/Institutions subject to the following conditions. They have put 4-5 conditions. If those conditions are fulfilled there would not be any problem in granting the increments. Those conditions include : (i) The Ph.D. degree be awarded to a candidate in a regular mode. So those who did Ph.D. prior to 11th July, 2009 should produce a certificate that he did Ph.D. through regular mode.

The Vice Chancellor asked, what is the meaning of regular mode.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the regular is that there was some course work. The second conditions is that the evaluation of the Ph.D. thesis by at least two external examiners. Third is the open Ph.D. viva-voce of the candidate had been conducted. The certificate to this effect has to be issued by the Registrar or Dean of University Instruction. The other condition is that the candidate has published two research papers from his/her Ph.D. work out of which at least one must be in a referred journals. The last condition is that the candidate has made at least two presentations in conferences/seminar based on his/her Ph.D. work. If he fulfills all these conditions, then a certificate is to be issued either by the Vice Chancellor, Prof-Vice Chancellor, Dean Academic Affairs Registrar (Dean University Instruction). If such a letter is given by any of the University, the UGC should not have any problem in giving five increments to the teacher.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said what he (Dr.Dalip Kumar) is saying is that the problem is with those who have done Ph.D. before 2009.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that Ph.D. has to be done per the prescribed standard. There is only one problem in the University i.e. some of the candidates who had done Ph.D. in 2007, 2008 had not published two research papers in the journals because at that time there was no such condition. That is why there is a problem. Secondly, he would also like to say that some persons have done Ph.D. after 11th July, 2009 and in accordance with all the four amendments made in the UGC regulations. A certificate is also being asked for from them to the effect that they have done the Ph.D. as per the new regulations, which is wrong. Because the persons who have done Ph.D. after 11th July, 2009, they did their Ph.D. as per the prescribed standard so there is no need have any certificate. The said certificate is required only from them who had done Ph.D. prior to 11th July, 2009. He would also like to say one thing more. In their University, the rules are being followed very fairly and stringently, but in other outside Universities issue the certificate immediately even if they have done course work or not and thus their teacher suffers on this account. Another problem here is that two papers are required to be published in the concerned subject of research, but there was no such condition earlier and the Ph.D. thesis was submitted with it also.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Director Higher Education has agreed to the point that the formula of either 2 & 4 or 3 & 5 should be applied, but it should not be made zero.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said if the Director Higher Education has agreed to it, he requested the Vice Chancellor to get it done before he is transferred somewhere else.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not the Director Higher Education but he has talked with Special Secretary, Finance.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that those who have done Ph.D. after 2009, they would be given increments under the 3 & 5 formula and those who have done Ph.D. before 2009 they will be given increments under the formula of 2 & 4.

The Vice Chancellor said that he cannot tell as to what will get resolved. Let something get resolved. He cannot take a harsh stand and collapse the whole thing.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said the increments are due and they should give the increments to the teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that they can ask the R.A.O. to get release the increments if they can. What he has to do in it.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they are not getting it done from the R.A.O., it is for the Vice Chancellor to impress upon him to implement it.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that the Senate can resolve it in two ways. As has been said by Professor Ronki Ram, those who have done Ph.D. after 2009, it should be followed religiously and those who have done Ph.D. before 2009, they should be given increment according to the regulations prevalent at that time. That is all.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that they should go to the R.A.O.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that they should get it passed from the Senate and the same be put up before the R.A.O.

Professor Rajesh Gill said on a point of order that as rightly said by Professor B.S. Ghuman, there is a notification issued by the UGC itself saying that there is parity. Now, what the R.A.O. says is that it is this parity holds in relation to the degree of Ph.D. not in the case of grant of increments. So, therefore, the notification of UGC itself says that this is the parity.

The Vice Chancellor said that he started the discussion with a request to understand the spirit in which the notion of increment has been introduced. The spirit of the notion is that people should be encouraged to do Ph.D. So, this is an incentive.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it does not concern the grant of Ph.D. increments, what they are talking equivalence for.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there is another method to get the cases of Ph.D. increments cleared from the Board of Finance and after that the R.A.O. would accept it. The R.A.O. also says the same thing to get it cleared from the Board of Finance and after that there would be no problem.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has already been discussed in the Board of Finance.

Professor Rajesh Gill said though the issue was placed before the Board of Finance on 28th November meeting, but it was not passed and a Committee was constituted on the issue. It is yet to be passed by the Board of Finance.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would get it passed from the Board of Finance as a meeting is going to be held. The Vice Chancellor further said that there will be a meeting of Syndicate in April and May and a meeting of Senate in first week of July and there will also be a Syndicate meeting on 21st of July, one day before his term comes to end.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Dr. Neeru Malik said that those who have done Ph.D. in Library Science their cases should also be considered.

On question by Dr. Rjay Ranga, the Vice Chancellor said that in between there would be one meeting of Board of Finance.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra said that there is a news item in today's newspaper that Court is not accepting Ph.D. degree issue by the a technical institute like NIT. All those institution which are under All India Council of Technical Education, there Ph.D. will not be accepted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal while clarifying it said that it was something else and that related to Haryana Public Service Commission regarding their advertisement.

When Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu started speaking in between, the Vice Chancellor said that this is not the way of running a meeting, what would they decided and what would be recorded.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the IITs are directly governed by the MHRD and the R.A.O. also says in the case of IITs that a certificate must be issued in which it is written that their Ph.D. awarded is in accordance with the UGC guidelines issued in 2009. The IITs are saying that when they are not governed by the UGC, how they can give such a certificate. They can give a certificate to be issued by the MHRD only as they are governed by the MHRD. That is the reason the people who do Ph.D. Course work of even 1½ years and also attend the classes, their Ph.D. increment is also not given. This is a technical issue because they cannot compel the IITs.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the Senate resolve that they consider degrees issued by IIMs, IITs, IISER and all such central institutions which are Universities as equivalent to the degrees that they themselves have issued.

Dr. Ajay Ranga referred to Section 20, Clause 2 of the UGC Act and said that as per this Act no University is competent to challenge the degree of other University.

The Vice Chancellor said nobody is challenging the degree of any University.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that R.A.O. is challenging the degrees of IITs. He further said that in the Act it has been written that the institutes which are notified by the UGC, no other University can neither challenge the degree issued by them nor refuse it.

Dr. Parveen Goyal wanted to know if the resolution of C-6 is passed to which Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it is passed.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested to pass the resolution given in Item C-36 that it would be placed before the Board of Finance.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it should be passed with the condition that all such similar cases be given benefit on similarity.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that a list of all the problems be made and placed before the Board of Finance and whatever would be passed by the Board of Finance, the R.A.O. has to accept it.

Shri Deepak Kaushik said that he has listened whatever has been discussed here. They are also part of the University. A type of atmosphere has created where it seems that only the audit is running the University. As regards the issue of Ph.D.

increments, the audit should also respect the decisions of the Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate. The R.A.O. should not think as if he is above all. He would like to tell them about news which appeared in the Danik Jagran newspapers with photographs. It is right that the R.A.O. is not an employee of the University, but they have no right to malign the image of the University. There was a party in the Golden Jubilee Guest House by the audit people. It was written in the newspaper that these people were drinking there and quarreling like anything. The people residing in that locality saw all this as to what is happening. As per the booking register, a room was booked in the name of an auditor for five days. It owing to 31st March, a room was given to the Auditor officially, it should have been mentioned that the room was allotted officially. He believed that this might be a wrong news, but he was of the opinion that they should think over it whether the audit is everything. The issue which has been passed by the Syndicate, the R.A.O. puts objections on it. He cited the case of the ward of an employee whose appointment was made by the Syndicate on compassionate. The case was approved by the Syndicate as a special case but the audit put an objection on it. When they enquired from the audit department about it, it was given to understand that some people have impressed upon the auditors not to get this case cleared. He asked, does the audit department should work like this. He requested that the Ph.D. increments should be given. In the case of non-teaching staff, if they appoint someone as Programmer, they ask him to teach the classes also. He said that one Mr. Charanjit who is working as a Programmer in the department of Mathematics since the last 3-4 years. He cleared UGC NET examination and is a topper. Then he applied for Ph.D. He also got the NOC and it has also been given in writing by the Estt. Branch that since he is working on contractual basis, he could do it and there is no need for permission. The Department has also given the NOC and requested that his admission be allowed to be done. So, if a teacher or non-teaching employee would like to do Ph.D., the Chairperson of the concerned department should not become a hindrance and he should be allowed to do Ph.D., although the increment be not given.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not a zero hour. He requested not to mix up the things.

Shri Deepak Kaushik said that if they want to get something, then he (Vice Chancellor) says, do not mix up the things. If he does not raise such issues, then there is nothing in the agenda which relates to the non-teaching staff.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has also nothing for him in the agenda. He (Shri Deepak Kaushik) is a member of the Senate and he has been given the privilege to attend to all the items.

Shri Deepak Kaushik again requested to grant permission to Mr. Charanjit for doing Ph.D.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not know what is the issue that he (Shri Deepak Kaushik) is talking unless he has gone through it and examined it, he cannot answer.

Shri Tarlochan Singh said that all his colleagues are speaking against the R.A.O. He would like to inform them that the office of R.A.O. is not only in their University, but the system of pre-auditing is done in all the departments in Punjab Government as well as the Government of India. This is a condition for any expenditure. It is rather a safety valve for them to get the auditing done before incurring any expenditure. The auditor may be wrong or strict, but they cannot avoid it as this is a law prescribed all over India. He had been a member of the Syndicate of Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru

Nanak Dev University, Amritsar for about 15-20 years. All the Syndicate decisions remaining pending till the financial matters are cleared by the R.A.O.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is advocating a confrontation with the audit.

Shri Tarlochan Singh said, that is what he is saying. All the colleagues are saying that he (R.A.O.) should be relieved immediately. He is not under them. R.A.O. is helpful to them because any mistake could be detected before the expenditure is incurred. He reminded as to what had happened in the country. Some Cabinet Ministers had resisted and due to that the governments were thrown out of power. It all had happened because of Audit Report. So, they should be careful that all their decisions should have the stamp of the R.A.O. Though, it might not have been taken in good taste, but it is a law.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he does not trust the long speeches. He has heard the discussion very carefully. The teachers are wanting the benefit. The Audit Department and the University Grants Commission had certain objections. The matter is in Court where all parties have represented. So, what is the option? To his mind the most reasonable thing would be, so that they are not charged with the evasion, that either they seek clarification from the UGC, discuss with them personally or leave it to the Judges to tell as to what is right. That is the safest or most honourable course to adopt. Shri Tarlochan Singh ji is absolutely right. The R.A.O. is a valuable part of the administration of the University. He is a person who gives cautions as to what is right and what is wrong so that the administration could go unhindered. Shri Tarlochan Singh is right in saying that because of the audit department the ministers were sent to jail and the governments were toppled. They cannot take a decision as it is not in the agenda. So let them should take a decision and operate as before and if the matter comes before the Vice Chancellor then he should bring it to the Senate.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that he has read somewhere that the University would send a proper letter to the UGC, probably that position has been changed to which the Vice Chancellor said that he has already requested. If necessary, some people representatives of the University be sent to the University Grants Commission to discuss this informally with them to resolve the matter. Eventually, if the letter of UGC is still with the R.A.O. and they do something and the R.A.O. turns it down, again there will be a problem as to what do they do. The Vice Chancellor may take up the matter informally whether the R.A.O. has some personal reasons to disown the figures. In that case the proper authorities must be requested to change him.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she agrees to the inputs given by Shri Tarlochan Singh ji and her other senior colleagues that R.A.O. is a very important person. She also considers R.A.O. as a very important institution to safeguard at least the financial matters, but the University knows, how to handle the issues. For instance, there are cases, whenever they want to put something in the cold storage, knowing that what the response is going to come, they ask for clarification from the UGC. She can tell instances where it was avoided altogether to seek any clarification from UGC and when there was a categorical clarification from the UGC, against having making a particular decision, even then, there was a strategy developed to get it done. One example is the pay fixation of the Registrar where there was a clear-cut clarification from the UGC that it is wrong and it is erroneously fixed and they cannot do it, even then they were able to do it and R.A.O. also has to submit because they managed it in the Board of Finance also. So, she requested to handle this case with the same conviction and with the same strategy, the increment case also because it affects more than hundred teachers.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Professor Ronki Ram that they are all concerned with the case of Ph.D. increments and probably, this issue does not pertain to Panjab University. This issue pertains to all the Universities where Ph.D. before 11th July 2009 is under consideration. Hereby, if they say that they could pass it in the Senate/Syndicate, they can get it done of their own, this would not be an individual case. So, he requested that in order to help their young Assistant Professors, the matter should be taken up in the way that it should not further complicate it because this is all India Universities issue.

