PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on Sunday, 6th May 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. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
9. Dr. B.C. Josan
10. Dr. Baljinder Singh
11. Professor Chaman Lal
12. Dr. Dalip Kumar
13. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
14. Shri Deepak Kaushik
15. Dr. Emanual Nahar
16. Shri. Gurjot Singh Malhi
17. Dr. Gurmit Singh
18. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
19. Shri H.S. Dua
20. Dr. Harjodh Singh
21. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
22. Dr. Inderjit Kaur
23. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
24. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
25. Professor J.K. Goswamy
26. Dr. Jagdish Chander
27. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
28. Shri Jarnail Singh
29. Dr. Keshav Malhotra
30. Dr. K.K. Sharma
31. Dr. Nisha Bhargava
32. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu
33. Shri Naresh Gaur
34. Professor Navdeep Goyal
35. Dr. Neeru Malik
36. Professor Manoj K. Sharma
37. Dr. Parveen Goyal
38. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
39. Shri Parmod Kumar
40. Professor Pam Rajput
41. Shri Prabhjit Singh
42. Professor Ronki Ram
43. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
44. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
45. Professor R.P. Bambah
46. Shri Raghbir Dyal

47. Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mahajan
48. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
49. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur
50. Professor Shelley Walia
51. Professor Shankarji Jha
52. Shri Sandeep Kumar
53. Shri Sanjay Tandon
54. Dr. S.K. Sharma
55. Dr. Surinder Kaur
56. Shri Satya Pal Jain
57. Dr. S. S. Sangha
58. Shri Sandeep Singh
59. Dr. Subhash Sharma
60. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
61. Dr. Tarlochan Singh
62. Shri Varinder Singh
63. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
64. Shri V.K. Sibal
65. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) … (Secretary)
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Dr. Amod Gupta
2. Capt. Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister
3. Professor Anita Kaushal
4. Dr. Amar Singh
5. Shri Amanpreet Singh
6. Professor B.S. Ghuman
7. Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu
8. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
9. Professor Deepak Pental
10. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
11. Dr. Harsh Batra
12. Justice Harbans Lal
13. Shri Harjit Singh, DPI Colleges, Punjab
14. Smt. Kirron Kher
15. Dr. Mukesh K. Arora
16. Principal N.R. Sharma
17. Shri Parimal Rai
18. Shri Punam Suri
19. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
20. Dr. Raj Kumar Chabbewal
21. Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar, D.H.E., U.T., Chandigarh
22. Mrs. Razia Sultana, Education Minister, Punjab
23. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
24. Professor Rajat Sandhir
25. Dr. Suresh Chandra Sharma
26. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar
27. Shri Sanjeev Bandlish
28. Dr. Satish Kumar

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

i) Veteran Journalist S. Nihal Singh, on April 16, 2018. He had donated a vast collection of books (Around 3000 in number, includes books in German, Russian, French and Malayalam and English), which were a part of his personal library, to the School of Communications Studies, PU, Chandigarh. He had also delivered the prestigious PU Colloquium on 11th May, 2016 entitled 'Indian Politics: The Tipping Point'.

ii) Prof. Vipin Dewan, Ex-Faculty member of University Business School on 28th April, 2018. He was spouse of a present faculty member Professor Smriti Sood.

The Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of S. Nihal Singh and Prof. Vipin Dewan and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

I. The Vice Chancellor welcomed Professor Shankarji Jha, on his taking over as Dean of University Instruction and also as a Fellow. He said, "I am pleased to inform the honourable members that:–

(i) Prof. A.S. Ahluwalia has been elected as President of the Punjab Academy of Sciences for a term of 3 years w.e.f. 1st April 2018.

(ii) Panjab University, Chandigarh has been selected amongst the 11-Member Subject Expert Groups (SEGs) for pan India implementation of Unnat Bharat Abhiyan (UBA) scheme of Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development. Other SEG Institution Members include 6 IITs (Kanpur, Delhi, Kharagpur, Madras, Roorkie and Bombay), IARI (New Delhi), NIRD (Hyderabad), AICTE and UGC. The SEGs will function as think tank and monitor progress of the scheme. PU has been assigned subject area 'Innovation and Design Education'. Prof. Rakesh Tuli, Sr. Research Advisor & J.C. Bose National Fellow and Coordinator, DIC at UIET, has been appointed as Coordinator for the SEG at Panjab University, Chandigarh. This is a choice made by MHRD. Each Subject Expert Group (SEG) will have technical and non-technical members and representatives from field and administration to facilitate effective implementation of UBA 2.0.

Shri Naresh Gaur informed that Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu, MLA, and Fellow, Panjab University has been inducted in the Punjab Cabinet.

RESOLVED: That:

(1) felicitations of the Senate be conveyed to –

(i) Prof. A.S. Ahluwalia on having been elected as President of the Punjab Academy of Sciences for a term of 3 years w.e.f. 1st April 2018

(ii) Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu, MLA, on having been inducted in the Punjab Cabinet.

(2) the information contained in Vice Chancellor's Statement at Sr. No. (ii) be noted.

While referring to the statement of the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that Professor Tuli has been made a Coordinator for a programme under MHRD. He enquired whether it is on the basis of a recommendation or has been done by the MHRD on its own.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Tuli is the Coordinator of Design Innovation Centre of Panjab University which is a Rs.10 crore inter-institutional project in Chandigarh given to the University. In that capacity he attends the meeting in the MHRD. Whenever the Vice-Chancellor receives any information to attend the meeting at MHRD, since he could not attend every meeting, the Coordinator is being sent to attend the meetings.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood enquired whether the name of Professor Tuli has been recommended or it has been done by the MHRD at its own level. He just wanted a yes or no answer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was not aware that some special groups are going to be formed. He received this and he was informed of the name.

While referring to the statement of the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Dalip Kumar said that two Government Colleges of Chandigarh, i.e., Sector-42 and Secotr-11 under Unnat Bharat Abhiyan.

At this stage, Shri Sandeep Singh raised the issue of examination of the students of Panjab University Regional Centre, Muktsar which is going to start w.e.f. 7th May, 2018 for which the roll numbers to the students have not been issued and detained from appearing in the examination. He requested that the students be allowed to appear in the examination.

Shri Sandeep Singh further informed that there are about 110 students out of which 84 have been detained and their examination is scheduled to be held on 7th May. This matter had also been discussed in the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is okay with it as he had told it in the Syndicate meeting.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in the Syndicate also the Vice Chancellor had said, okay in the Syndicate. The examination is to start on Monday.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is no building at P.U.R.C., Muktsar and the students are facing a lot of problems there.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that a list has been displayed and the more than fifty percent students have been detained from appearing in the examination.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the students are standing outside. He requested that roll number to the students be got issued so that could move to Muktsar as they have to appear in the examination tomorrow.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Director of the Centre has already been conveyed not to stop any student from appearing in the examination.

Professor Keshav Malhotra wanted to know whether the Director has been instructed not to stop the students from appearing in first paper only or for whole of the examination? He requested the Vice Chancellor to clarify it as the students who are standing outside do not have any information about this.

It was informed (by the Secretary to Vice Chancellor) that the Director has been conveyed not to stop any student from appearing in the first paper and subsequently the details would be sent to the Director. It is important for them to appear in the first paper.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if there is some mistake on the part of the students, then they could detain them, but since the P.U.R.C., Muktsar does not have the infrastructure and other facilities, then how they could detain them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is contradiction as the S.V.C. has said that no student would be detained, but he has talked to the students and they have not been given the roll numbers.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the students be allowed to appear in all the papers. This was also endorsed by Professor Keshav Malhotra.

It was clarified (by the SVC) that even if the orders get late, the students would appear in all the papers.

Shri Sandeep Singh said, why to delay the orders and why they have to wait.