The Vice Chancellor said, let him reiterate that the Special Secretary, Finance is ceased of the matter. He (Special Secretary, Finance) has told him categorically that zero increment is not a proper thing and at least increments under the formula 2 & 4 must be given if not 3 & 5. A meeting will be set up with the Finance Secretary U.T. where the audit people would also be present and they would take a conscious call. He (Vice Chancellor) had already told them that the Governor, Punjab is also ceased of the matter because it has reached to the Administrator U.T. that within Chandigarh, there is this problem. The things have reached this stage that to those who have already been given increments, it is being thought to recover the money. Governor is also feeling uncomfortable of any such course of action. This is what he would do, but he cannot do it tomorrow. For the next four days, he is busy.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he is suggesting something new in this regard. He said that the solution does not in whole-hawk applying the provisions after 2009 on the case, because they have to find the approach that they have taken it and they have to follow it. By following that approach, they would be able to get something for the teachers on that account.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Ronki Ram that he should tell if there is something new.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they are asking the R.A.O. to do this or that to which the Vice Chancellor that they are not asking the R.A.O. to this. He has already told them what they are going to do.

The Vice Chancellor gave a brief introduction about Dr. Raj Kumar Chabbewal who has come to attend the meeting as a representative of Punjab Government and requested him to add something to the discussion.

Dr. Raj Kumar Chabbewal said that practical, actually and officially, it is his first meeting. He does not know much about the agenda. He may talk out of the agenda also. He expressed that he is feeling pleasant to attend the meeting. First of all it is a matter of great pleasure that the Punjab Government has increased the allocation of grant to the Panjab University. The Punjab Government has also made a provision in its budget for the arrears and the grant for the constituent colleges. The Panjab University is a lifeline not only for Punjab, but for whole of India. This University has produced great personalities. He is happy that he has been nominated by the CM/Speaker as a Senate member. He would further like to talk about the Panjab University SSG, Regional, Hoshiarpur which is running very smoothly. Shri Lajpat Rai Monger Ji, a great donor, had donated the whole building of this to the Panjab University. He had made an agreement with the University at that time regarding the clinic which was already running there. It is 'Kandi Area', inhabited by poor people. The doctor who was working there used to render medical aid to the people of the area. At the same time Shri Monger had committed that he would give Rs. 3 lacs to the University every year and the doctor stationed there would also attend to the people of the local area along with the student of the Centre. The University raised the bill for ninety

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

thousands so he said that he would pay only ninety thousands, but the University said that he had promised to pay Rs. 3 lacs. Last year that great man expired. So, he requested that the clinic should keep running not only for the students but for the outside patients also. The expenditure for that would not be more than fifteen thousand because the doctor is already there. Most of the people are suffering from dental problems. They can also depute one more dental doctor. With just a small money, they can help lot many patients over there. So, this could be a tribute to that great man. He requested the whole House to allow this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now he is not taking any ad hoc decision, he would look into it with as much seriousness as he could and requested Dr. Raj Kumar Chabbewal to send a note on the issue.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that lot of discussion on the issue has taken place and the universities of Punjab are also granting the Ph.D. increments. The technical lacuna which he noted is that as per the Regulations of 2010, five increments would be granted to those who have done the Ph.D. with course work but there is no mention of Ph.D. done without course work. The RAO or any other official has objected that the increments could not be granted to the persons who have done the Ph.D. without course work. Before the issuance of the present Regulations, earlier four increments used to be granted for Ph.D. and two increments were granted to those who did the Ph.D. during service. Technically, that rule has not been withdrawn. If that has not been withdrawn, then if not five at least four increments have to be granted.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to what is the resolved part of the items.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the resolved part is that whatever she (Professor Rajesh Gill) has said, Item C-36 is accepted. If necessary, he would again take up it to the Board of Finance. Again if no resolution comes while talking to the Special Secretary, Finance and the Secretary Finance as the Special Secretary, Finance has invited them to meet the Secretary Finance and said that the audit persons would also be there and fail to resolve anything then are two options, one is that because the Board of Finance had asked to do something where quorum was not complete, they go back to the Board of Finance and then do whatever appropriate.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-6** on the agenda, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the case of Dr. Meera Nagpal, PURC, Ludhiana which is similar to Dr. Rajnish Saryal be also dealt with accordingly.

RESOLVED: That the issue under **Item C-36** on the agenda (the representation dated 17.02.2018 (Appendix) of President & Secretary, PUTA and President & Secretary, Distt. Council PCCTU, regarding Ph.D. increments to teachers working in P.U. and its affiliated Colleges) , **as per appendix**, be approved.

VIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-7** on the agenda was read out, viz.:-

C-7. That the term of appointment of Dr. Bhupinder Singh as Associate Professor (temporary), in the Department of Indian Theatre, P.U. be extended till the end of academic session, i.e. 31.05.2018, after that he will join his parent department.

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 5)

Shri V.K. Sibal said that this item has been repeated time and again and asked as to what this person was teaching in the University School of Open Learning. The Calendar says that they could transfer a person if the teaching work is the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this person is a well known person in the field of drama. There is a shortage of faculty in that department. So they thought that since they could not recruit any faculty and have admitted the students, they are morally bound to provide the teacher. So, it is in this background that it was done. At some stage, the chemistry between this person and the Chairperson of that department did not work and there is a breakdown of trust between them. Due to which, the Chairperson recommended that the person should be sent back to his department and he (Vice-Chancellor) could not fight with the Chairperson also. So, in the interest of the students he had said that up to the end of this session, let the person continue and then he would be sent back to this department. So, this is the whole matter. If Shri V.K. Sibal says that they have ignored the Calendar, the Press could say that the Panjab University and the Senate ignored the Calendar. Such things would go to the UGC and NAAC that the Panjab University is in the habit of ignoring the Calendar and it should be penalized.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as per the Calendar, this item should not have come to the Senate as it has been approved by the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that certain things are done in the academic interest. The business of the Panjab University is to train young people and disseminate the knowledge.

Professor Chaman Lal said that there is a need to resolve the internal contradiction between these faculty members and the Dean of the Faculty should hold a meeting because the person has been sent on a vacant post.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is not the issue right now.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this item should not have been placed before the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are not discussing any such thing. The Dean of University Instruction has done a lot of work to resolve that issue. If they discuss the things arising out of something, then the business of the House could not be conducted in a day.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the Vice-Chancellor is bulldozing the House.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not bulldozing the House.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-7** on the agenda, be approved.

IX.

The **Item C-8 on the agenda** was read out, viz.

- C-8.** To consider reply dated 14.10.2017 (Appendix) of Shri Komal Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration, duly forwarded by Chairperson, Department of Public Administration, Panjab University, in response to the show cause notice No.6821/Estt. dated 03.10.2017 (Appendix), served to him, pursuant to the decision of the Senate meeting dated 10/24.09.2017 (Appendix).

NOTE: The Senate in its meeting dated 10.09/24.09.2017 has considered and accepted the PUCASH report and has also decided to place Dr. Komal Singh, Department of Public Administration under suspension. Accordingly, Dr. Komal Singh has been placed under suspension with immediate effect under chapter IV (vii) Part VI, Rule 1.1 page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, vide order No.6806-20/Estt.I dated 03.10.2017 (Appendix).

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 32)

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he has enough to say on this issue and a lot of discussion has already taken place in the last meeting of the Senate. He appealed to House that his (Dr. Komal Singh) own condition and the condition of his family is very pathetic. He requested the House to consider his case sympathetically keeping in view the conditions of his old parents and also his two minor children. He himself is not keeping good health. He said though he did not want to say, but this is a fact, he feared that he may not survive for a long time. The members are also aware of his medical condition. He appealed the House that he may be given the punishment, but the condition of his family may also be kept in mind. They should also keep in mind his minor children and old parents. He is a single earning hand. He requested the House either to impose the penalty of reduction of his 2-4 increments or he is working in the AGP scale of Rs 7000/- which could be lowered to Rs. 6000/- and this case be closed.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma wanted to know the major penalties.

The Vice Chancellor requested to read the case in detail. He has become habitual. They cannot expose the students to this kind of danger continuously. It is their responsibility towards the students and to the society also.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that a lot of discussion took place in the Syndicate. While agreeing to what the Vice Chancellor said, he further stated that he is habitual to commit such type of activities. It is right his family condition is very bad, but they have to instill a confidence in the minds of the students. If they allow such people to do such activities freely without any check, the others would also be encouraged to commit such things. They cannot be let free on the pretext of bad condition of their family. He should not be allowed to escape at all. He should be dismissed. If they would like to help him, then one of his family members could be given some small job if eligible, though it is not necessary. But this man has no right to teach the students in this University because it is question of the prestige of the University, it is the question of the security of the students studying in the University. So, there should not be any compromise on this issue, otherwise the other persons could also take the same path.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Professor R.P. Bambah said that he was thinking whether they can make it compulsory for him (Mr. Komal) to take psychological treatment and he could be given leave without pay.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already tried this and it has not worked.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that if he agrees hundred percent what has been stated by his colleague (Dr. Subhash Sharma) sitting behind him. This case does not deserve any sympathy. A signal that they would send to the students will be so horrendous if they treat this leniently. There has been a domestic enquiry which has been accepted. The man is guilty and he is habitual to these things and (he) feels there is no room for sympathy even one percent.

Professor Chaman Lal said that on such issues, especially when the SC/ST category is involved. The biases should be kept much away. In this case, he realized, two days ago in the newspapers he got the impression that many issues have been settled and certain students have withdrawn the complaint. Now withdrawing the complaint by certain students it is a reflection that there are certain grounds for suspicion of the charges. The man, in certain other cases, has submitted in a legal kind of a thing. So, now without evaluating that response, how they can straight away dismiss him. There is a legal process. The legal answer to this man is, he was given a show-cause notice and he replied to it. The legal answer has to be evaluated by a competent legal person, either some University advocate or a legal luminary from the Senate or from outside the Senate be appointed and he should evaluate the answer. Then there should be no ground that a person has been hanged without (trial) and that should be the motion. If a person has committed a crime, the punishment should be proportionate to the crime and not that they could hang a person at any time. It would show that there are certain prejudice about some community. So this has to be taken in a very very dispassionate manner. They should express their views in terms of legal aspects of the case.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he would like support Professor Chaman Lal to the extent that they have to be cautious, careful to ensure that they following the proper legal procedure. That so far has been followed, whether he is guilty or not, this not the issue, that issue has already been settled. The issue now is the quantum of punishment. What they have before them is a reply to the show-cause notice. That show-cause notice was issued under a particular regulation which is quoted here. That regulation, under which the show-cause notice was given, prescribes only three options for them and there is no fourth option. These are major penalties. There is no question of either forgiving him or giving a minor penalty. The Senate has already decided to issue him a show cause notice under a regulation which prescribes major penalties. Those major penalties are only three. One, reduction to a lower rank, two, removal from service which does not disqualify him for future employment and finally, dismissal. He has carefully read the show cause notice and the show cause notice does not give him the feeling that he deserves any sympathy. But if at one place if he says that he apologized, that apology does not mean admission of guilt, what kind of answer is this. If he has apologized and if he still feels that he is not guilty, then what for this apology is. So, there is absolutely no ground at this stage to either exonerate him or to show sympathy because of his family conditions which have been mentioned, those issues they have already gone through. Their choice is now confined only to these three, choosing the first one, in his view it would not be appropriate if he still be teaching in the University. Finally, he is willing to say, do not dismiss him, remove him from the service, let him seek another employment elsewhere so that he is not totally disqualified. He is not fit to continue as a teacher in this University, it is quite clear, he

should be removed from service and then God help him if he is able to overcome his obsession, of which there is no sign yet. When he could find another job, this could not be a problem and God bless him and his family, but they cannot do injustice to those people and those girls who have been victim of his behavior.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that the issue is that the person was issued a show cause notice as per the decision of the Senate. Then he has given a reply. The first thing is that either they accept this reply or not to accept it. Then comes the question of punishment, that is the second issue. First of all they have to see, what he (Shri Komal) says is right or not. First they should decide this one whether we accept it or not. Then they have to go to the next step as to what punishment they have to approve, but not at this stage may be at a later stage.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the PUCASH has already recommended that the case is proved and recommended the major punishment. In the last meeting of the Senate also they wanted to impose the major penalty but some of the members had suggested that the show cause notice be issued. The show cause notice had been issued and if they send the show cause notice for legal opinion, according to him, it would be wasting the time. The Act prescribes two months (60 days) for the employer to take the action after the receipt of the report of PUCASH. Far more than 60 days have lapsed. They should be conscious of the fact that anybody could go to a court or tribunal against the Senate saying that it is deliberately delaying it as it is not taking the decision. His short point is that the decision has to be taken today and now and let them not postpone it for any further consideration. The decision has to be major punishment. All that they have to decide today is that which of the three major punishments should be imposed on him and nothing else.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that on the basis of suspension for 6 months and the PGI treatment, his opinion is that the maximum punishment, except anything less than capital punishment or removing from the service, should be imposed as the person has committed the mistake.

Dr. Akhtar Mahmood said that the agenda does not say anything about the punishment. Where does it talk about the punishment? First, they should bring the agenda for punishment for what he has done. Then it is okay, but the agenda does not say anything about that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has already said that they are bound to take some decision.