It was said (by the SVC) that let they should first get a para from the Syndicate section in this regard to which Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Varinder Singh said that they have already given in writing.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it has been done by the Vice Chancellor, but message should also be conveyed to the Director that the students would appear in all the examinations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to submit that as a onetime measure all the students of Muktsar Regional Centre will be allowed to appear in the examination and it was also discussed that the examination is to commence on 7th, the information be sent today itself. It was unanimously agreed also, thereafter, after three days, when nothing was done, he talked to the SVC and told him that giving reference of the Syndicate decision, where the he (SVC) was also sitting, take the orders from the Vice Chancellor and convey them. But, today they have been told that nothing has been conveyed as yet. Rather a list has been displayed where 84 students out of hundred plus have been detained. If this is how the decisions of the Syndicate are to be treated, he wondered, what is the solution with the students. It is not so simple as they think. He has come across a student who is bed ridden, who had applied one month earlier for change of examination centre from Muktsar to Chandigarh. The Director, in spite of the fact was convinced about the reasons did not recommend and send it. He is saying

that he is still not sure whether the students would be allowed to appear in the examination or not so he cannot recommend this. Now he would like to say if this is conveyed there, how that student is going to be allowed to appear in Chandigarh as per the request because it has not been clear. Now the question arises whether the Centre is at Muktsar or Chandigarh, roll number is given, one can appear at Muktsar and Chandigarh also. It is nothing but harassment of the students in the name of rules, notwithstanding the fact that they have not been able to provide even the bare minimum facilities at Muktsar for the students to sit and there are no faculty. So, it was discussed in the Syndicate that without mentioning any decision, they should refer it to Senate to take a decision. It was agreed, not only by the Syndicate unanimously but by the Vice Chancellor also. Now, today also the Vice Chancellor said that he is okay with it. So, what was the hindrance during the last one week. Why the students are not being conveyed? They do not want any assurance from the SVC. The SVC has assured him four days earlier also so that it could be done in the forenoon itself on that day and today they are standing at the same place. They should just imagine the plight of those students who are to appear for the examination tomorrow in the morning. They are standing here in the rain demanding that they should be given a chance to appear. The students, most of them are to appear at Muktsar, how do they expect them to fair well in the examination. Are they really having any sympathy towards the students. So, he requested that the official communication be sent right now, in writing, along with the instructions that if any candidate has applied for change of Centre, pending adjudication on that, that candidate should also be allowed to appear at Chandigarh, the necessary instruction may be given to the Controller of Examinations. Keeping in view that they are here to find solutions for the students and not to create problems for them.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the students be told to go back to prepare for the examination otherwise they would keep on waiting for next couple of hours.

Shri Varinder Singh said that till the time the building and infrastructure is not arranged, the students studying there should be migrated here. How they would study there when the buildings are in a dilapidated condition.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Director, P.U.R.C., Muktsar was here yesterday and it is the Director who has conveyed to the students that their cases are not being cleared.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he would like to submit for the information of the House that the teachers who are working there, though on temporary basis, have their own politics, such a problem was not there earlier.

Shri Naresh Gaur and Shri Sandeep Singh said that it should be conveyed to the students that their case is clear so that they can go back.

After discussion, it was resolved that the roll numbers to students of Panjab University Regional Centre, Muktsar be issued and they be allowed to appear in all the papers for which the examination is going to start w.e.f. 7th May, 2018.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out a case of a student who is in a critical condition and putting up at Chandigarh for treatment. She has requested for change of examination centre from Muktsar to Chandigarh. He, therefore, requested that keeping in view the interest of the student, the centre be changed to Chandigarh.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Controller of Examinations to take care of it.

At this stage, Dr. K.K. Sharma raised the issue of suspension of three teachers by the Management of Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce and Management, Ludhiana and they have been directed to mark their attendance in a corporate office situated at a distance of about 30 kms. Some other members also raised the issues relating to higher fee being charged by the College, non-grant of leaves and vacation to the teachers.

Dr. K.K. Sharma further said that this college (Aurobindo College) charge Rs. 65000/- as fee for B.com Course whereas it is Rs. 25000/- in other colleges. There is no summer vacation given to the teachers and only 7 days of casual leave is given to the teachers whether one is a male or a female teacher. When some of the teachers gave a collective representation to the management to grant them all benefits as per the P.U. University Calendar, then three teachers were suspended. The teachers who had got this college started as founder team and had contributed a lot for the development of the college, three of them were suspended. He, therefore, requested that a Committee be constituted and visit the College to sort out the issue.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that one of the lady teachers who has been suspended has rendered 14 years service in the college and she is the one who has the longest service in that college. Their attendance is taken in a factory like a bonded labour.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the issue which is being raised today by various members, has been raised by him since 2013, but nobody paid any attention to it. He requested the House that a Committee be constituted to enquire into the matter because there are three such teachers who have 15-16 years of service to their credit have been terminated.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu informed that the College had applied for permanent affiliation which might not be granted (Refer I-39) to them and it be stopped till the issue is resolved.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not a zero hour. They would come back to it as the agenda concludes.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that out of the 18 teachers, 13 are lady teachers. One lady teacher who is 40 years old and taking care of her parents, has been asked to mark her attendance outside the college.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as some of the members started speaking together.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that it is a big question mark on the teaching community. He suggested that the Committee should be formed on Monday itself and it should visit the College on emergency basis. This is the demand of all of them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the Committee should be formed here itself which should include the local members of Ludhiana and Dr. Kamal Kumar.

Dr. Neeru Malik suggested that a female member be also included in the Committee as out of the 18 teachers in the College, there are 13 female teachers. The father of a female teacher was threatened so that the female teacher should resign.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the said teacher has now resigned.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that Shri Harpreet Singh Dua should also be made a member of the Committee.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that after suspension, the teachers are asked to mark their attendance in the corporate house instead of the College.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that the corporate house is at a distance of 35 kms. from the College.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that how a teacher could go to a factory to mark the attendance.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that it is really shameful.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members could raise this issue in the Zero Hour to which some of the members said that it could not be raised during the Zero Hour but has to be discussed at this moment being an important issue.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that a Committee of the local members of Ludhiana including Shri Harpreet Singh Dua be formed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there has to be proper fact finding.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they are not asking for taking a spontaneous decision but a Committee be formed to look into the issue and take appropriate steps.

Shri Varinder Singh again suggested that a Committee of the local members of Ludhiana be formed.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that a timeframe of one week be given to the Committee.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that 'might is right' is being rightly proved there.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that it is a demand of all the College teachers.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that it is a demand from all the College teachers of Punjab that such a culture should not be created that if some teachers submit collective representation for the benefits as provided in the Panjab University Calendar, such teachers are placed under suspension.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let Principal R.S. Jhanji chair the Committee including Ms. Inderjit Kaur, Shri Ashok Goyal suggested the name of Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Shri Naresh Gaur and Dr. K.K. Sharma. The Vice-Chancellor added the name of Principal I.S. Sandhu being a Principal.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that the teachers who have got elected from the Lecturer constituency should not be made members of the Committee but some other external members be added otherwise those teachers would indulge in politics.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has proposed the name of Principal R.S. Jhanji, Principal I.S. Sandhu, Ms. Inderjit Kaur from Ludhiana to this Professor Keshav

Malhotra suggested the name of Dr. K.K. Sharma and local Senators of Ludhiana. The Vice-Chancellor added the name of the Principal of S.D. College.

This was agreed to.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had thought that the Vice-Chancellor must be aware of this issue but from the response it looks as if he is not aware of any such thing. He thought that the Registrar would be able to give some feedback about this case but he (Shri Ashok Goyal) could presume safely now that the suspension seems to have been done almost one month back and the intimation to the effect that the suspension has been made probably has not been sent to the University. Probably, the copy of the charge sheet has also not been sent to the University. This clearly shows how irresponsibly the Colleges are acting while the University regulations demand that immediately the Colleges have to send the copy of the suspension order along with the charge sheet. If the same had been received in the University, then probably the House could have been satisfied had it been explained as to what is the position. But if it has not been received, the Committee now appointed should also look into it. The Committee should also look into the aspect that it is written and he was completely amazed to read that the suspended teachers would be directed to report at the corporate office. This is what they are reaching at that the Colleges are being run from the corporate houses. This should also be taken into account by the Committee.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that now that a Committee has been formed, the Committee is a neutral body and they should not dictate as to what the Committee has to look at. The Committee would decide as to what it has to look at depending upon the complaints that they receive. So, there is no need for any member of the Senate here to say that certain things must be seen by the Committee. That is interfering with the neutrality and objectivity of the Committee.

After a lot of discussion, the following names were suggested by the members for the Committee to look into and sort out the issues raised by the members and the Dean College Development Council be requested to issue the letter in this regard:

1. Principal R.S. Jhanji ...Chairperson
2. Principal I.S. Sandhu
3. Ms. Inderjit Kaur
4. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
5. Dr. Neeru Malik
6. D.R. (Colleges) ...Convener

II. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-37** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-37. To consider the following recommendations of the Syndicate dated 29.04.2018 that:

(i) it is resolved to recommend to the Senate that the powers, delegated by it under the Panjab University Rules and Regulations to the Vice-Chancellor may also be withdrawn from the Vice-Chancellor with immediate effect;

(ii) to direct Registrar to file an affidavit stating that the affidavit filed by Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice-Chancellor on behalf of Panjab University in the Punjab and Haryana High Court on 17th April, 2018 without authority be treated as withdrawn. The Registrar be directed to file an affidavit on behalf of Panjab University before 6th May, 2018;

(iii) the Chancellor be also informed through the Registrar that the Syndicate has resolved after discussion and requesting the Vice-Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit, while failing in its endeavour to get the affidavit withdrawn, the powers delegated by the Syndicate to the Vice-Chancellor be withdrawn. Taking a serious note, the Syndicate resolved to report to the Chancellor for taking appropriate action against the Vice-Chancellor for having filed such an affidavit containing undesirable language against the members of the governing body;

(iv) an affidavit would be prepared with the help of Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma. This Committee would be free to have assistance from the Advocate of their own choice. The affidavit so prepared is to be submitted to the Court before 6th May, 2018, i.e., before the next meeting of the Senate

NOTE: 1. Dr. Subhash Sharma mooted a proposal to withdraw the powers delegated by the Syndicate to the Vice-Chancellor which was seconded by Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal and accepted by other members except Professor Ronki Ram.

2. The resolution that powers delegated by the Syndicate to the Vice-Chancellor under the Panjab University Rules and

Regulations be withdrawn from the Vice-Chancellor with immediate effect.

(Discussion of the Syndicate dated 29.04.2018)

Professor R.P. Bambah said that as the oldest member of the Senate, he has some responsibility on Item C-37 put on the desk which he did not have much time to look into. But he could say general thing. According to him, lot of damage has been done to the University by this sort of situation and as responsible members he requested them that they resolve this in a very dignified way and do not discuss the matter here in the Senate. He suggested the formation of a Committee of certain number of people with a request that they might resolve this matter in a dignified way consistent with the commitment of all of them for the welfare of the University so that there is no mudslinging and unnecessary discussion which would be very harmful to the University. He requested the Senate through the Vice-Chancellor to have a small Committee with a request to resolve this matter as soon as possible without much discussion in the Senate or any other body.

S. Tarlochan Singh endorsed and supported whatever Professor R.P. Bambah had said. All the colleagues sitting here are academically senior to him. He might be senior in age but all others like working Professors who are elected are senior to him. Whatever has happened during these days, a general impression of that is not good for all of them. They do not want that this matter should spread further at a time when the Vice-Chancellor is going to complete his term. This is Panjab University and they all being Punjabis believe in Punjabiat. They always go in for taking positive decisions. He appealed to all the members that let they pass all the pending agenda because the same has been prepared by the current administrators and they know better about it and the coming administrators might not be able to understand in a better way. So, they should settle everything amicably. He favoured what Professor R.P. Bambah has said. There could be differences and some of them could be genuine. As the Vice-Chancellor was not allowing the zero hour, he pointed out that sometimes in the Parliament also, such discussion takes place and a decision is arrived at that time itself. So, they should not say that the zero hour be held in the last of the meeting. As they have taken a right decision about the issue of a College of Ludhiana, such things are allowed everywhere. So, he requested the members that they should work in tandem for the remaining term of the Vice-Chancellor and discuss the whole agenda in an amicable manner.

This was supported by others members.

Shri Varinder Singh said that whatever Professor R.P. Bambah and S. Tarlochan Singh have said is a good suggestion. Whatever has happened is not in good taste. But there are some questions in their mind also which should be cleared by the Vice-Chancellor. He also represents a society and answerable to them. Whatever decision is to be taken by the seniors, he is okay with it. He requested that whatever questions they have in mind should be replied.

S. Tarlochan Singh appealed to the members not to discuss this issue in the Senate and a Committee could be formed on the issue.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they do not know as to what has happened in the Syndicate. But a message is given to the society that they are dacoits and looters and that the Syndicate and Senate are vitiating the atmosphere. Now the press people are

also here and all the members are watching everything. He has no issue on the withdrawal of the powers. But a clear message should go to the society. The Vice-Chancellor says something in the meeting of the Syndicate while in the Senate he says that the affidavit submitted is 24-carat gold. But it should be made clear whether it is 24-carat or not. If they are silenced, the matter would remain at the same level and the Vice-Chancellor could again give a statement that they are looting the University and the Senators do not allow the work to be done. At least all these things should be made clear so that the members could also be clear about these. The society should also be clear about these things. He is requesting for the answer to these things. He did not want any untoward argument to take place but the debate should be held. At least a good message should go to the society because the members and the society might not be aware of the Syndicate decisions. He requested that the questions that they are having should be cleared. He is not in favour of it that some unpleasant argument takes place.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the suggestion by Professor R.P. Bambah is welcome. Instead of indulging in discussion on this issue, which is a very sensitive issue, everybody is responsible and disturbed also over whatever has happened during the last 7-10 days. If something could be amicably resolved, definitely they welcome it. He supported the suggestion of Professor R.P. Bambah.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Dr. Neeru Malik also supported it.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that she has come to know through newspapers that an affidavit has been filed. Being from the legal background, her respectful submission to the Vice-Chancellor who is chairing the meeting and the honourable members, there is a prescribed procedure in the statutes about making the amendments in the Act, Regulations and Rules. The governing reforms may be the requirement of the need of the time, nobody is objecting to it.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there must be some reasons behind the governance reforms.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that since certain procedures are prescribed, and by following that procedure they could make suggestions for bringing the reforms. Without bringing those suggestions before the authority which is the competent body to make recommendations to the Central Government, according to her, that affidavit is premature at this stage because the Senate has constituted the Committee to bring the governance reforms. Let the recommendations of that Committee be placed before the Senate and Syndicate. The suggestion of Professor R.P. Bambah, being a senior member, that if the matter is amicably solved because for the last 7 days, according to her, the members as well as the officials are concerned about what is appearing in the newspapers and what is going in the University. They are all responsible persons and concerned for the teaching, non-teaching and students and are answerable to them. They are answerable to the society also. It is a welcome step that a Committee of responsible senior persons be constituted and then appropriate decision to withdraw the affidavit, till the recommendations of the Committee come, should be taken.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that that he agrees with what the senior member Professor R.P. Bambah and S. Tarlochan Singh, a senior Parliamentarian and senior member of the House have said. Any outsider does not know anything about who is wrong, who is right. When a public man reads the newspapers, it brings down the image of the University in his mind. For that person anybody could be at fault and they could blame each other and it is going on for some time, it is not a new thing. He

pointed out that the case going in the Punjab and Haryana High Court is not an adverse litigation. It is not that the Panjab University has filed this case nor is it that somebody has filed a case against the University. Hon'ble Justice Mahesh Grover of Punjab and Haryana High Court read news in the newspapers on 5th September, 2016. After reading the news, he wrote a letter to the Chief Justice of the High Court and said that he is an alumnus of Panjab University and after reading he is worried that the condition of the University is not good and a suo moto notice be taken.

Shri Varinder Singh interrupted to say that the information being provided by Shri Satya Pal Jain is totally wrong.

Continuing, Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he is having a copy of that note and would like to read it for the members. He has brought that note of Justice Mahesh Grover and would read it. If this note is not on the record, he is ready for any punishment that the House might impose on him. It is a part of the official record.

Shri Varinder Singh again interrupted and said that the information being given by Shri Satya Pal Jain is totally wrong.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he has brought that note of Justice Mahesh Grover and would read out the note. In democracy everyone has a right to put forward his opinion and it is for the House to decide what is right and what is wrong. He did not want to read the note but since Shri Varinder Singh is saying something, he would like to read the note. It is an order passed by Hon'ble Justice Mahesh Grover on 5th September, 2016. He did not want to read the note because the Judge has written something which the members might not find in good taste. He read out the note. A newspaper report carrying the statement of the Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University that the University is likely to shut done by January next year if the Centre does not clear the funds raises an issue of pre-eminent concern about the premier historical institution which has produced men of stature in all stages of life. The statement has to be accorded primacy considering it coming from a person of the stature of Vice-Chancellor, an assignment entrusted to man of eminence. In my considered view, it would be the bounden duty of all to see that the University, which has been in existence since pre-partition days, does not hasten towards its demise for lack of funds. Evidently, if the doom is predicted so soon, the institution must be in state of decay already. Apparently, the stakeholders of the University have done little to share the financial burden while constantly obstructing the University's efforts to be declared a Central University, this could possibly have ameliorated the situation. The Vice-Chancellor has stated about the University being in the hands of mafia which also cannot be wished away. To alienate an authority anguished by the working and post working at cross purpose. It Panjab University has to be treated with great concern, the cumulative impact of both the statements would invite the concern of all those who have been associated with the premier institution and the undersigned as an alumni would venture to take suo moto notice of such serious state of affairs particularly apprehension of the Vice-Chancellor of shutting down of the University for lack of funds to treat this as a writ petition. It would be appropriate. He pointed out that this case is going on for the last two years and it is Court on its own motion. Panjab University is a party in this case and Punjab Government, Chandigarh Administration, Haryana Government and UGC are also the parties. Government of India is the main party. He is representing the Government of India in this case. That is why he pointed out these things.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Shri Naresh Gaur and Shri Varinder Singh interrupted and asked the Vice-Chancellor as to who are the mafia persons.