Dr. Akhtar Mahmood said that where is the agenda for punishment, they should bring the agenda for punishment.

The Vice-Chancellor said, alright, it is his (Dr. Akhtar Mahmood) opinion.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is not possible for 90 members to examine the reply of the show cause notice. According to him, it should be legally examined either by the legal experts sitting in the Senate or from some outside legal expert, only on receipt of the report, the Senate could take a decision. Otherwise the natural justice demands that the reply given by the person should be examined and the same could not be dispassionately done here as to what is the legal plea of the person, whether it has some weight or not. This could be seen. Before hanging the person, the reply should be got legally examined and gone through.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

The Vice-Chancellor asked that would they be not abdicating their responsibility.

Professor Chaman Lal said that rather it would be fulfilling their responsibility. If they hang a person without legally examining it, then they would be bypassing their authority.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that what would do! They (ought to) take the decision, and the person has the option to go to the Court. If the Court thinks that the person is right, the Court could reinstate him. Why they are delaying it? If next time again someone says to do something, this way a lot of time would pass and the issue would lose its gravity, and the girls would go after completing the education and it is not a justice to them. Let them take the decision and the person has the legal option to go to the Court against their decision and fight in the court. There is no issue about that.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi while referring to Professor Chaman Lal said that if the girls quote the law that why the decision in their case is being delayed for so many years and they have to answer to the court, what they would report to the Court. Why they have not taken a decision within 60 days? It is not only 60 days but several years have passed. It is total dereliction of duty on their part not taking a decision. A time of 60 days is an enough time.

Professor Chaman Lal said that let any member of the Senate say that whatever the person has said in his reply is wrong. Let anybody say it and it should be countered by facts that the reply given by the person is wrong and they reject the reply. Even it is not being proposed that the reply to the show cause notice is rejected and then they go for punishment. When they have not read the reply carefully, how could they just assume it. This is no way.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that let them reject the reply and then give the punishment, there is no problem.

Professor Chaman Lal said that since Mrs. Anu Chatrath is sitting here, she could tell about it as she must have read the reply of the person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not stopping Mrs. Anu Chatrath to talk on it.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that this show cause notice was issued to the person on the basis of an enquiry held against him in which he has confessed his guilt also and he has asked a lawyer to draft the petition which should have gone to a Court and not to this body. This body is looking into it. The PUCASH is a domestic enquiry, which it has looked into and the charges are proved. The person has shown nothing on the basis of facts that the charges are wrong. Therefore, according to him, it is a red line that they are some lawyers, they are not the Courts. The Courts shall judge the legal issues and not the lawyers.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they have already adopted all the measures and the procedures as the matter has been examined by the Committee, PUCASH and the Syndicate had discussed it and taken a decision. As the person had deposed everything before the Committee, now what more he wants to say. The Committee has given its decision after examining and discussing the issue. Therefore, they should now take a decision. The option of approaching the Court is open to that person and he could go to the Court.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Dr. Neeru Malik said that as the Vice-Chancellor has rightly said that they cannot take a decision at the cost of the security of the girls. When they talk about humanity to give the person a chance, the last thing that they could do is that the counselling be got done either termination could be done or he could get rehabilitated after availing two years' leave. If he opts to go for rehabilitation, that is fine otherwise there should be no point in keeping him to progress in his work in his department because the girls are not feeling safe. These are things which are deteriorating the position of Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has gone through the whole course of rehabilitation.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that a last chance could be given.

The Vice-Chancellor said that personally he is not recommending the rehabilitation course. The last time they were only debating between dismissal from service and removal from service of the University which does not disqualify him from future employment. These are the only two options.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that what they could do is that they should impose the penalty which does not disqualify from future employment.

Dr. Neeru Malik favoured the option second.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired as to which are the other penalties under major penalty.

The Vice-Chancellor read out the first major penalty which is reduction to a lower post or time-scale; or to a lower stage in a time-scale. They could not impose this penalty and permit the person to go and teach the students.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if the reduction to a lower post is done, the person could again harass the girls.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the reduction to a lower post is not an option. They have to impose the penalty only from 2 and 3.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the removal from the service be chosen.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the penalty of removal from service of the University which does not disqualify from future employment is the only option.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this is the only thing that they could do. This is the only relaxation that they could grant.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if it is so they could take a gun and fire the whole family of the person.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if the person commits the rape, then what would they do.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he bets with the House and Chadha Sahib that they are deciding on the life of a person.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not allowing Dr. Ajay Ranga to talk in such a way.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they have to decide as the person has damaged the life of the students. If that person would have done anything wrong with their own daughters or sisters, could they pardon that person. This is not the way.

When Dr. Ajay Ranga was standing near the dais and was in heated arguments with Dr. Subhash Sharma, the Vice-Chancellor requested him to take the seat, but Dr. Ajay Ranga continued with heated arguments.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor had to adjourn the meeting.

After sometime the Vice-Chancellor resumed the meeting.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the person could approach the Court. Since the PUCASH has been constituted under the constitution, he (Dr. Ajay Ranga) could not question its report.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said then it means they should send all the persons to Court.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that then they should abolish the PUCASH.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in India there are maximum cases against this University because they take wrong decisions. They compel the persons to go to the Court when they can decide the cases here.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested to hold voting on the issue and said that they are in favour of penalty number two mentioned under the head major penalty.

The Vice Chancellor said that he recommends removal from service of the University which does not disqualify him for further employment.

Some of the members raised their hands in favour of it.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that this agenda is to assess the show cause notice reply. It would have been the next step to decide the punishment. He hoped that most of them have not read the report very carefully and even if they have gone through, there would be 91 diverse replies because everybody would think in his own thought frame. So, it is better that they should make a small Committee to view the reply.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it would undermine the PUCASH.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the last Senate meeting it was decided that a show cause notice would be issued to him and after that two of the three options could be explored.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said, it means they have already fixed the match.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is alright if it is his (Professor J.K. Goswamy) opinion.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that it is not like that, before the show cause notice, they cannot define the two clauses. It cannot be possible.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said in order to satisfy those who say that they have to go through various steps, he moves that first they reject his reply and he supports what he (Vice Chancellor) is proposing to give punishment number two, namely, removing from service.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that they should look for a proportionate punishment as the proposed punishment is too harsh and that they are doing it in haste.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that enough time has passed.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not doing it in haste.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that those who are talking about his (Shri Komal) removal, he has no objection on their opinion, but he challenge all of them to defeat him logically that Mr. Komal is wrong. He agreed that he is at fault, but his fault is not such that he should be given such a harsh punishment.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he (Dr. Ajay Ranga) should have represented before the PUCASH in case he so concerned about him.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he was not called by the PUCASH, otherwise he would have pleaded there. They accept their version.

The Vice Chancellor said that PUCASH has its own scope and procedure as PUCASH is made as per the Government of India Act.

Dr. Subash Sharma said that if the things go like this, then the discussion would continue for two years and no decision would be taken.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that the Vice Chancellor cannot decide before sending the reply of show cause notice that these two are the options. He (Vice Chancellor) cannot do that.

The Vice Chancellor said that they did not accept his reply.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if he (Vice Chancellors) rejected the reply, he requested to give the reason.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not giving any reason.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that this is not the way.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said why he (Dr. Ajay Ranga) did not stand up when he has raised an issue in the morning and now he is asking for the reason.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in the morning it was an issue which was pinching him (Dr. Raghbir Dyal) and it is the issue where he is feeling the problem.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as several members started speaking together and nothing was audible.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the members to proceed for lunch the Registrar requested to Vice-Chancellor to consider to completing the item before lunch.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal, on a point of order, asked as to what is happening here. The Vice Chancellor, as Chairperson of the Senate announced for lunch and the Registrar is requesting the Vice Chancellor to continue the meeting as if they all are silent spectators watching this all drama.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to go for lunch and then come back.

After lunch when the meeting resumed, the Vice Chancellor said that before lunch they were discussing Item C-8 and just to recapitulate this matter has been discussion on 24th September and after a very very long discussion they had resolved that the report of PUCASH dated 7.12.2015 submitted by Professor Nishtha Jaswal be accepted. Mr. Komal Singh, Department of Public Administration be placed under suspension and a show-cause notice be served on him as to why he be not dismissed from the service. Dismissed from the service was the penalty number three amongst the major penalties. He has replied to the show-cause notice. He feels that his reply is not tenable for questioning things which are already decided at the PUCASH level that the complaint of the girls was false, this that and so on. That is not tenable at the moment. The reply, he believes is unsatisfactory. So, he deserves to be handled as per the Calendar. They cannot risk that he should take classes in the University any more. The options like rehabilitation that he should go somewhere else, all have been exhausted. He had personally taken interest and had transferred him from the Public Administration Department to the University School of Open Learning where the contact with the students is less, but he did not accept those things, forced his way back and indulged in more things. So at the moment, he (Vice Chancellor) cannot risk getting him back to the University to teach. All that they can do is option two so that he can explore his career somewhere else. The Vice Chancellor said that this is his personal suggestion but it is an opinion and how they have to take a call on it. As Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they cannot just postpone it away. Postponing it away would bring more disrepute to this body, so he thinks they should have the courage to take a call.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that a suggestion has been made that he may be given the punishment, punishment may be suspended and he may be asked to go on leave without pay or leave due to him for a year or two years and have psychiatric treatment. If he brings a certificate to the satisfaction of the University that he is cured of this position, then he may be allowed to join and if does not do so, then automatically dismissed from the University service without any further action. This is a suggestion and he is not saying to accept it. He could be punished, suspended, given leave due to him without pay for certain period during which he would ask for treatment and after that to the satisfaction of the University, he should bring a certificate as such that he is now fit to be sent to the classes, may in the University School of Open Learning and he does not do so, then without any further reference to the Senate, he would automatically stand dismissed. This is a suggestion for their consideration and he is not saying to accept it or not to accept it.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in addition to what Professor R.P. Bambah has said it was also discussed during lunch. The accommodation provided to him may also be withdrawn during that period. It would be sufficient punishment for him so that he can reform himself. If he fails to, automatically it would be written in the order, he stands removed from the service.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he has a question with regard to the suggestion which has been made by Professor R.P. Bambah. My question is whether by doing what Professor Bambah is suggesting is weakening the authority of the Senate.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Senate has already taken a decision to impose a major penalty on him and subject, of course, to his reply to the show-cause notice. A notice was to ask him to show cause, why a major penalty should not be imposed on him. Actually, it said, why he should not be dismissed. He has given no cause/reason why that penalty should not be imposed. Actually, he is questioning the judgment or the verdict of PUCASH. That was not the issue. The issue was to show cause why a major penalty, namely, dismissal should not be imposed. He has not resisted that question. Now if they go back and do not impose the major penalty which is suggested, it is not a major penalty, it is not in the Calendar. He thinks that they will be making a mockery of the Calendar. Are they going to send a message to the people who might be in future guilty of such misconduct. He thinks that they have to be very careful. They are setting up a precedent and he is very uncomfortable by setting up a precedent which sends a message to the offenders that they can get away even after they have been found guilty, even after, the Senate in its wisdom has considered the condition of a major penalty and then doing nothing, going on leave is not a punishment.

Professor Chaman Lal said that on this very sensitive issue, he fully supports Professor R.B. Bambah.

The Vice Chancellor made it clear that it is not his (Prof. R.P. Bambah) suggestion.

Professor Chaman Lal said that actually it has come from Professor Bambah whether it is his suggestion or suggestion of someone else. Anyway, he supported this issue. Secondly, he would like to make his position clear. The impression goes as if he is single handedly defending a person who has committed a heinous crime. He had not see the person at all and he has not even seen his face. But his concern is one social and the other Senate's legal position. The social concern is that in their society, whether they like it or they did not like it, dalits, women and adivasi, feel a great victimization. Here, unfortunately, one side a dalit teacher and on the other side women students. He is all for women students and there is no doubt about it. At the same time, when such a situation comes, he believes in the justice system. He said that he is not a student of law but whenever he read through Bhagat Singh's writings, he has spoken about two systems of law throughout the world, one is reformative justice and another is retributive justice and he supported reformative system of justice. Any person may be committing some crime or mistake but there is scope for reformation even in any worst situation. In that sense he has proposed that a person should be given maximum chance to reform. He has all respect for PUCASH as well as women members of the Senate. Some of them may be getting a wrong impression. He does have a daughter. He requested not to think that he is trying to defend something indefensible. But he meant to say as to what kind of society they want. What kind of model they want. They want that kind of model, what kind of dreams Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi had for independent India. They wanted a society which is very liberal and humane, which is free of crime. But freedom of crime, can it come through retribution, can it come through all law or can it come through reforms also. They have to combine reform as well as the authority of law, but at the same time keep a scope for reformation of a person. So, in this case, this man is not accused of raping a student, this man is not accused of even attempt to rape. Whatever he is accused of is certain misconduct which a teacher should not do to his student. There is accusation of drinking etc. This is a moral turpitude. This is a kind of thing which a teacher should not do. Now this type of thing is coming from a certain back ground, dalit background, where they have to give an additional scope to reform so that they may not feel that the society is not treating them well etc. etc. He said that he is not asking for any forgiveness. But he is trying to reply Ambassador Chadha and what Professor Bambah

has said that two years' without pay leave, reference to proper Psychiatric at PGI or the University can choose of its own, they can have direct report from the concerned Psychiatric rather than he brings the report. A particular Psychiatric could regularly treat him and if he refused to accept this, it can be automatically linked that he will be removed from service. Secondly, if he does not follow whatever is suggested in the order, he liked the word 'suspended punishment as used by Professor Bambah. It does not mean that Mr. Komal Singh is not punished, he is punished quite strongly. Putting him in a without pay, removing him from the campus also. This is a punishment in proportion to the accusations against him. So, they should very dispassionately think as he is thinking without knowing the man at all.