Continuing, Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he has not added anything but just read the order. He pointed out that it is not an adverse litigation. The Court has taken notice on its own and thereafter the version of all the parties are going on. He did not know as to many persons have read the affidavit filed by the Vice-Chancellor, a copy of which he is having with him. The Vice-Chancellor has filed the affidavit by his name and one could agree or disagree with it. In the hearing in the case, the UGC, Government of India, Punjab Government, Haryana Government had their own viewpoint and the Court is taking further in its own way. Haryana Government has also made another offer that it is ready to grant its share of funds and affiliate 1-2 districts with Panjab University. Hon'ble Chief Minister of Haryana had written a letter to the Home Minister in this regard. The Central Government marked that letter to the Punjab Government. On the asking of the Chief Minister of Punjab, the Education Secretary of Punjab said that they do not agree with it. Haryana Government had its own view that they wanted to affiliate the Colleges and Punjab Government had its own view against it. The Court took on record both the viewpoints and said that decision would be taken on it at appropriate time. The Vice-Chancellor has filed an affidavit and the persons could differ on it, there is no second opinion on it. If some members differ on the affidavit, they could file a counter affidavit in the Court.

Shri Varinder Singh intervened and said that it is wrong. Since it is the personal view of the Vice-Chancellor, he should hire his own advocate. He asked to why the case already going on about the financial crisis has been clubbed with this one. The Vice-Chancellor must be having the knowledge about the constitution of the Senate before becoming the Vice-Chancellor about 6 years ago, why he did not file his personal opinion at that time. As Shri Satya Pal Jain is talking about filing counter affidavit, how it could be filed as it has been clubbed with the earlier case.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that Mrs. Anu Chatrath is a very senior Advocate and presently is Additional Advocate General of Punjab. He brought it to the knowledge of Shri Varinder Singh that if someone has to file an affidavit in the High Court, then the permission of the Court is to be taken. The affidavit is placed on record only after the permission of the Court. If one wanted to withdraw the affidavit which he/she had filed, even then the permission of the Court is required for withdrawal.

Shri Varinder Singh interrupted again and said that he knows all about it and requested Shri Satya Pal Jain not to twist the things. Every member knows such things.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that what Shri Varinder Singh had earlier said and from that it appeared perhaps he did not know the procedure. That is why he wanted to bring it to the knowledge of Shri Varinder Singh. If Shri Varinder Singh is talking in such a language, it justifies that what the Vice-Chancellor has said is right. Shri Varinder Singh is justifying it.

The Vice-Chancellor and Shri Satya Pal Jain requested Shri Varinder Singh to first listen and then say whatever he wanted to say.

Continuing, Shri Satya Pal Jain said that he has three reasons. First is that as said by Professor R.P. Bambah and S. Tarlochan Singh, they should not indulge in more controversy and not damage the image of the University. He is not blaming anybody. In totality, it seems that the University is being laughed at and they should sort out the matter. Secondly, he has a copy of the affidavit which has been filed in the Court, that is the personal affidavit of Professor Arun Kumar Grover. It is for the Court to grant the permission. He has read in the newspapers that some of the Syndicate

members have said that they would file an affidavit in the Court before 6th May, they could seek permission of the Court and could say in the Court that they did not want the reforms and the Vice-Chancellor is telling lie, if the Court grants permission they would be heard otherwise not. The next date of hearing in the Court is 15th May and the term of the Vice-Chancellor is going to expire on 23rd July, it depends on the Chancellor whether he could grant the extension to the Vice-Chancellor or appoint a new Vice-Chancellor as the post has been advertised and a Selection/Search Committee would be formed. Therefore, they should not go into controversy. They could discuss so many things on merit on both sides. He agrees with the spirit which Professor R.P. Bambah and S. Tarlochan Singh have suggested.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they also agree that they do not want to go into any controversy. But he does not agree to the discussion being taken to some other direction. He wanted to discuss as to why the affidavit was filed and what were the reasons behind it and what are those developmental works which the Vice-Chancellor wanted to do but the Senate did not allow. He wanted to know all these things.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that a suggestion has been made by Professor R.P. Bambah and S. Tarlochan Singh that they should avoid discussion and try to form a Committee of responsible neutral members who could look into the issue and try to see if the compromise is possible. The crucial point is that whether they want the discussion or not, they could vote on it and decide about the discussion. Secondly, he completely agrees with what a member has said that the affidavit is something personal. There are Court proceedings which are sub-judice. It is a personal affidavit and anybody, third party could not compel a person to withdraw his affidavit. He could not do that. It is a decision which involves the person who has filed the affidavit. If somebody has an objection, he/she could approach the Court and could seek permission to say whatever he/she wanted to say as he/she had differences. But to bring it here is not the right thing. He completely endorsed the suggestion of Professor R.P. Bambah and S. Tarlochan Singh.

On a point of order, Shri Naresh Gaur said that Shri V.K. Sibal is a senior lawyer and a respected person and has used a word 'neutral', he wanted to know from him as to who are the controversial members and who are the neutral members in the House.

S. Tarlochan Singh said that the whole House is neutral.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he respects S. Tarlochan Singh. The whole House is not neutral otherwise there was no need for Shri V.K. Sibal to use the word neutral.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he wanted to know whether the senior persons sitting on the front benches are neutral or not. In a democracy, how could they expect any neutrality. According to him, the idea of groupism is inherent in any democracy. To talk against groupism is to talk against the very essence of democracy. It is a matter which concerns the whole Senate and there should be a discussion on this issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to decide whether they want the discussion or not.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the discussion has already started with Shri Satya Pal Jain having initiated the discussion and he has raised certain points. Shri Jain has already discussed on what the Syndicate had decided. He has every right to

reply to that being a Syndicate member. There was nothing in the Syndicate like what Shri Jain has talked about. So, he should be allowed to reply to that.

Dr. Ajay Ranga requested the Vice-Chancellor to allow open discussion in the House as the Vice-Chancellor openly accuses the Senators in the media. But the members are not given an opportunity to speak. Here also the Vice-Chancellor is listening to the members who are talking in his favour. Why the other members are not allowed to speak?

Professor Shelley Walia said that too much of poison has been spewed against the Senate and the members and he could not accept this. It is like scandalising the Senate. When the Vice-Chancellor could wash dirty linen in public, he did not see why they should stop debating the issue here.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that let they have an open discussion.

When on a point of order, Ambassador I.S. Chadha wanted to say something, Professor Rajesh Gill requested the Vice-Chancellor not to be selective as she has been raising her hand for the last half an hour. Professor Rajesh Gill was supported by a few other members also.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the Vice-Chancellor without any hesitation allows the frontbenchers to speak and stops him whenever he wanted to talk.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Vice-Chancellor allows only that member to speak who talks in favour of the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Naresh Gaur endorsed it. He said that it is not neutrality as the Vice-Chancellor allows only that member to speak which he likes.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the members to allow him to conduct the meeting.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested the Vice-Chancellor to be neutral.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath requested the Registrar to note the names of the person who wanted to speak in sequence.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Syndicate elected by the Senate has discussed this matter in detail and whatever happened in the Syndicate is before them. If they need some time to read through it, they could take have a 5-minute break but let him tell that at the end of it what the Syndicate has recommended. So they have to take a call on the following 5 points on page 13 of the papers placed before them which he read out:

(i) resolution that the powers delegated by the Syndicate to the Vice-Chancellor under the Panjab University Rules and Regulations be withdrawn from the Vice-Chancellor with immediate effect.