Professor Pam Rajput said that she was restraining herself from speaking for the simple reason that this is an issue on which not only women should not speak. She said that she is very happy and conveyed her gratitude to the House that the men have taken up the cause and speaking on the issue. She has great regards for Professor Chaman Lal. But since he has used the word 'rape' and she has objection on that. Professor Chaman Lal has said that the rape did not take place. Does it mean that rape should take place and then they take out a candle march. It is criminal act to violate the modesty of a woman. She wanted to say this straight away in the House. So, let they should not take it so easy. In this case while taking forward the view point of Shri Gurjot Singh, she said that they have already made a mockery of the Act. This case has not been decided in specified period of 90 days, rather this case is continuing for the last many years. She had said it in the meeting of Syndicate, which is on record, that this case is running for the last many years, whereas the Act says that the Committee Against Sexual Harassment should take up and decide the case within 90 days. What was going on during the last three years. The file was being sent here and there that he (Mr. Komal Singh) should be given some treatment. She had demanded at that time that a Committee be constituted to find out where the file was shuttling during the last three years and who was responsible for it, fix the responsibility and punish that person also. Had that been done, then Mr. Komal Singh would not have reached to this condition and perhaps his situation would have been better. Further she would like to say that some members are talking about the suspended punishment, would they be actually following the Act by doing so? This suspension idea is being linked with his treatment. The suggestion of other members which came through Professor Bambah, does it mean that this disease is because of his habit of drinking and that if his treatment is done, then something good would happen. It is not like that. It is not that simple, read carefully the report of PUCASH. She would like to say that she absolutely respects the sentiments of Dr. Ajay Ranga. They should show some compassion to students. Mr. Komal Singh also should have thought about his family. This Senate may take a call if they can create a corpus through which the expenditure to be incurred on the education of their children could be met out. The report was submitted on 24th and the employer should have taken the action within 60 days. They call special meetings of the Senate and Syndicate on all the issues, why a meeting was not called on this issue within 60 days and taken action on that. This is a test case for the University also. It is not that it is the only case, there may be many more cases, but this is a test case and they should not send a wrong message. She is with one, those who take that whatever action they want to take, the action should be taken today as they have already gone beyond the days stipulated in the of Government of India Act, 2013.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he has a serious objection that on such a serious issue, someone is involving the caste in this issue. He also felt pained that some members are quoting the names of great persons, like, Shahid-e-Azam Bhagat Singh, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi to save such a person against whom

serious misconduct has been proved. Not only the case has been proved, but could anyone sitting in the House knowing that person could say with true heart that the person is not teaching the classes in a drunken condition for the last many years or the person does not have such a character. Could even any one member who is supporting this person say that he is a good person and not having such a character, he could agree. But he felt pained that to save such a person, some members are citing the names of great men. Even a member is rallying round the caste to put under carpet the misdeeds of that person just because that the person belongs to a particular caste. Caste, religion or gender should not be allowed to become a hindrance in the justice system. A suggestion has been made on compassionate grounds of the family, if they grant the person leave without pay for two years, whether the person gets the treatment or not, but gets a certificate and starts teaching, then what justice they are doing with those students with whom the person has misbehaved and harassed them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that option has already been exhausted.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should not discuss this option.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the file was missing for a year and the person could have mended his ways but he used this period to get himself reinstated.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that to get a certificate in this country is not a big issue as anybody could get any certificate, he is sorry to say it on the floor of the House. So, such a person should not be allowed to go scot free. The person has to be punished. If the House today does not punish that person, then it would create a history in Panjab University that so many Senators by keeping their personal interests in the forefront have allowed such a person to escape and set a precedent that if anybody commits something like this, he would escape by taking the help of someone. He appealed the House not to create such a history. The punishment has to be given to the person and there should not ifs and buts. They have to impose the major penalty and which that penalty is to be imposed, the House could think over it. They could debate on the penalty to be imposed out of the three major penalties but they should not debate on the issue that the person should not be punished. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to get the voting done in the House on the two penalties and today they should punish the person. If they are not able to punish the person, it would send a message to the people of areas of Panjab University, Chandigarh and nearby areas of Punjab and they would think whether they should send their daughters to study in Panjab University or not because in Panjab University there are people who have the power to save such persons by taking one or the other plea. He pointed out that during the lunch time, a lady newspaper reporter came to him and said that he (Dr. Subhash Sharma) was right as she knows about two cases against that person. One case is that a girl student from some village came who was first helped by that person and then she was harassed. That girl complained against the person but ultimately the person by putting pressure on the family got that complaint withdrawn and the family of the girl got married. The lady reporter said that she had covered this news and reported in the newspapers about several years ago. She had told him about this particular person. There might be so many cases which might not have been reported. Why they want to play with the future of girl students? Why they want to give an opportunity to such a person? He fully agreed with the viewpoints of Professor Pam Rajput that why they should give an opportunity to the person to reach a stage of raping someone. Then who would be responsible to this House. What they are talking about the retributive or reformative justice? He requested that there should be a major punishment.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person is not looking after his family or the children or the parents.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that the person is neither looking after his children nor the parents and now he has divorced his wife as well. Neither is he performing his ethical duty towards the society nor towards his profession. She agreed to what Dr. Subhash Sharma has said. She is a witness to certain things which I have seen with my eyes. The issue is also sensitive. They are discussing the misconduct of a teacher. If that teacher belongs to SC, they are not discussing it as it is not the area of concern. It is a misconduct on the part of a teacher, they should discuss and analyze and the penalty should be imposed as per the impact of the volume of misconduct.

Professor Ronki Ram said that as Professor Pam Rajput has said, they have discussed a lot on the issue in the House and before lunch there was a very heated discussion which is not in good taste. There have to be some facts on the merits of the case on the basis of which they have to take a decision. As Professor Bambah said that there are some moral issues which are to be kept in mind while taking the decision. But a balance between these two has to be maintained. According to him, in the present case, the PUCASH report has been submitted and whatever procedure was to be followed has been adopted. Now the punishment has to be imposed on the basis of what has been established in the PUCASH report. Now they have to impose one of the three major penalties as Ambassador I.S. Chadha has also talked about it on the basis of the resolution of the PUCASH. If they take any other step or any other thing like legal side as said by some members that the person could approach the Court. He enquired as to whether if they give any punishment at their own level other than those specified in the Panjab University Calendar, would that be qualified on its own. Could they say that they have asked to defer it? The question is that the crime was committed and there would be deterrent to that in future. If they are going to give some sort of suspended punishment, then the word 'suspended' be used as a deterrent in future. If not, then the House has the right to decide about it. Otherwise in the University not only this case, but other cases are also coming up later. For how long, they could keep saying like this. He is not going into the personal cases. If there is a person in the society, the law is there and if something has gone wrong and law is not performing its duty and they get legitimacy beyond that law, people start questioning it. But if the law is not doing its own duty, then the people would start questioning the law itself because the law has not taken the action. According to him, at this stage, the punishment should be there and what punishment has to be given, that matter should be decided and other things should not be taken into consideration.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the discussion is going in the right direction. As said by one of the members that any certificate could be obtained easily, he requested that if it is so, could that member procure a certificate of MBBS for him so that he could become a doctor. If it is said that due to misdeeds of a person, the image of the University is being tarnished, first they should analyze themselves. If the person has committed a crime which has been proved, it is not compulsory to award death penalty but the rank of the person could be reduced to some lower rank. If the person even then commits misdeeds, then whatever punishment is applicable that should be imposed. As someone has talked about the great men, they could see the history as to what those great men had done before becoming the great men. It is not that if a person has done something wrong, the person should be punished in that way. Everyone should be given an opportunity to improve. As Dr. Neeru Malik has pointed out that the person is not looking after his family and parents. But they could award the punishment according to the crime committed by the person. But such a punishment should not be given that the person might not end his life.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that a lot of discussion has taken place. But he would like to talk about a middle path which Professor Bambah and Professor Chaman Lal have talked about. As they are talking that the punishment should be given and it seems that there is a unanimity on this. But the question is which punishment should be imposed and why the same should be imposed. As Dr. Neeru Malik had pointed out that the person is not looking after his family, as far as he knows the person is looking after the family and is providing education to the children by sending them to school. If Dr. Neeru Malik has some other information, he did not know about that. He has got a telephone from the father of the person and his father would make a telephone call only if the person is looking after him. That is why his father is making telephone calls time and again for his welfare. They could manage the issue of following the rules of Panjab University Calendar and the reformation at the same time because there is a provision in the Calendar for demotion. If they put the clause of reformation with demotion, then as Dr. Subhash Sharma and others have pointed out, the condition of the punishment would be fulfilled and the person could submit the certificate of reformation after a year. Basically his all problems are related with the psychological problems or due to drinking habit. If after a year the person submits a certificate to the effect that he has now got rid of the drinking habit and rehabilitation of psychological treatment, the person could be demoted subject to the production of these certificates. As already has been discussed, the punishment should be proportionate. It is right that the person has committed a crime but as said by Shri Sandeep Singh and Professor Chaman Lal, he should be given a last chance. But at the same time, they are awarding him the punishment also. It is not that they are not imposing any punishment of demotion as the members are saying that they have to face the society also. Therefore, the demotion could be done as it in itself is a big punishment. If there is any issue of students, the person could be transferred to the University School of Open Learning.

Dr. Neeru Malik pointed out that the person had rejected this proposal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person was sent to the University School of Open Learning but he came out and the USOL also refused to take him.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that the person does not accept that he has committed any crime.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that the demotion is also major penalty. He suggested that the demotion could be imposed on him along with reformatory measures.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in the last meeting of the Senate, the decision to impose the penalty on the person had been taken and on the basis of that show cause notice was issued to him. Today, they have just to see whether the reply given by him to the show cause notice is acceptable or not. This is the real issue. In the reply, he has not anywhere mentioned that he should be pardoned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person is not feeling any remorse.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that if the person is not asking for exoneration, then who are they to pardon him.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is alright. If there is any mercy appeal, only then it could be accepted. But the person is not appealing for any mercy or any compassion.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Dr. Neeru Malik asked if the demotion could give any guarantee to the effect that his conduct would change.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that a written submission of the persons supporting him should be taken that the person would get alright.

Shri Jarnail Singh also supported it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga while expressing his concern and pity said that the only guarantee could be his death. Expressing his anguish, he said that there is only one punishment of hanging a person which this House could not impose.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that the punishment should be there and there is no second thought about it. He also agreed with this thing that the reply to the show cause notice is not okay. But one thing is clear that one has to take sympathetic view keeping in view his son, daughter also because it is not the first case in University which has happened. He said that he had been handling the (such) cases at Hoshiarpur. He had been given the four cases of CBI. They (the guilty) were not removed out of the University. They were given to him with the condition that they would not be allowed a public interface. He had to manage them that they could not meet the students, they could not meet parents, and for four years he managed those four people. The reform has to be taken because his (Mr. Komal Singh's) daughter is in Class 9th, she is already in an age, if not supported properly, he would say that another life is going to go. Although they have three options of major penalty, he said that he still requests that least option of demoting him, putting him off the public service, public interaction and also rehabilitation if they feel, can be made, that should be chosen. If left to their (grand) parents, who are resourceless, and energyless by the way of age, it will be very difficult for them to handle. They are going to allow two other lives to penalize along with Komal Singh.