They have to take a call on this recommendation of the Syndicate.

(ii) further, it is resolved to recommend to the Senate that the powers, delegated by it under the Panjab University Rules and Regulations to the Vice-Chancellor may also be withdrawn from the Vice-Chancellor with immediate effect;

So, the Senate has to take a call on (i), (ii).

(iii) resolved to direct Registrar to file an affidavit stating that the affidavit filed by Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice-Chancellor on behalf of Panjab University in the Punjab and Haryana High Court on 17th April, 2018 without authority be treated as withdrawn. The Registrar be directed to file an affidavit on behalf of Panjab University before 6th May, 2018.

The Registrar was asked to do certain things and whatever he has done, he could tell it to the members.

(iv) the Chancellor be also informed through the Registrar that the Syndicate has resolved after discussion and requesting the Vice-Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit, while failing in its endeavour to get the affidavit withdrawn, the powers delegated by the Syndicate to the Vice-Chancellor be withdrawn. That has already been withdrawn. Taking a serious note, the Syndicate resolved to report to the Chancellor for taking appropriate action against the Vice-Chancellor for having filed such an affidavit containing undesirable language against the members of the governing body.

His response to this is recorded on page 12, they could see it in para 2.

(v) an affidavit would be prepared with the help of Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma. This Committee would be free to have assistance from the Advocate of their own choice. The affidavit so prepared is to be submitted to the Court before 6th May, 2018, i.e., before the next meeting of the Senate.

So, the members could ask these three members of the Syndicate as to what is the progress that they have made on this. Five recommendations from the Syndicate have come to them and they are free to take a call on these five recommendations and his response whatever has to go to the Chancellor, he has already got recorded it in para 2 on page 12 which they could read. This is where it is. He is not stopping anybody from having discussion and the members are free to do whatever they feel.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that before taking up this, a decision has been made on his request that they do not discuss this matter in the Senate and form a Committee with a request or direction that they should resolve the matter honourably in a dignified way consistent with their requirement for the welfare of the University.

He requested that first the Senate should decide whether it agrees with him or not. If they agree with him then no further discussion on the case. If they do not agree then all the steps could be taken up. But first his request is that he has made a proposal, let the Senate take a decision on that proposal.

The Vice-Chancellor hoped that Professor R.P. Bambah's proposal is clear to all the members. They could take a call on Professor Bambah's proposal. If they agree with it, then the matter proceeds in a certain way. If they do not agree with it, the matter would proceed in a different way.

Professor Shelley Walia said that forming a Committee is for procrastination and its postponement, he thinks that it needs immediate action because they cannot wait for Committees to be formed when they have already gone to the Court. This he thinks would involve serious questioning and he thinks they need debate on this.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he would like to tell the House about the proposal put forth by Professor R.P. Bambah. As member of the Syndicate, he would like to say that Syndicate has requested the Vice Chancellor many times to withdraw the affidavit and nobody has used any unparliamentary words neither in the first Syndicate meeting nor in the second Syndicate meeting. The Committee about which they are talking to, would that Committee be above the Syndicate? All the Syndicate members were in favour of reforms. The Committee which was entrusted the job of governance reforms was formed by the Syndicate and Senate. The Syndicate requested the Vice Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit, but the Vice Chancellor did not agree to it meaning thereby that the Vice Chancellor did not like to obey or implement the decision taken by the Syndicate. Due to this only, the five recommendations of the Syndicate have been placed before the Senate. First, the Committee which they would like to form, cannot be above the Syndicate. Second, those who have read the affidavit, they would find that many things are there in the affidavit. He requested the members not to speak anything without going through it. When they would discuss it threadbare, Professor R.B. Bambah would also come to know of it that as per the affidavit, there should not be election for appointment of Dean. They are going away from the democratic system. It is mentioned in the affidavit that the Syndicate and Senate should be elected as is being done in the neighbouring Universities according to which, for election of the Syndicate, the Professors should vote. Besides the Senate members, the Professors should contest the election. This is a part of the affidavit and if the members wish, he could read it out here.

Shri Jarnail Singh said asked the Vice Chancellor if he is allowing debate on this or they have been taking any decision on the proposal put forth by Professor R.P. Bambah. Professor Bambah has proposed not to have discussion on this issue.

On this, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that whatever Professor Bambah has proposed is not acceptable to them because the said Committee could not be above the Syndicate.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired as to why no affidavit has been givenby the three member Committee formed by the Syndicate. The Hon'ble Court has suo moto notice on the statement given by the Vice Chancellor published in various newspapers stating that the University would be shut down and the Mafia is not allowing the University to run. So, he again asked as to why the three member Committee, did not prepare the affidavit. He said that they agree what Professor R.P. Bambah has said.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that to his mind many Hon'ble members have formed their opinion of the basis of the news published in the newspaper. He requested the members to go through the attached minutes of the Syndicate. He would first like to make three things clear, i.e. first Shri Satya Pal Jain ji has said that the Syndicate members are free to submit an affidavit in the Court that they do not want governance reforms. He would like to tell that they are not against the governance reforms as they have talked about it repeatedly, they all welcome the reforms. The reforms must be done but the reforms should be done only after discussion. The report of the Committee which was formed by the Syndicate, should have been placed before the Syndicate and Senate. They only want discussion and nobody is against the reforms. He is against the view that the Syndicate members did not want reforms, hence they should file an affidavit against it. Secondly, as pointed out by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal as to why the three member committee did not prepare and file the affidavit, he would like to make it clear that the affidavit was not to be filed by the three member committee. Rather it was resolved in the Syndicate and he would like to reiterate it again that they have requested the Vice Chancellor for withdrawal of the affidavit as all the members are feeling hurt. Such things do happen in the government system also that affidavits are filed and withdrawn. They had requested the Vice Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit and get it discussed in the Syndicate and on the basis of the discussion and again file the affidavit. If he (Vice Chancellor) did not like to withdraw the affidavit, he could direct the Registrar to do this. After that the Vice Chancellor said that it is his personal opinion, it is okay. If it is not the opinion of the Panjab University and Syndicate, this should go to the Court and they direct the Registrar to file an affidavit to this effect. For that a Committee consisting of Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma was constituted. To discuss this issue, they sat together with the Registrar where the Registrar opined that since an affidavit is filed on personal oath by the Vice Chancellor, so he (Registrar) could not withdraw the affidavit. But all the Syndicate members were of the opinion that there is no such like thing as the Vice Chancellor Professor Arun Grover is not a party as an individual in this case. Whatever the Vice Chancellor is doing, he is doing all that on behalf of the Panjab University. If he has to file the affidavit on his personal opinion, then he should have to file it by becoming a party. All this was discussed in the Syndicate that they could withdraw the affidavit filed by the Vice Chancellor and submit a fresh affidavit and the Registrar was directed to do this and talk to the Advocate. These things are in progress. Somehow, what they have decided has not been carried out, the way they have decided. They would sit again with the Registrar and discuss the issue as to why it has not been carried out and what has come in its way. From the correspondence made by the Registrar in this regards and received by them shows that the Registrar has received the opinion from the University Counsel that there is no need to withdraw the affidavit. An email has also been attached with the material sent to the Advocate which was sent by the Vice Chancellor in response to their resolution. He does not know why that email was sent to the Advocate, the Registrar might know better about it. But the question was not this, whether there is need or not to withdraw the affidavit. But the question was to take permission from the Court to withdraw the affidavit by following the legal process. As regards whether there is need or not, it has already been decided by the Syndicate that there is a need and the affidavit be withdrawn. So he said that the Registrar should note that what has been resolved by the Syndicate and what was written to the Advocate was not in accordance with the resolved part of the Syndicate. The third thing which is coming up is regarding personal opinion. He said that once the Vice Chancellor has brought an item to the Syndicate wherein it was written that no employee could write directly to the Chancellor, even if one has some personal grievances, personal agenda or some other personal problem, one should come through the proper channel and that he is not allowed to write directly to the Chancellor. In the item, names of eight people were figured in the item who have

written directly to the Chancellor and disciplinary action was sought against. If an employee of the University cannot write to the Chancellor regarding his personal problem, it would be termed as indiscipline. If a Vice Chancellor, without discussing anything in the Syndicate/Senate, without taking approval of the Syndicate and Senate, which is the governing body of this University, files an affidavit in the Court for reforms, which is the biggest agenda of the governance reforms, is it not indiscipline. The Vice Chancellor says that he has filed the affidavit in his personal capacity, though it is not in his personal capacity because the respondent is the Panjab University and not Professor Arun Kumar Grover, though it is filed through the Vice Chancellor, but the respondent is Panjab University. So, if the Panjab University is the respondent, then any affidavit filed by the Vice Chancellor would considered to have been filed on behalf of the Panjab University. He enquired whether the Vice Chancellor has the right to file an affidavit for governance reforms without the approval of the Syndicate and Senate. This is the important question. Everybody is for the governance reforms. These were the basic points on which discussion was held and everything happened in a very polite manner. The members can see the minutes and they requested the Vice Chancellor with folded hands to withdraw the affidavit. With this, the feelings of many people got hurt. He has been in the Syndicate and Senate for the last one and a half year. Besides this, the Vice-Chancellor has been appointing him as a member of some other committees and he has been devoting a lot of time for the University work, but, he has not claimed a single penny from the University or any favour. After attending the meeting, when he goes to his home, his wife used to ask that they were working like that of a mafia and also looting the University. They are called vultures. The society used to ask them questions about it which pains them. He said that all agree with the suggestion put forth by Professor R.P. Bambah and said that all these things harm the interests of the University. It has also lowered the reputation, dignity of the University as well as that of Syndicate and Senate. He further said that they feel proud of the democratic system of this University. The statements given by him (Vice-Chancellor) play a vital role in lowering the reputation and dignity of the University. When the reputation is lowered, they feel pain. Similarly, the Vice-Chancellor should also feel pain when the reputation and dignity of the Syndicate and Senate is lowered. There may be some problem in the democratic system, such problems do occur in the country, but it does not mean that they should finish the democracy. He suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should place the report of the Governance Reforms Committee before the Syndicate and Senate and they are ready to deliberate it with an open mind. Whatever governing reforms are required, they are ready to do. There is no such person who does not want governance reforms. If at all, they have to give an affidavit, there was no need to write that the people who got themselves elected in the Senate only after securing only two to three thousand votes, there was no need to write that the position of Deans' are being compromised. Does it mean that all the deans' who have come through this process of election during last 2-3 years are incompetent? By doing all these things, they are trying to lower the prestige of the University. He requested the whole House as well as the Vice-Chancellor not to involve his prestige with this affidavit. If he (Vice-Chancellor) so wishes, the whole House is ready to request him again for withdrawal of the affidavit. He said that the report of the Governing Reforms Committee be placed before the Syndicate and Senate, they are ready to have all the reforms which are necessary for the development of the University. He requested the Vice-Chancellor that keeping in mind the hurt feelings of the members and requested him to kindly reconsider for the withdrawal of the affidavit. By doing this, the matter would be solved amicably. They once again reiterated that they are also having concern about the reputation and dignity of the office of the Vice Chancellor as well as of the University. He (Vice-Chancellor) is a very eminent academician and he has led the University meticulously. He said that since the Vice-Chancellor is at the fag end of his tenure and they feel that this tenure should be completed honourably and there should

not be any affect on his dignity. But at the same time, the dignity of the Syndicate and Senate should also be restored. Keeping these things in mind, he again requested the Vice-Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that if the House (Senate) feels appropriate, they should direct the Registrar for withdrawal of the affidavit. This was endorsed by some other members also.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that as everybody has said that this was an unfortunate event that has happened and the aftermath, the anguish shown by the members is but natural. She said that Professor Bambah, is a very senior member and they all respect him. Professor Bambah has suggested for constitution of a Committee, but in her opinion, how is it possible to constitute that Committee when the whole Senate is full of mafia, vultures and divided in groups. She said that everybody is associated with one group or the other so there seems to be no possibility of that Committee. Nobody is neutral, even if someone asks for permission to speak, the person is viewed before giving permission. While feeling sorry to Professor Bambah, she said that she was not very optimistic about this committee.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that whatever has transpired here that is all relevant, but all these things could be placed before the committee. He requested that they should do all these things in such a way that the dignity of the University is preserved. He suggested that a committee consisting of the Vice-Chancellor, three members of the Syndicate who have been given the responsibility of making the affidavit, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Shri Satya Pal Jain, Ms. Anu Chatrath, Shri V.K. Sibal and Shri Tarlochan Singh. However, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal requested to recuse him from this Committee. Professor Bambah requested Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal to be on the Committee as he has rendered very good service to the University. If he (Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal) remembers that a Committee of Syndicate members was constituted to which he (Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal) was a member and settled the issue relating to Non-teaching staff. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal should serve the University in the same spirit in which he has been serving in the past. His (Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal) words would carry weight in solving the issue, so Professor Bambah requested him to be a member on the Committee.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the whole Senate should request the Vice-Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal is saying rightly not to be a member of the committee as the other members might not behave properly.

Professor R.P. Bambah said, in any case, the Committee could be modified.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if the whole House request the Vice-Chancellor for withdrawal of the affidavit, the whole thing automatically would get resolved and then there would be no need of such Committee.

Professor R.P. Bambah was of the view that they have to resolve the issue and it could not be done in this way. Once the Committee is constituted, it would definitely arrive at some solution. He said that the three persons could be included in the Committee who have to prepare the affidavit. He requested that let they think of the University. He said that let they think of the fact that they owe so much to the University. The University has given done so much for them. They even at the risk of being unfair to themselves, they should find a solution. It is the question of dignity of

the Senate and the Vice Chancellor. They should not compromise his (Vice Chancellor) dignity as also the dignity of the Senate which is the Governing Body. Whatever has happened in the Syndicate, is okay. He pleaded the members with folded hands to close this chapter. He opined that this issue could not be solved by having discussion of so many members in the Senate, it needs small discussion in a Committee. But if all the members start to show their anguish here, the matter would not be solved. Once a Vice Chancellor had told him that if they write a two line letter to a Professor, then it is responded with four page letter. Here also the same thing happens. So, they should form a small Committee with a request to solve the issue in any case. The decision be placed before the Senate and the issue be closed in this way. He requested to concede to his request, if his suggestion is not accepted, the Senate which is the governing body can take a decision.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested that the Committee should submit its report in a time bound manner.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she fully agreed with the suggestion and proposal of Professor R.P. Bambah, but it should be made time bound and the decision of the Committee should be acceptable and binding to both sides.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if the Senate authorises the Committee, then it would be acceptable to all.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the Syndicate is like a small Committee and its decision to withdraw the affidavit should be accepted.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he has been listening the discussion for long time. The proposal given by Professor R.P. Bambah was regarding the fact that the discussion might not be taken on this issue. But every subsequent speaker has preferred discussion on the issue. With every step, they have been forced to indulge in discussion. If somebody requests to stop the discussion abruptly, then the message would go that preferred people have been given time, and those who did not suit the Vice Chancellor, they are not given time to speak. He was also in the Syndicate when this decision was taken. As Professor R.P. Bambah has said that this issue should be resolved by a small Committee. Virtually, they were sitting in the small meeting i.e. Syndicate and they tried to resolve this issue there. One of their colleagues, by standing from his seat and with folded hands for ten minutes, requested the Vice Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit as it entails the issue of the dignity of their institution. But when this was not accepted, then he (Shri Sanjay Tandon) said that if the Vice Chancellor thinks that he cannot withdraw the affidavit which he has filed, then the Registrar could be given instruction by the Syndicate or by the Vice Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit on behalf of the University. In this way, the Vice Chancellor would not be held responsible for it. Then some other colleague also requested the Vice Chancellor to allow the Registrar to withdraw the affidavit. By point or the other, they tried their level best to dilute their decision, but none of the decision was accepted by the Chair. They kept on proposing, he (Vice Chancellor) kept on disposing. Maintaining the dignity of the Chair has been their first priority and the Vice Chancellor is a witness to that and he (Shri Sanjay Tandon) has tried to do that in all the meetings. At times, he used to have differences with his colleagues, but before requesting, he would like to know whether the whole responsibility to save the dignity of the Institution, organisation and university lies with the Syndicate or Senate only or can it not be transferred to the Vice Chancellor or the Registrar. Should they think before giving any paper in the market, press or the High Court, which lawyer they have to hire? Who allowed him to file such affidavit? When they raise a finger they are not allowed to discuss. How far is it