Dr. Rabinder Kumar Sharma said that whatever has been stated by Professor Goswamy, it should be taken care of if it can be acceded to.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that they are going to reach out the penalty of such a case in which what his mind analyses. He said that (ok) one side there is the act of the person and on the other side, is the prestige and the faith of the Committee involved. He said that in such a cases, the present case is definitely of an offence having been committed, he would not go into the merits or demerits of the findings of the Committee though there are many in which if they read the bare complaint that amounts to the verbal offence made by the accused and the degree of offence committed as per criminal law, it is very important to discuss about it and while awarding the punishment in which they are going to take a final decision, to make a final call on it the quantum of sentence, they are left with a very limited option. So they are keeping one person or point that they would shoot him or you yourself quit. These are very small, tight options, in view of the gravity of offence he has committed. He said that his opinion is that as Ambassador Chadha has stated in the morning session that the major penalty includes reduction in rank, then dismissal and then removal with future prospect, join for future employment. He further said that his opinion on this is if they chose any one, let them say reduction in rank, which has been discussed as suggested by Professor Mehta and another colleagues, he thinks that it will bring the chance with the minimum capture of two years so that a man can have a chance to rehabilitate himself, to have a self evaluation and by that time, there was one saying in Punjabi, that if one does not amend himself, his children make him right. By that time the children will be mature enough to take care of situation and they can help their father

to rehabilitate or to act in a better way. He said that there are his points which he has made before the Vice Chancellor in this case. He said that give him the harsh punishment because this is not the one case, there are all other case which are coming and yet to be decided. There will be a parameter set to spoil the atmosphere. They are not any such a state which is governed by some dictators, authoritarian rule, they have to think which is good for the society, which is good for the nation, which is good for our institution as well. He said that his opinion then is that he may be given a major penalty but the question is not that, it has already been decided by the Committee and the findings have already been given but giving complete removal or the dismissal will bring a very big hassle to the family as well. He said that he has no soft corner for such a person who has committed such a mistake, but there are some other better ways, liberal ways to think about it because this is not the one case and there are many cases, which are following this and are behind this case.

Professor Meenakshi Malhotra said that he has been listening about this case since morning and Dr. Randhawa just said that there are many cases in the pipeline. She said that recently they have received a very-very similar case from the Dental College. Now the question is that if they do not do something, these people keep on daring. She said that the children are of 20-21 years of age, they come to them with some kind of trust. Now I have the sympathy with the family of Komal, with his wife. She said that shall it be right or not to share with the House that she knows that one day, when Professor Sobti was the Vice Chancellor of this University, she was immediately called by him to go to Ankur School and when she reached Ankur School, Principal Madam of Ankur School, perhaps it was Mrs. (Rupinder), she does not know, she was the Principal and she saw a lady crying there. She found that she was wife of Komal and she was saying that when she came out of home in the morning, Mr. Komal chased her in a Maruti Car to hit her. She said that she is not aware what happened because clash between husband and wife is a common thing and nothing new. She (Wife of Komal) said that she was walking along the road, and he brought the car and that lady rushed inside the Ankur School under the patronage of the Principal and Principal said that she is under her custody and she will not leave her. She said that Komal came, apologized to his wife and the principal and made so many arguments. But the wife of Komal said that she does not know as to why he was following her in Car and he wanted to hit her. Professor (Meenakshi) Malhotra said that the problem with them was that they were not in a position to let her go with Komal. If there would have happened anything wrong, the police might have enquired from them as to why they had let her to go with Komal when they were aware of all such situations. She said that they called the brothers of the wife of Mr. Komal, from Punjab and the response of the Brothers was that they have done her marriage and now (they are) no more concerned about her. But Principal said that let they come and take this lady with them. She said that till 5.30 in the evening, they were watching in the school waiting for the reach of her brothers to come and take away their sister. Professor Malhotra said that she is not sure as to whether Komal did want to hit her wife, she cannot say anything about it but it is evident that relationship between the duo had reached to this level. She continued saying that now in the capacity of Dean of University Instructions, she realizes that the children (students) which come to them, are of very vulnerable age and if they do not take any action today, the message in the society will go that our children are not safe. Same things she has been finding in the dental college where around 50 girls came to her one evening few days back, ten days back and they have told her so many things having taken place. She cannot believe that is it her University where something has been happening to such an extent, and she was ignorant about it. She along with the Vice Chancellor, went to the college the next day and there was a lady teacher who told them that there are seventy percent lady teachers in their department and she asked them the question as to if they were aware of the happening of such kind of things to the girls, and if they do not know, then it is also shameful and

if you know and do not do anything, that is (even) more shameful. She said that she cannot decide to say what it was, it was a big question mark and they acted as 'Dhritrashtra'. The senior people have to decide what to do but the realities are before them those 40-50 girls came to her and the kind of things they were talking, it is shameful. She stated that they would leave one, followed by another one and then third one will come to the fore claiming that his is not so heinous crime, ultimately something, they shall have to think about it. She said that she is not saying that they should save the Komal, penalize him major or light, and the children would pose questions to the seniors as to what has been done on our part. She said that literate people are sitting over here they should think about it. They cannot tie a band on their eyes like 'Gandhari'. Ultimately, they shall have to think about it that what will be the solution to it.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa on the point of order wanted to say that as he has said about other cases also, and he has said before his saying that the punishment given to him must be in proportion to the degree of offence committed. He said that in the other complaint as he has read in newspapers, definitely if that is found to be true, that needs to be higher or rash more punishment. He stated that his only point was that in this case, as per the bare complaint which has been made, findings out of that complaint, he has made verbal remarks.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the children who have lodged complaint (with courage), after all they are the children of someone (else). If in the name of the children, they could set the father free, what about the children who have filed compliant and made so much of the efforts, and they take some extreme step on the premise that against whom she had complained, he has been left without any punishment. He said that that part should also be considered. It will set a precedent and would become an example if the people are left at large in the name of the children or family. They should see from both the angles that the complaints are also the children of the someone, they could take some extreme steps, like committing suicide. They may say that despite of the proving of the charge, the accused has been made let free by the Senate. In his view, the others will get encouragement to commit such mistakes. He said that his views should be taken into consideration while deciding on the case.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he happened to live in teachers' flats and Shri Komal was also resident of the teachers flat. His (Komal's) father and his mother were living with him.

Professor Ronki Ram had to stop speaking on the issue as the other members raised objections to recalling an old incident which has already been discussed in the earlier Senate meeting(s).

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that a lot of discussion has already taken placed on this issue in the Syndicate and in the Senate as well. He said that there are three types of punishments with them and whichever is the minimum of them, may be awarded to him. He further said that he will also reiterate the same things that that they should think about his children, his parents. And if the parents are not taking care of their children, how can they. But nevertheless, on humanitarian grounds, after consulting all the colleagues, the minimum punishment should be given. They cannot go to (any) fourth option. They cannot go beyond the agenda item and they have no choice. He said that who are in the favour of major punishment and those who are in the light punishment, let it be decide by getting the hands raised in his support, or against it. He said that the way the issue is being handled, it would not go to any end.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that in his view, he endorses the view points of Dr. Randhawa and Dr. Jagdish Mehta regarding the demotion of his rank and give him

warning not to indulge in such practices in future otherwise strict consequence he will face.

Dr. Neeru Malik that if the third point is admitted, he suggested that one more condition could be imposed that he will proceed on leave for two years and he should be sent in a Boys' Colleges, and he should not be allowed to enter the girls' class.

At this stage, a din prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they have no authority to accept the suggestion of Dr. Neeru Malik. The three types of punishments have been suggested and the agenda item has some rules, and he requested the House that they should not go beyond the agenda item. It should be discussed out of three punishments, which is to be awarded to him.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his is the simple viewpoint that what they are discussing today as to what is the gravity of his offence, all things have been dealt with at the level of the PUCASH and if they had to make resistance, it should have been made at that time. On today's agenda, there is only a simple issue that there are three types of punishments and he is in favour of one of the first two categories of punishments – dismissal without employment; and dismissal with employment options. He said that he does not like that such a person should remain in our University. The children cannot be left to the panic created by such persons.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said it was Professor Bambah's suggestion that let they ask for show cause for the highest punishment. If there is any mitigating circumstance in his (Komal's) reply, it could come out, (however) there are no mitigating circumstances (now). In fact, very legally and even morally speaking, there is no reason even to delay his dismissal. But, because of the sentiments raising the humanitarian sound effect which others have pointed out, we cannot be taking a humanitarian view only of the accused and forgetting the humanitarian view of the victim (s). So he said that he thinks that very right from dismissal down to reduction in rank is not justified. That (are) no mitigating circumstances, in which he (has) replied to show cause notice; but nonetheless, one step below, I suggest again, that on humanitarian ground, dismissal may be allowed with future employment option.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him respond whatever he has heard. As has been pointed out that they have no dissenting voices, other than the defence by one or two persons, that his reply is not satisfactory. He has not pleaded for mercy, so that part is over. They had asked for why he should not be dismissed. He said that let them recall that before 2013, they did not have the PUCASH act. The Parliament had to bring into this act because of the unease felt by MPs across the party lines, that women were not finding things safe at their places of work. The new Act was supposed to be a deterrent that it would really put a fear into people that there is no space for such kind of things and no tolerance for such acts of harassment. The directives had to be given to all organizations such that they would constitute such Committees, how this committee would be constituted etc. etc., everything was done. So there is a national requirement that they must respect the spirit of the Act and the purpose of the act. So the deterrence has to be there. Act has to be seen in the spirit of zero tolerance. So if it is zero tolerance, then they cannot allow any possibility of recurrence of these things. He was retested for the last three years. So this person, I personally feel, cannot be permitted to teach in the University whether it is his parent department or the USOL. Returning in teaching in the University is not permissible. So now how to allow him to reform, okay, as one young faculty member time and again said that then they cannot shoot him. The Vice Chancellor said that they are not shooting him and they were

saying punishment two in the sense of allowing him to seek reemployment. So let they take a recourse to a recent directive from UGC that permits ex-teachers of the University to be re-employed. The teachers of the University can be called back to serve the University and there is a very noble scheme of UGC that the University must have a significant contribution in the MOOC national agenda of the country. So let they follow this number two that he be removed and permit him to offer himself for the MOOC agenda. There is no contract involved in MOOC system. Let him adopt technology and he be employed for developing MOOC courses. If he does that, then as per new directive of the UGC, we can pay somebody upto 4000 rupees a day and upto 80 thousand rupees a month. So let him earn his living via this new directive of UGC which they have already put to the Syndicate as an issue to be adopted. So let him develop MOOC courses and earn his living.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that by this way, his family will be accommodated and the commitment of the University will also be fulfilled. This is the only favour which could be made to him.

Professor Bambah said that what better could be made to his children.

The Vice Chancellor said that MOOC is not a competition. Look at him as to how many books/courses he produces/frames. There is a UGC requirement such and such courses be prepared in the MOOC or the MOOC system and you earn your living. We would not close his option of getting himself employed on behalf of the University. The Vice Chancellor said that he has only made a suggestion. We are not closing his doors to get re-employment in the University.

He further said that he is not suggesting to take it as a resolved part, he is just saying this.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that if they open this window, then they should follow the procedure.

Some of the members agreed to it while some of them wanted to know as to what the actual decision was.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that teachers can be removed by 2/3 majority of the Senate. He said that they must ensure that there is 2/3 majority of the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor enquired about 2/3 majority of the Senate, whether it is of total Senate or of the members present. The Vice Chancellor asked the official to check it. He also read out the reference from the PU Calendar and said that it says, 2/3rd majority, now is it the majority of the total Senate or of the members present in the Senate. They are empowered to terminate the appointment of University teacher on the ground of incapacity, inefficiency or serious misconduct involving moral aptitude. He further said that, okay, who are against this.

The members raised the voices to conduct the voting.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to if there was any dissent.

At this stage, a din prevailed as several members started speaking together.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are recommending removal from service.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let they first decide.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not considering the third option. They are doing second.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they have declared him guilty, for it there is a requirement of 2/3 for second option. He suggested that first and second both should be kept.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he does not think that it requires 2/3 majority, the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 has been passed by the Parliament. It supersedes all the regulations anywhere in the country. It is an act of parliament and the bodies recommended by the act are mandatory for the employer to follow. There is no 2/3 business in this. It will not be applicable here.

On a point of order, Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that what of the quantum of sentence and how it is to be decided.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said if he could get the copy of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 or should he say that the copy of the act is not available now. He further said that he is not speaking on the merits of the case, he is simply saying if he could have the copy of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013.

The Vice Chancellor said that the copy of the Act is in the office and that is coming. He further said that they have adopted the Sexual Harassment Act and they have to adhere to it.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu said that he would like to add to it. First of all, they should be clear whether they are going to take action as per Panjab University Calendar, or as per the Sexual Harassment Act. If they decide as per the Calendar, then should specify that under these rules, and if this is to be decided by the Sexual Harassment Act, then they would have to go by those rules. He further said that the punishment has to be decided as per the PU calendar.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have adopted that Act and shall have to adhere to it.

Professor Goswamy said that if he has been found guilty, his charges would go down if decided as per Act. He further said that either they should go completely with the Sexual Harassment Act or hold the departmental enquiry of the same.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that as far as this case is concerned, action has been taken as per the findings of the Sexual Harassment Committee of the Panjab University. If it is not rightful committee constituted against him, permission will have to be taken to treat that as per Act and not to a particular calendar. As per the Act, punishment has to be given.

The Vice Chancellor said that there would be no further enquiry.