justified? If they say that they do not have trust in the officers of the University, then how would they run the University. Addressing to Professor Bambah, he said that he (Professor R.P. Bambah) had adorned the Chair of the Vice Chancellor and he must be knowing that equal responsibility lies both on the Syndicate/Senate and the Vice Chancellor. When this affidavit was submitted, all the previous Vice Chancellor should have gone to the office of the Vice Chancellor and ask as to what he has done. Why is he bent upon to ruin the institution? He went to every platform and talked with the Government and other institutions to help the University and the Vice Chancellor is witness to that. He tried that the University should be saved, it may be the issue of funds or any other matter and he would not like to involve any other institution or a person in this discussion. While sitting in the meeting of the Syndicate, even some of the members tried to talk to him (Vice Chancellor) individually that it would not make any difference if the affidavit is withdrawn. Very eminent lawyers are sitting here. Could anyone not suggest him to withdraw the affidavit? Why he (Vice Chancellor) is adamant by saying that the affidavit could not be withdrawn as the same has been filed in his personal capacity. He wanted to know what type of personal affidavit it is that he is raising finger on his colleagues. He reiterated that the responsibility of saving the University lies on both the sides. He posed a question to the Registrar whether he is an employee of the Vice Chancellor only or he is not bound to implement the decisions of the Syndicate. Does it mean that if he (Registrar) is asked to file an affidavit, he would do it and if there is a decision of the Syndicate to change it, then why he should not do that. He (Registrar) should think it himself. He is an employee of the University and not that of the Vice Chancellor. So, this should be kept in mind that when the Syndicate in all its wisdom has directed the Registrar, it was his duty to implement the decision of the Syndicate. The three-member Committee kept on pleading before him to implement the decision done by the Syndicate. He had just given an idea that if the Vice Chancellor cannot withdraw the affidavit, that is the reason the Registrar was associated with the Committee. Had the Vice Chancellor agreed to withdraw the affidavit, it would have been solved there and then and had not come in the open. They have talked about the media. If they read out the minutes of the Syndicate meeting, they would come to know that he (Shri Sanjay Tandon) has said there that this would be a black day in the history of Panjab University and these would be headlines of tomorrow's newspaper. For God sake, he requested the Vice Chancellor clinch this matter here only. All the good things they have done in the Syndicate, would not be published, rather it would be highlighted that the powers of the Vice Chancellor have been withdrawn. It had happened many years ago. He again requested that this matter should be stopped here. They scuttle the decision by making various committees. But they should try to take the decision to some logical ends. He again requested the Vice Chancellor and the officers of the University officers present in the meeting to understand that the dignity of the Syndicate and Senate has to be maintained, at the same time when they are trying to maintain the dignity of the Vice Chancellor. The decision taken by the Syndicate should have been implemented, though an effort has been made to avoid that decision which has been explained by his colleagues. He said with this affidavit the University, Senate and Syndicate is not going to be benefited by it. Nobody, sitting here, would oppose the governance reforms. Whatever proposal the Vice Chancellor would bring, they would, after discussion, they would stand by him, propose it and pass it and also go anywhere to talk about it, if required. But he requested that this matter should be clinched here and the tomorrow's headlines should be that the Senate has resolved the matter. Therefore, they should withdraw the affidavit and the three-member Committee would be authorised to file a fresh affidavit.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Shri Sanjay Tandon ji has asked a very relevant question and he requested the Vice Chancellor to allow the Registrar to clarify the

position. He would like to supplement that that the three members met him (Registrar) in his office on 2nd May at 3.30 p.m. He would be very happy if he would let them know, in sequence, that after 3.30 p.m. till date what has happened in this matter.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that in the 29th April meeting he was not present in the meeting, however he was briefed by the Controller of Examinations as to what has happened on 29th. So, he updated himself after he arrived back. As desired, on 2nd of May, a meeting of the Sub-Committee of the Syndicate comprising of Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. Subhash Sharma and he himself was held in his office where the Assistant Law Officer Mr. Saurav Dhawan was also present. The meeting was held exactly at 3.30 p.m. and he communicated at 5.30 p.m. the complete thing to their Legal Retainer Shri Girish Agnihotri ji. It was desired that he must communicate to him and he wanted in writing. On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal, the Registrar said that he met him (Shri Girish Agnihotri) personally. He (Registrar) briefed him that this is what has happened and he had taken the script which was given to him by the Assistant Law Officer, the script which he has received on whatsapp was the exact language which was discussed and he would read it for the benefit of all, which is as under:

> "That in terms of the decision of the Syndicate which resolved that the Registrar Panjab University be asked to withdraw the affidavit on behalf of the respondent/applicant, the Committee decided that the Registrar shall consult the University Counsel Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate on the legal implication and possibilities of withdrawing the affidavit filed by the Vice Chancellor because the Syndicate version is that, that the affidavit has been filed on behalf of the University, therefore, it needs to be withdrawn.
> In view of the above, may I request you to offer your valued legal opinion as ordained by the sub-Committee of the Syndicate. The Syndicate has desired that Registrar to file an affidavit before 6th May in consonance with above decision, hence an early reply will be appreciated."

This was done on 2nd May itself, physically given and thereafter, he followed it up with an email to him at 10.25 at night. Early morning, he has to proceed to Delhi.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, why followed by email.

The Registrar said that he has communicated to him personally and Shri Girish Agnihotri said that it should be sent to him in writing. On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal, he (Registrar) said that he had not given him in writing, he followed it up at 10.45 at night, he mailed him from his residence because he had to go to Delhi to the Chancellor's office. So, as he returned back on the 4th of May, he reached here at 12.00 O'Clock and at 12.30 p.m. he, spoke to Shri Girish Agnihotri and asked as to what has happened. At 1.00 p.m. he submitted the reply to him (Registrar). On 4th May, that was given to the Senior Law Officer. The S.L.O. entered in the diary register and brought it to his office and at around 2.30 p.m. he mailed it to all the three members and he personally called them also. The development on the 2nd itself, he had spoken to all the three members that this is what has happened. He did brief all the members and tried to call him (Shri Ashok Goyal) but he did not receive his call. So, he called all the three members individually on the initial day as well and whatever happened on 4th. So, on 4th he gave the communication pronto that means without even wasting any time, on 4th itself he had given the inputs to them and then further direction was awaited. So, this what he has to say about it. He had not deviated from anywhere from the Syndicate's direction. The Syndicate had given him the direction and the Sub-Committee has articulated that he has acted on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said so to say that he (Registrar) was taking directions from the Vice Chancellor, presumably is wrong.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that it is wrong. At no stage he had even consulted the Vice Chancellor on this issue.

Shri Tarlochan Singh said that the Registrar has not told about the reply of the Advocate to which the Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to read the reply given by the Advocate.

The Registrar read out the reply given by Shri Girish Agnihotri as under:

"Vide your email an opinion has been sought on the legal implications and possibilities of withdrawing the affidavit filed by the Vice Chancellor of the University because the Syndicate version is that, the affidavit has been filed on behalf of the University, therefore, it needs to be withdrawn.

We have been shown the email dated 21.4.2018 sent by the worthy Vice Chancellor to the members of the Syndicate and others. Relevant extract of the email is reproduced hereunder:

I hereby inform that I shall file another submission in the Court stating that the affidavit filed by me was drafted by me personally and it is indeed based on my personal comprehension.

This ought not to be considered as the opinion of the Governing Bodies of Panjab University, I shall also add that the two documents, one relating to financial concerns and the other relating to the 'governance reforms' submitted to Hon'ble Court on October 20, 2016 were also got collated by me personally, though submitted by the office of the Registrar, Panjab University.

I am solely responsible for the submission made to the Hon'ble High Court and to the Supreme Court of India since October 20, 2016.

In view of the above, we have the considered opinion that there is no need to withdraw the affidavit filed by the Vice Chancellor of the University which is stated to be filed and drafted by Worthy Vice Chancellor personally.