Professor Pam Rajput said that there is nothing such, the Committee has to give its judgement and the employer has to take action.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he has to clarify, he has read the Act, the Act only prescribes, as Professor Rajput has pointed out, the procedure laid down to determine whether or not the charges of sexual harassment has been proved. If it is proved, then the Act, if he remembers correctly, it would soon be confirmed, does not prescribe the punishment. That says the punishment shall be accorded according to the rules of the employee's organization. That is why, why they are wasting all this time in the punishment to be determined under our Calendar because the Sexual Harassment Act does not describe the quantum of punishment. It only lays down the procedure for determining the guilt or otherwise of the charges made. If the charges are established, then the Act requires the necessary punishment be given according to the rules of the Calendar of the employees' organisation which in this case means, under the Panjab University Act.

The Vice Chancellor asked if there is any dissent on number two.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that as has been stated by Ambassador Chadha that the voting should be conducted. Ambassador Chadha saying about removal, suspension, termination or reduction in rank. All three conditions should be kept and all be asked to cast votes with yes, or no option and there should be 2/3 majority of the total House.

The Vice Chancellor said that these are not the options with which they have to do it.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that through the amendment in the criminal law, it has been added to the Indian Penal also that if the employers report, then imprisonment of one to three years could also be imposed if the guilt is proved.

At this stage, a din prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Shri Ashok Goyal read out the relevant portion of the Sexual Harassment Act 2013 as that it is very clear that if the charges are proved to take action for sexual harassment as misconduct in accordance with the provisions of the service rules applicable to the respondent. The second is that before proceeding further, I just wanted to know have we decided it by 2/3 of the present. It is the 2/3 of the total mandate. He said that 'always' remains not applicable in the University. The University is so clear that where there is the need of present, there has been written as 'Present'. There are regulations where it has specifically been mentioned that 2/3 of the present. Where they do not need present, they have not mentioned the word 'Present'. He further that before proceeding further it should firstly be decided as to if it is 2/3 of the total majority or 2/3 of the present majority.

At this stage, a din prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that whose conscious does not allow them to punish him, let they leave him. Shri Ashok Goyal objected to the statement Dr. Subhash Sharma that they are not leaving him free, whosoever wants to leave him, should do so.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is the first person in favour of punishing him because this type of misconduct cannot be stirred.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it has nowhere been written that it would be as per total majority and wrong interpretation should not be given.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Shri Sandeep Singh said that would he improve upon himself if given punishment.

Dr. Subhash Sharma again said that let him be given no punishment, but he should not be allowed to teach in the University.

At this stage, a din prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there had come a case of a teacher who had molested physically and they all opposed to it that it was not the right thing, it is the matter of the last Senate, his two increments had been stopped and he was exonerated. He further said that Dr. Subhash is only aware of the half of the picture, to make his view, he should have the knowledge of the full picture. Dr. Ranga said they he himself is stating that he should be punished but not to the extreme extent that he might die.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they have to take a call on it, if there is any doubt on this issue because today three options have already been passed, it should also be cleared as to if the 2/3 majority of the present or 2/3 majority of the whole Senate, they should not try to leave the crux of the situation on these technicality because sometimes the whole issue is left aside and come out with the technicality. He said that okay, before we decide how we would go to implement the punishment otherwise tomorrow there would be many questions, that the issue was raised and because of the vague technicalities were taken into account, the things went other way. They should resolve and go with it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the construct of this House is that the Chief Justice of Punjab & Haryana High Court is the member of the Senate. Let they refer the matter to the Chief Justice of Punjab & Haryana High Court to help us to decide on this issue. He further said that they can take a vote if but what of it is today, then they would see whether (it) can result into what they want.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that this cannot be such. They cannot go like that.

At this stage, a din prevailed as several members started speaking together.

The Vice Chancellor said that if amongst them, it says by a simple majority, what to talk of 2/3rd majority (of the total), they would not be able to punish him at all. He further said that the first is not an option. They cannot risk the students to be taught by such a teacher in our University. The Vice Chancellor said that (would) remain him suspended and (the University would) give him salary till his date of retirement.

At this stage, a din prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that all (present) want dismissal, but, the Vice Chancellor would not be able to prove it with the 2/3 majority.

The Vice Chancellor said that if there is some lacuna in the act that the 2/3 people have to be in the Senate, then the punishment cannot be given. Let the central government, and it is the central government's responsibility to amend the act. On the suggestion of Dr. Sandhu to award him number one punishment, the Vice Chancellor said that he as a Vice Chancellor is not recommending the punishment under number one.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

At this stage, a din prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he has to make a suggestion, let them put to the House the proposition that we may award him the punishment number two and that they put to the house and ask whether there is any dissent, if so, see how much dissent is there.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it has nowhere been written total in the Calendar and they cannot go beyond the calendar.

Dr. R.S. Jhanji said that they have to decide in view of whatever the law states.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there are only two persons and the third one is the Vice Chancellor himself, who are only speaking. Nobody is listening to the other members of the House.

Professor Goswamy said that if there is rule, just follow it and what else.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just wants to share the information with the House not by reading the regulations, he would limit himself only to the Act where they have given different sections wherein they wanted the 2/3 of the present will follow, they have mentioned it and had there been any intention of 2/3 of the present, then there was no difficulty in writing in the regulation also. Now they can see as per the Act, what is the Senate. It is on page 4 section 11 and the composition of the Senate is explained which makes it a 91 member house and besides 91, there are two more senators, one is the Chancellor who can be chairman of the Senate and another is the Vice Chancellor is the Chairman of the Senate in the absence of the Chancellor. So basically it is 93-member House which has been defined as Senate in the Act in Section 11. Now he drew their attention to Section Honorary degrees. He said that he has been limiting himself to the Act, Section 23, Honorary Degrees, where the Vice Chancellor and not less than other 2/3 members of the Syndicate. It is not mentioned 2/3 of the members present in the Syndicate. It is mentioned that the Vice Chancellor and not less than 2/3 of other members of the Syndicate recommend that an honorary degree be conferred on any person on the ground that he is, in their opinion, by reason of eminent position and inflict upon proper person to receive such a degree where the recommendation is and where there recommendation is supported by not less than 2/3 of the fellows present in the meeting of the Senate. In Section 11, it talks of the Senate, in Section 23 it talks 2/3 of the fellows present in a meeting, and the regulation which have been referred to by Dr. Bambah, it is 2/3 of the Senate and even if they want to interpret, they cannot because this Senate cannot go out of the Panjab University Act. In between while repeating that he is the first one, in fact, punishing a person who have committed such a crime. But while punishing, he did not want to leave a lacuna that they to send a message in the Public that we are very strict, and they are leaving a narrow path for him (Komal Singh) to escape. If they propose the termination, termination means dismissal and removal both, then of course it has to be way of vote by getting 2/3 of the majority, 2/3 (of 91) means it would be 61. To say that 61 members never attend the meeting of the Senate, is probably not right. Generally on an average, 70 percent, 75 percent, they are present in the meeting though by the end of the day or by the afternoon, the number dwindles. But once, they put the matter to vote, qua, dismissal or removal and the requisite numbers to endorse the punishment is not achieved, do not think then, they could suggest alternative punishment because, technically whatever has been proposed by this House which has to be decided by way of voting either falls or gets passed. Now if the idea is see that let them do, the others will see it themselves, at least he is not in favour of it that let them

should send their message, rest is left of the fortune of the person whether he comes back or recurses to the Court or not. If he happens to come there, there would come to fore that they think that the Panjab University was the body of the intellectuals, and such happenings are occurring there too and particularly happening despite of the fact that the provisions were read out there, this would not work that I do not bother, I do not bother. He said that the law will have to prevail. Still if the agitated members who in fact think that they are the only watch dog of the society, in that list he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is not included, they (rest of the members) are free to propose that the voting can be done as the Vice Chancellor has also suggested. But he just wants to warn that if they are not able to get the desired result, what will be the message, the message that the Senate, the supreme body of the University, the punishment authority of the University while discharging its role as disciplinary authority, for whatever reasons, has not been able to punish the person who is guilty of committing such heinous crime. That is why in Sexual Harassment Act, it has been written that whosoever is found guilty, by the PUCASH, as in our case, by the internal complaint committee, the procedure as laid down by the service rules of the respondent has to be followed. Now there are some organisations where there are no service rules. There could be a private company where there are no service rules, there could be big showroom in the mall, that there are no service rules, then the different procedures have been given for them also. So as per that procedure, without suggesting anything, he leaves it to the Chairman of the House to decide whatever way he wants, he just wants to caution that they will not send any signal where it should look that on the surface that they wanted he should be punished, but, internally they wanted that he should be saved.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it has already been said that there is no doubt on the punishment they would like to choose of the three. But before we chose the right punishment of the three, we must follow the rules and regulations so that they (should) not make mockery of themselves. He said that the procedure should be followed.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he wanted to suggest one thing patiently and coolly everyone should think about it. There is no dispute in the Senate over awarding him major penalty. In major penalty, there is one penalty which everyone agrees and which has been suggested by Dr. I.S. Sandhu also. He said that he thinks that they should cool down and take a decision which is more rational and which gives a message also that the man has not been spared, he has been given major penalty.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that at one point of the statement of Shri Ashok Goyal, at one place they have mentioned about the senators present, okay, and on another place, they have not written, present. But it does not mean that it is total. They could have written senators total. He said that, let it be by the Parliament or the Assembly, whenever any motion is moved, either 2/3 majority is required or majority is required, it is always decided as per the present members. In Parliament or in the Assembly, there never comes any motion, with the total number of M.Ps. That is why the parties ask their all MPs to be present, because things are to be decided as per the present numbers. What the Parliament does, is that the members who are present, the majority will be of their and if there is any impeachment against anyone, the 2/3 majority of the (those) present is required. It cannot be such that in our case, the total Senate count has to be there. If they wanted to talk about the interpretation of Shri Ashok Goyal then 2/3 members are not present here and no punishment cannot be given, and even the first punishment cannot be given. If all agree, even then 62 members consent will not be there. That is what he is trying to say that in Act there is no mention of the total, they should not go for total, they should consider the Senators present. It did not happen anywhere in the world, neither in Parliament nor in

Assemblies. If it is not in the Parliament, then, how the Parliament has put it here while making the Act

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that Mr. Ashok Goyal has drawn their attention to one provision wherein the word 'present' is mentioned and that provision only applies to a decision by the Syndicate. He has not pointed out and he (Ambassador Chadha) does not think that there exists any similar provision for voting in the Senate.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to read out the section relating to Senate.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that the provision wherein the word 'present' is mentioned, which has been referred to by Shri Ashok Goyal, relates to the Syndicate. There is no regulation which talks of 2/3 majority of the present members in the Senate, this is only for Syndicate. If they go by the interpretation, in the absence of any direct reference to 2/3rd, if he (Shri Ashok Goyal) draws that inference, it is not simply possible to award this punishment to anybody. Therefore, he humbly submitted that they do not insist on the interpretation of 2/3rd majority. Supposing, they decide to award major punishment unanimously and only 60 people are present. Does it mean that he does not get punished? It cannot be because there is no way of determining the opinion of actually 2/3rd members of the Senate itself. Are they going to approach the Chief Minister, Punjab and ask him whether he is for or against? This is not possible. There is no specific mention of the requirement for total membership or specific mention of the members present in the context of the Senate. Therefore, they cannot assume. It is impossible to determine exactly what is the view of the 2/3rd member of the total Senate. Therefore, they cannot possibly agree to this interpretation. He suggested the Vice-Chancellor to take the sense of the House and ask how many people give their dissent on the punishment mentioned at no.2.

Shri Ashok Goyal, on a point of order, said that he has read the section relating to 2/3rd of the members present.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that was for the members present in the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, no, it is for Senate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said it is in different context.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not saying that the context is the same. What he is saying, where the framers of the Calendar wanted 2/3rd of the present, they said it in section 23 relating to honorary degree which says: '...their recommendation is supported by not less than two-third if the Fellows present at a meeting of the Senate...'. Section 11 defines what the Senate is, 'the Senate' means 93 members of the Senate. The Senate cannot be those who are sitting here. It is meeting of the Senate, but the Body named Senate consists of 93 members where the framers wanted 2/3rd of the Senate where they thought it could be done by way of support of 2/3rd of the present members in a meeting. It is specifically mentioned, 'supported present at a meeting' and it is nowhere written in regulation as has quoted on page 13 that 2/3rd members of the Senate, no reference has been given of the meeting. Had it been said that it in meeting then also they could have agreed. But, this is what he thinks. He respects everybody's opinion. It is his duty to bring it to the notice of the House.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have already debated this issue even in the case of Mr. Munish Verma, where it was to be decided whether it should be 'present' or voting of the total Senate, and ultimately a Committee was formed where it was decided that it would be total Senate only. This was opined by Shri Satya Pal Jain ji.

The Vice Chancellor said that do the Senators realize that they let off a Senator because of that lacuna.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as several members started speaking together.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that Committee about which Professor Navdeep Goyal is talking about has not submitted its report. Mr. Munish Verma's case cannot be cited.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they continue to wait 2/3rd members of the Senate, nobody would ever get dismissed in this University.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested to obtain legal opinion on the issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the major penalty which they are talking is a rule. The decision which they have to take now has to be taken according to the present rules and they cannot make new rules for this. They have to choose the penalty from the three given options, but rule can easily be changed. Regulations and Act cannot be changed. They should do it for future. Secondly, in the present case, it seems to him that they have no other option to go for option one. But, what the Vice Chancellor has suggested that his duties could be attached with MOOCS so that he might not be in contact with the students.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu wanted to know if they can add any more punishment in the already existing options.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as several members started speaking together.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that it is a very simple issue and he is sorry to say that they (are) unnecessarily wasting their time. He would like to draw their attention to Section 20 (a) (b) at page 32, P.U. Cal. Vol. 1 which states that (a) When the debate, if any, is concluded, the Chairman shall put the proposal to vote, (b) All questions shall be decided by 'majority of votes of the members present' and voting.... So, where is the question of total Senate to be available? It is very clear. It is written in the Act itself.

Shri Ashok Goyal, on a point of order said that, that is why he was limiting himself that he did not want to go to the regulation because the regulations are subordinate to the Act as the Act is superior to the regulations. It is the procedure which is written in the Chapter of the Senate which has been formed as regulations and the regulation which has been quoted earlier on page 113 of P.U. Vol.I, that is also a regulation. Keeping in view the wording of that regulation, he tried to explain by way of taking the definition of the Senate and also of the total as well as of the members present. He also tried to dig out only from the Act. However, still he is not suggesting anything. He had told them that they could do whatever they wished, but they should be careful and try to minimize the kind of embarrassment, which they are going to face.

Professor Ronki Ram said that Shri V.K. Sibal had also quoted something.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever Shri V.K. Sibal had quoted is a regulation, but he is quoting the Act and there is different between the Act and the regulations.

Professor Ronki Ram requested Shri V.K. Sibal to enlighten them again.

Shri V.K. Sibal explained that the regulations are framed under the Act and they are consistent with the Act. There is no conflict between the Act and the regulations. As such they have to respect both. The Act says something for honorary degrees and they do respect that and the regulation says about the voting in the Senate which is more specific. It says about the people present and voting, which is as simple as that. He does not know why there is so much conflict.

The Vice Chancellor enquired, 'is there some seriousness in what they are discussing'?

Professor Ronki Ram said that if the Act is clear, then they have to ignore the regulation to which Shri V.K. Sibal said that otherwise, the regulations would have been *ultra vires* of the Act.

Dr. Ajay Ranga enquired can the Act override the Constitution of India.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not answering this question.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that, had the Act overridden the Constitution, the Supreme Court of India would have struck it down by now.

The Vice Chancellor said that it seems there is a complete unanimity that whatever has happened deserves at least major punishment. Of the three major punishments, at least he as a Vice Chancellor did not recommend the first one.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that he (Vice Chancellor) should (not) use these words because he does not have the prerogative of recommending. Why they are weakening their case? Let him share with House that he (Vice Chancellor) should read the law. Even the recommendation for the Syndicate has come, who could not have done this. Were they trying to help him or punish him? He does not know why illegal lacunae have been committed. It is the Syndicate, which has sent this to the Senate with the recommendation that major punishment should be awarded. How they can send the recommendations.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that let they not vote on the recommendation but on his motion which he has made.

Shri V.K. Sibal and Dr. Subhash Sharma seconded the motion.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he has made a motion which has been seconded and let it be put to vote.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the person is to be proceeded against in accordance with the service rules.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he has moved a formal motion that the person be removed from service which has been seconded and requested to put it to vote.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

The Vice-Chancellor requested Ambassador I.S. Chadha to say it again using the mike.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he also wanted to move a motion.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha formally moved that the person may be awarded punishment no.2 prescribed in the concerned regulation and it be put to vote.

Dr. Subhash Sharma and Shri V.K. Sibal seconded the motion.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha repeated the motion that they award the person with the punishment prescribed in the concerned regulation. He read the motion that the person may be removed from service of the University which does not disqualify him from future employment under regulation 3(B)(v) appearing at page 114 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-III.

Dr. Subhash Sharma and Shri V.K. Sibal seconded the motion.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that as is being discussed about 2/3 majority, if the motion fails, then what would happen if there is no 2/3rd majority, the person would get let off.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that then, nothing could be done.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that then they could not change the motion and come to first option.

Dr. Neeru Malik wanted clarification on two things. The first one is that suppose the motion fails and they opt for the demotion, would the demotion improve his conduct. If they are sending the person with demotion to the same circumstances, again it would be a punishment to the same students. Secondly, if they avoid the dismissal as Dr. Ajay Ranga has said that first there was a case where the physical molestation was brute and lowering of two increments was given and the person was released. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa has also mentioned that there are certain cases which are in pipeline. It means that the governing body of Panjab University is habitual in releasing the offenders. It is being proved here. They are giving a message to the society that one could come to the University, one is open either to molest physically or mentally, and (one) is going to be free.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if this motion fails, they would move the Chancellor.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that they are concerned about the education and future of the children. They have Ankur School on the premises of Panjab University where they could provide free education to the children of the person (Shri Komal Singh) and when the students would step into the University education, the University could waive off their fee. This is the way that they could make the family sustain. The person is neither interested to go to USOL nor ready to go for rehabilitation. As one of the members has said that most of the members had received phone about it, she did not receive any phone. The report says that the person has committed misconduct and the person is saying that he has not done anything wrong. They have received the phone calls of his father whose statement is nowhere recorded in the report. If they release the person on the basis of the statement, it means that they are proving that he has

mis-conducted whereas he says that he has not done anything and they are releasing him.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that who are they to release, that is why the voting is to be done.

At this stage, several members started talking together.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that let an open voting be done so that the people of Chandigarh should know as to who are in support of the motion and who are against this motion. Let the people of Chandigarh and Punjab who are in support of the motion and who are against this motion.

Professor J.K. Goswamy asked Dr. Subhash Sharma not to play democratic politics.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he is not playing politics.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he agreed with what Dr. Subhash Sharma has said.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that if any worse case than this comes afterwards, then what would they do, would they hang that person.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the voting be got done.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the decision of punishment should be deferred and a special meeting of the Senate be held on one line agenda so that the persons interested in punishing the person should be present in maximum number.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the justice delayed is justice denied as a period of three years has already passed and they should not wait.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that what Shri Ashok Goyal has said, it means that it is 2/3rd of the Senate. At the moment they are not having 63 members present and the motion would be defeated and the person would be back in service.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is not mentioned so.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that as Ambassador I.S. Chadha has said that the voting be got done on his two line motion. If that motion fails, they would not be able to award any punishment to him.

One of the members intervened to say that whatever decision is taken by the majority of the members, the same should be carried.

To this, Shri Naresh Gaur said, "then it is okay".

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that since at the moment, 62 members are not present, how the motion could be moved, which is the condition of the regulation.

Professor Pam Rajput said that she would like to express her anguish that they are taking the shelter of one technicality that they should get the voting done on this issue and see that the motion is got defeated by voting against the punishment by the

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

majority of the members and the person gets away from the punishment. They are making the mockery of the Act as well as of the dignity of the women. She pleaded that they should act at least now and take a decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the academic and scientific circles, this University is known as someone which let a very senior teacher of the University off from a very serious scientific misconduct which should have been punished severely in any institution of the world.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired as to whether it is in the case of fossil (scam).

To this, Dr. Dalip Kumar said that, yes in the case of Dr. V.J. Gupta.

Professor Pam Rajput said that, that is why the punishment must be awarded.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there should not be any controversy over the issue of passing the motion by 2/3 majority of the members present or total. There is a precedence when the services of Dr. Mantrini Prasad of VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur were terminated by this very House by passing a motion by majority of the members present. They should follow the same precedence in this case as well.

To this, one of the members intervened to say that if a wrong precedence is set, it is not advisable to follow the same again.

Shri Jarnail Singh pointed out that the charges against Dr. Mantrini Prasad were of very serious nature as he was accused of giving certain documents from the reference library of Sadhu Ram to some other agency and misappropriation also.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that let they take a decision now.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that the voting be got done on the 3 major penalties.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the voting should be got done on the motion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would like to bring to their attention the resolution proposed by Ambassador I.S. Chadha and seconded by Professor R.P. Bambah & Shri V.K. Sibal.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that the proposed resolution, on which the voting is to be done, should be displayed on the screen.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he has also a proposal to make.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor said that they should take 10 minutes to type and display the proposal and with these words, he left the House.

When the proposal was typed and displayed on the screen, the Vice-Chancellor welcomed back the members. He said that they had agreed that the gravity of the misconduct is such that the major punishment is warranted. He has received a resolution from Ambassador I.S. Chadha which is seconded by Professor R.P. Bambah and Shri V.K. Sibal and there was a desire of the members that they wanted the proposal to be projected and same stand projected on the board.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he wanted to move his own proposal.

The Vice-Chancellor asked if they could put it to vote and then come back if it fails.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said, no. There could be no option.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that if the motion fails, the person would go scot free.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that all the three options be given and then secret voting be got done.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that since three options have come from the Syndicate, so the secret voting be got done on all the options and the option getting the maximum votes could be adopted.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if they provide all the three options and the voting is got done, if all the three options are voted equally and the condition of half of the strength is not fulfilled, then no option could be cleared.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the option getting the maximum votes would be carried.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is not so mentioned in the Panjab University Calendar. The Act says that at least minimum majority should be there. If there are 50 members, then at least 26 votes should be there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they unanimously reject the third option and the voting be got done on options 1 and 2.

Dr. Subhash Sharma, Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan, Principal I.S. Sandhu and Shri Jagdeep Kumar supported it.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the third option is dismissal from the University service.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a secret voting on option no.1 and 2.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that why secret voting is to be got done.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Dr. Subhash Sharma is trying to put undue influence on the members and requested that secret voting be got done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the secret voting is to be done on the option 1 and 2. Let the ballot paper for secret voting be got done.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the ballot paper be prepared with option 1 and 2.

The Vice-Chancellor asked as to on which post the demotion of an Assistant Professor could be done.

Professor Pam Rajput said that it seems that some members wanted to save the person from punishment.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he is ready for awarding the punishment of dismissal.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the secret voting should not be got done and open voting be got done.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they should got for secret voting and Dr. Subhash Sharma is trying to influence the members.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that no one is influencing and Dr. Ajay Ranga is doubting the integrity of the members.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Dr. Subhash Sharma is a powerful man and he could influence. So, he requested that secret voting should be got done.

Professor Pam Rajput said that it means that the University could not defend the girl students.

Professor J.K. Goswamy requested that the proposal on the screen may be changed.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the person is a senior Assistant Professor in the grade pay of Rs.7,000/-.

Dr. Subhash Sharma enquired from Dr. Ajay Ranga as to what is this designation of senior Assistant Professor. He said that it is no designation but only the pay scale.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that the resolution projected on the screen has to be changed because it talks about either removal or the person would go scot free. So, this resolution has to be changed.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he has submitted the proposal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter is very simple. If the proposal receives the dissent which is more than the half, then they would go to the other one option. Then that option would be there by default as they have only two choices.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is right.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it could not be so. The options have to be given at the same time.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if this motion succeeds, it means option no. 2 and if this motion fails, it means option no.1. It is very simple.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it is not so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have been sitting here since morning and the entire public is watching them. He did not find any other option and let there be a secret voting as it does not matter. The society is going to see what they are doing.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that there is no provision for removal option.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

The Vice-Chancellor cautioned the members that his (Shri Komal Singh) rank is only of that an Assistant Professor whether the grade pay is Rs.7,000/- and it is not demotion in rank. Who is he if the members are saying that the person is in senior scale or super senior scale? His rank is only of an Assistant Professor. The major penalties are reduction to a lower post or time-scale or to a lower scale in a time-scale. If he goes to a lower stage from grade pay of Rs.7,000/- to Rs.6,000/-, that is fine.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that they could not put two options in the first instance. They have to vote on the proposal.

The Vice-Chancellor requested not to get into a technicality. They have two options and let them go for secret voting. It is either option 1 or 2 and requested the members to go one by one and vote. They would come back to this item as soon as the ballot paper is ready.

While the ballot paper was being prepared, at this stage, Item No. 9 and 10 were taken up for consideration, the discussion of which has been put up at the end.

Thereafter, the discussion on Item No. C-8 continued.

The Vice-Chancellor announced secret voting on Item C-8 and announced the options of major penalties: (i) reduction to a lower post or time-scale; or to a lower stage in a time-scale; (ii) removal from service of the University which does not disqualify from future employment. The members are supposed to tick one of the options.

On a query of some members, the Registrar explained that the members are required to mark cross (X) against the option they are voting for.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the reduction is from the grade pay of Rs.7,000/- to Rs.6,000/-.

It was informed by the Registrar that the members have to put a cross against the option they are voting for and a pen has been provided there. The members have to use that pen only.

On a query by Dr. Subhash Sharma, the Vice-Chancellor again informed the members that they have to put a cross (x) against option with the pen which is provided there.

The Registrar announced that the ballot paper is ready and the members keen to vote could go for voting and requested Ambassador I.S. Chadha and Dr. Ajay Ranga to be there for the counting.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members for their attention and announced the result:

Total votes	51
Invalid	1
Valid votes	50
Option one i.e. lower in rank, lower in grade pay	18
Removal from Service	32

The Vice Chancellor said that this is what the position is at the moment.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Professor R.P. Bambah said that it means no punishment as there is no 2/3rd majority, so they cannot give any punishment.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said there is no 1/3rd majority as it would require 34 votes.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is for the Government to see as to what is to be done because if the Senate of the University cannot respond to a call of this nature, call of lacuna in the Act, then they have to worry because no punishment is not an answer when the misconduct is of this nature. Anyway, he would like to adjourn the meeting now.

Dr. Ajay Ranga requested the Vice Chancellor to tell as to what is the resolved part.

Professor R.P. Bambah suggested to take legal opinion on the issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has to check whether as per the precedent somebody was removed with a simple majority. It is the contention.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that now it is not a question of simple majority or special majority. It has to be decided before the voting. It has been decided that there should be 2/3rd majority and they need to have 34 votes which is not.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that then they would have to get the voting done on resolution number two. If there is 2/3rd majority it would be okay otherwise the mandate could be either way. Now they have given the option. So, the option means, which option gets more votes. There are two options, it means who will get the more votes.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that they have saved them.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said they have not saved them, but they have saved the culprit to which Professor J.K. Goswamy said, no. Continuing, he said that they have saved the accused, they have lowered the credibility of the Panjab University.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that, had this resolution would not have been edited, Mr. Komal Singh would have gone scot free.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he is even now scot free.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it has happened only because of their conduct, otherwise they were ready for punishment, but they have not let it happen. It has been got done deliberately.

The Vice Chancellor said, alright, this is the result and he would ask to seek a legal opinion.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said, no legal opinion.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the issue be sent to the Chancellor to which the Vice-Chancellor said, he would send it.

Continuing, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if they had to do this, why they have got the voting done. It means if it is not done according to him (Vice Chancellor) or

according to Ambassador I.S. Chadha, would it mean that they could do anything. What does it mean to seek legal opinion.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the House has given a clear mandate in favour of number two option with 32 votes. The majority of the House wants to give that punishment. The sentiment of majority of the House is that he should be given punishment of removal. They cannot let him free like this.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they also want that he should be given punishment, but the punishment should proportionate.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he was the proposer of the resolution. What he has proposed was a simple resolution imposing one particular punishment, that is not what was put to vote. The question they put to vote was not for or against his motion. It was asking the House to choose between one or the other. The Vice Chancellor has said that they cannot go by the technicalities, let they should get the sense of the House.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked to again move the resolution.

The Vice Chancellor said that the sense of the House is that the person needs to be punished to which some members said, 'yes'.

Dr. Ajay Ranga asked as to why the argument is taking place again and again. He requested Dr. Subhash Sharma that it does not happen again and again. They are not like the dacoits of Chambal Valley who work as per their diktats.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it means that the person has been let free. He further asked, do they let him free?

Dr. Ajay Ranga said he is saying that the person should be punished.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it has been decided.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that option of reduction has been decided.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that reduction option has only 1/3rd of the votes.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they see the rules. The proposal of Ambassador I.S. Chadha needed 2/3rd votes.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if the option getting 32 votes is not passed, then how the option getting 18 votes could be considered as passed.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if some members could not understand the technicalities, they should not discuss it as the proposal of Ambassador I.S. Chadha needed 34 votes.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that when he (Dr. Ajay Ranga) had explained other things, could he not give this suggestion earlier before voting. They are not legal advisors. They should accept the mandate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested to have legal opinion on the issue.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Dr. Ajay Ranga said as to why legal opinion should be taken.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it has been decided by 32 votes.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that this is sheer *Gundagardi* (rowdism)

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that option number two has been decided by 2/3rd votes and his (Dr. Ajay Ranga) opinion has been defeated. Let the decision be admitted.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that since the voting has been done now, he (Dr. Ajay Ranga) should not say it as rowdism (*Gundagardi*).

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as several members started speaking together.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor said, let they should meet on 15th of April.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor not to fix the date like this as they (Senate members) are not the students of the University and he should take the consent of the House.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he had already told the Vice Chancellor that he would not be in Chandigarh on this date.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the meeting could be rescheduled.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the Faculty meetings have been postponed, fresh dates will be intimated.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether discussion on Item C-10 would continue in the next meeting to be fixed.

The Registrar again announced that the Faculty meetings have been postponed and fresh dates would be announced.

When the secret voting on Item C-8 was in progress, Items No. C-9 and C-10 were taken up for consideration. After the voting the results were announced and the discussion on Item C-8 again resumed which has been made a part of the discussion under that item.

X. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-9 on the agenda**, was read out, viz. –

C-9. That

- (i) the resignation of Dr. Charanjeev Singh, Professor, Department of Public Administration, w.e.f. 01.08.2017, i.e., one day after the expiry of EOL without pay sanctioned to him upto 31.07.2017, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, be accepted.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

- (ii) the resignation of Dr. Deepti Laroia Sarkar, from the post of Assistant Professor, University Institute of Legal Studies, w.e.f. 09.09.2015 i.e. one day after the expiry of EOL without pay sanctioned to her up to 08.09.2015, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, be accepted.

NOTE: The Syndicate while accepting the resignation of the above teachers has also decided that their resignation be accepted subject to the submission of an applications expressing regrets for the inadvertent lapse on their part for not giving the notice in time and the same be placed before the Syndicate for information.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 4 & 5)

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-9 on the agenda**, be approved.

XI. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-10 on the agenda**, was read out, viz.:-

C-10 That minutes dated 16.08.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 20.03.2017 (Para 3), to work out the modalities for the appointment of Guest Faculty/Part-time faculty in the P.U. Constituent Colleges, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 26)

Dr. Ajay Ranga pointed out that the course of M.Phil. is being run in the Department of Public Administration where five teachers are working as guest faculty out of which no one belongs to the subject of Public Administration and their approval has not been given by the Dean of University Instruction.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the draft of the appointment letter has been mentioned at page 255 of the agenda. He has some queries on this issue. He enquired as to whether the remuneration of Rs.25,000/- to be paid to the guest faculty in the Constituent Colleges is for qualified or non-qualified teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that it is for the qualified teachers.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that only the workload has been mentioned and not the eligibility. The draft of the appointment letter is not appropriate. He pointed out that some unqualified teachers appointed as guest faculty in the Constituent Colleges are being paid a salary of Rs.15,000/-. There are some guest faculty teachers who are working since 1st week of September, 2017 but their salary has not been released till date. He enquired as to who is accountable for this.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Finance and Development Officer has informed him that the salary is not pending with the salary section.

Shri Raghbir Dyal again enquired as to who is accountable for this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not stopped any salary bills.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the draft of the appointment letter is not appropriate.

Principal I.S. Sandhu clarified that the appointment letter had been drafted in the month of September. He pointed out that in the Constituent College, no ineligible person is appointed. If no eligible candidate is available only then an ineligible person is appointed and that also with the approval of the Vice-Chancellor. So, there was no need to mention that the salary of Rs.25,000/- would be paid to the NET qualified teachers as no unqualified teacher is appointed. Regarding the query of Shri Raghbir Dyal on payment of salary of Rs.15,000/-, they were paying a salary of Rs.25,000/- till last year. But the Vice-Chancellor had approved the payment of Rs.15,000/- to non-NET qualified candidates as per the rules of Chandigarh Administration. The salary to the teachers is being paid. As regards the query of Shri Raghbir Dyal that the teachers are not getting the salary, now the approvals which were pending have been granted and the teachers are getting the salary. There might be a rare case in which the salary bill might not have been submitted due to which the salary could not have been paid.

Shri Raghbir Dyal pointed out that a teacher was appointed on 4.9.2017 but the salary has not been paid.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into all the issues related to salary. The payment of salary is not related with the item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the appointment letter could not be approved as all the things have not been covered in it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal also said that the draft of the appointment letter could not be approved.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that why it could not be approved as they appoint only the eligible persons.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that such things have to be clearly mentioned in the draft of the appointment letter.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they are not appointing the non-NET qualified candidates.

Shri Raghbir Dyal pointed out that they are appointing the non-NET qualified candidates.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Shri Raghbir Dyal is right. They appoint the NET qualified teachers. However, the candidates without NET are being appointed separately on a salary of Rs.15,000/-. But the draft of the appointment letter under consideration is only for those candidates who are NET qualified. He said that with the resolved part, a note could also be approved that this be approved only for UGC NET qualified candidates.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it should be mentioned that the eligibility is as per UGC/Panjab University norms.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired whether any appointment letter is issued to the candidates who are unqualified and are paid a salary of Rs.15,000/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the appointment letter would have to be issued.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that under the Item C-31, which has now been made as I-41 for information, it is clearly mentioned in para 2 on page 624 of the agenda and read out that “instead of guest faculty wherever appointed earlier, but do not fulfill the qualifications laid down by the UGC, the eligible persons, who apply for the next academic session/next semester, wherever available, should be given preference in selections”.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first of all let them differentiate between approval and sanction. Approval is always of the teachers in their parlance. In the Constituent Colleges those who are non-NET and unqualified and have been appointed, obviously they could not be given approval as teachers. But whether it is sanctioned or not sanctioned, if somebody has been appointed under the rules of the University even if tomorrow the sanction is not granted, the period for which the teacher has taught, the salary has to be paid because they have made the appointment and it is not the fault of the teacher if the appointment has been made without the sanction of the Vice-Chancellor. In this regard, he suggested that if the sanction from the Vice-Chancellor is required, either the appointment should not be made without the prior sanction of the Vice-Chancellor or the bills should be raised pending sanction from the Vice-Chancellor so that the teachers are not to wait for their salary for 2-3 months as has been pointed out by Shri Raghbir Dyal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has personally told everyone that the salary should be paid to these people as they are appointed on a very low salary of Rs.15,000/-. So, it is the duty of the Principal or the Chairperson to see that they are paid the salary and it should not be delayed for more than a week.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his question is not over as he is not satisfied and wanted to know if the Non-NET faculty is to be appointed or not. He requested the House to decide it so that they might be able to tell the Principal whether they should give appointment letter to them or not.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that the appointment letter has to be given but it should be mentioned there that they would be given at the rate of Rs. 500/- per lecture subject to maximum of Rs. 15000/- p.m.

Shri Raghbir Dyal again asked if the appointment letter to the non-NET is to be given or not to which the Vice Chancellor said that appointment letter has to be given. Shri Raghbir Dyal requested the Vice Chancellor to get it recorded.

When some members started speaking together, the Vice Chancellor requested them to speak one by one as it would be very difficult to record their versions.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if there is such case in his college, he would forward it to the higher authorities.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they should make a mission for it as it is not concerned with one college only, but Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu is taking it personally.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that since he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) is asking him, so he has told him about his college only. He has nothing to do with other colleges.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Senate should take a decision whether the University Guest faculty Lecturers who are not eligible, would they be issued an appointment letter or not to which some of the members said that the appointment letter is to be given.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as several members started speaking together.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that there is a teacher in his college who is non-NET, but he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) makes an approach for him whereas they have many NET qualified teachers available for appointment.

The Vice Chancellor requested that they should concentrate their discussion only on the item under consideration.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said, it is very strange, at least they should take some decision on this point. He said that Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu has alleged that there are Non-NET faculty appointed in Computer Science in his college, which is wrong because out of the four, two teachers are NET qualified. How does Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu know about his college?

At this verbal duel took place between Shri Raghbir Dyal and Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and nothing could be heard properly.

Shri Raghbir Dyal again asked whether the appointment letter is to be given to the Non-NET faculty to which the Vice Chancellor said, the appointment letter is to be given.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are now going to do voting on Item C-8.

Professor Mukesh Arora, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they would like to speak on Item No. C-10 to which the Vice Chancellor said that C-10 is finished.

Professor Rajesh Gill wanted to speak something to which the Vice Chancellor said that first they should go for voting and she may speak after the voting to which Professor Rajesh Gill said, 'yes'.

Thereafter, the members left for secret voting on Item C-8. When the voting concluded, the results were announced and the discussion started again on Item C-8 which has been made part of the discussion under the said item.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as several members started speaking together.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor said, they should meet on 15th of April.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor not to fix the date like this as they (Senate members) are not the students of the University and he should take the consent of the House.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he had already told the Vice Chancellor that he would not be in Chandigarh on this date.

Senate Proceedings dated 1st April, 2018

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the meeting could be rescheduled.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the Faculty meetings have been postponed, fresh dates will be intimated.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the discussion on Item C-10 is not complete.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether discussion on Item C-10 would continue in the next meeting to be fixed to which the Vice-Chancellor said, 'yes'.

The Registrar again announced that the Faculty meetings have been postponed and fresh dates would be announced.

RESOLVED: That since the discussion on **Items C-10 on the agenda**, remained inconclusive, the same would be continued in the next meeting.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE CHANCELLOR