(Girish Agnihotri) (Arvind Seth)
Senior Advocate Advocate"

Dr. Subhash Sharma that the issue which was discussed in the meeting, nothing of this sort was discussed whether it is to be asked to the Advocate that there is any need to withdraw the affidavit or not. It was resolved in the Syndicate to withdraw the affidavit. The duty of the Advocate was how to execute it and how to withdraw it and what are the options with them. They have not asked for the opinion whether there is any need to withdraw it or not. It has already been decided by the Syndicate to withdraw the affidavit. They have just said that it should be asked from the Advocate as to how this has to be withdrawn. There is a lot of difference between what they wanted and what the Advocate has replied. It has never been said to ask the Advocate whether there is need to withdraw the affidavit or not. They have already decided to withdraw it because the governing body did not agree to it. So, he would again request that if this Advocate is receiving orders from somewhere else, then change the Advocate. The decision of the Syndicate is very clear, it is written in the

resolved part that this affidavit has to be withdrawn. They have requested the Hon'ble Court and he agrees with the view point of Shri Satya Pal Jain that the Court may or may not allow it to withdraw the affidavit, it is their prerogative. He does not want to indulge in this litigation as he is not an expert of law. But they have given a very clear indication to Registrar to approach the Court to withdraw this affidavit. They have just to worry about as to how the affidavit has to be withdrawn.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that he actually transmitted the same language which was written and he did not do any value addition.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he (Registrar) transmitted the same, but the reply was not the same.

Continuing, the Registrar said that the language of the decision was, 'therefore, it needs to be withdrawn'. This was the language which was drafted by them.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that as far as their email was concerned, it was fine. It was according to the decision of the Syndicate. As far as reply is concerned it is not according to their requirement.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he was there in the Syndicate and what Dr. Subhash ji has said is very right. Now the matter is not confined to Syndicate, it has come to the Senate. The item is already there. He would like to propose from there where Dr. Subhash ji has ended. If Senate agrees on what the Syndicate decided that if the Vice Chancellor is not going to withdraw the affidavit, but if the Senate decides to direct the Registrar that on behalf of the Vice Chancellor, withdraw this affidavit. If the Senate agrees with this, they can direct the Registrar whether they would like him to seek the legal opinion or not. Let the Court, as he (Dr. Subhash Sharma) rightly said, to take a call on it. If this is done, the matter is finished there and then only. They can propose it and let the Senate say to withdraw the affidavit on behalf of the University. Let the Registrar file an affidavit. Is it agreeable to everybody. Then the matter is closed.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he endorses the proposal of Professor Ronki Ram and let the Senate direct the Registrar to withdraw the affidavit. The matter would then be closed.

Shri Sanjay Tandon asked Professor Ronki Ram whether he would like to have voting on this issue to which Professor Ronki Ram said 'no'.

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

Professor Ronki Ram proposed that if the Vice Chancellor has no objection and is not going to write on his own, they direct the Registrar to withdraw the affidavit to which, he thinks, the Registrar would not be having any problem. This was also endorsed by a few members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if this is the way that the Vice Chancellor is allowing everybody to speak as and when he wants, he does not think that the Vice Chancellor is conducting the meeting. One of the lady member would like to speak, she has not been allowed. He, himself is raising his hand, he was not allowed to speak and all others are giving in between some proposals. Shri Sanjay Tandon is right he (Vice

Chancellor) is giving time only to those who want to speak in his side. He requested the Vice Chancellor to conduct the meeting as Chairman of the Senate.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she has come across a new definition of neutrality and objectivity. She would like take them all to the very first instance where the PIL was filed by Justice Mahesh Grover. The very first event that happened was, there was probably some statement of Professor Arun Kumar Grover, responding to which Justice Mahesh Grover filed a PIL which has also been read out by Shri Satya Pal Jain, in which it was stated that the University probably would close down by January and the financial status was bad. She would request for an investigation as to that stage, what was the truth in this statement and that the financial health of the University was so weak, was so bad that the University would close down. This was an instigation out of which the PIL comes. This was the first thing that initiated the whole process. Was actually the University financially so poor? She would like to tell them that if an independent investigation by CBI or something is undertaken on this, they will get to know much more what they know as Senators and Syndics, that, was the financial position of the University actually bad? What about he concealed incomes? How much was the income, how much was the income, what was the status. Whether funds were available for paying salary? She asked whether the University has done investigation in the pension scam. If they were so worried about the financial health of the University, then why no investigation has been done in the pension scam. Why fire incident took place in the accounts branch, why that was not investigated. If Justice Grover was so worried about the financial health of the University, why not the Vice-Chancellor was not worried, why the investigation was not done? These investigations should be marked to CBI immediately. She, therefore, questioned the very first statement on which a mountain of a mole hill was made. It was a wrong statement. Secondly, it maligns the image of the University, very old people are sitting here and they respect them, they listen everything silently, they have also grown old now, it is a relative term, the young teachers are like their children. They also want to listen to them. They also have the right to debate. If they have not the right to debate in the Senate, how they could provide this to the teachers. Everybody wants this right to debate and discuss things. While referring to the minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate, she said the names of eight teachers were mentioned and it was suggested to ruin them. They could read the proceedings of the Syndicate. It was being said to penalise them. But when the authorities malign the image of the University, then also the teachers should be penalized and Senate be ruined. Where is the justification of this? Who is responsible, let they should decide here. Who is giving statements in the newspapers and who is giving bad name to the University? It is said that they be optimistic and think about the welfare of the University. She asked if there is any instance when they talked to harm the university. These all are projections. Further, she talked about the groups. In the affidavit, the prominent thing which has also pinched everybody much is regarding the groups. Professor Shelley Walia has rightly said that how there could be democracy without groups. They talk about voting and elections. In number of Senate meetings, the Vice Chancellor has given statements many times that he has not seen such like democratic structure in any of the institution of the world, they have a platform where they can speak, there is no other platform. Here the divide and rule policy has been applied. No doubt, there groups, groups were created and were used/misused for personal interest. For every agenda item, Senate was divided and groups were misused. Groups were created within the Syndicate, across the Syndicate and Senate, then recently between the Senate and the University teachers. Let them quarrel amongst themselves and now within University teachers, let the PUTA be made to quarrel. They are talking about the groups, she asked, whom they have spared. By making the teachers quarrel amongst themselves, do they think that it would give the University name and fame. She enquired, who is

responsible for it? Even when somebody is allowed or disallowed to speak in the Senate, there seems to be groupism, not from the Senate, but from the Chair. They are not allowed to speak, sometimes they have to say not to bulldoze, sometimes they have approach someone for this. She is not so small that someone is not able to see her. She has to raise her hand for a long time and she does not create any uproar, she does not shout, but she is not permitted to speak because she is Rajesh Gill and what she would say, that would not suit him (Vice Chancellor). He (Vice Chancellor) could see only some people and not others and they are talking about governance reforms, democratization. She knew about governance reforms as public debate, democratization and decentralization. But, what they are doing is, centralization. The note which she has read in the affidavit that is towards centralization of authority. It is centralized authority and they will hold for it and they want a debate. The debate may not be crushed. Only the Senate is not demanding debate, but the whole teaching community is asking for it. They want open debate, students also want debate. They hold huge discussion and talk theoretically, they talk about ideologically, it may be in any form. They talk about democracy, they crush the democracy. They have to give space. They are themselves becoming proclaimed reformer, spokesman and mouthpiece. She said even as President of PUTA, she does not consider herself as spokesperson of her teachers unless she takes them into confidence. She calls them, listens to them. They have to listen to every teacher, every student and teaching and non-teaching employee, every member of Senate and Syndicate. Why they are afraid of governance reforms? The spirit of governance reforms is transparency, decentralization and democracy, but for that they have to have a big heart. They would have to listen dissent for that, they have to absorb and negotiate, have to change their position. Are they ready for that, she asked? She feels that this whole issue has been created by flouting the whole procedure. This was done because the intention is not good. Who does not want reforms? Nobody would deny for reforms. Many things are obsolete, so, they need reforms, but it is being delayed. Controversies have been created. It should have been done smoothly. Therefore, the discussion would not be held only in the Senate, the discussion would be held in whole of the University, it would be held amongst all the stakeholders, discussion would also be held on each reform and then they would decide as to what they have to do.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it is 6th of May today, why discussion has not taken place so far. Is it so unimportant issue?

Professor J.K. Goswamy replied to Professor Ronki Ram that the meeting of the Governing Body of PUTA has been fixed, but as he (Professor Ronki Ram) is saying to discuss the affidavit, they would not discuss it because it is the personal affidavit of the Vice Chancellor. They have come in the PUTA with mandate and they would not get provoked. They are for the teachers and would work for the teachers.

Shri Naresh Gaur said it seems to him that perhaps they are deliberately sidelining the issue.

Shri Varinder Singh said what Professor Ronki Ram has said about withdrawing the affidavit is alright and they should direct the Registrar to start the process for its withdrawal. He pointed out the former President, PUTA (Professor Akshaya Kumar) who had proposed the governance reforms had contested the election three times but could not succeed.

Shri Deepak Kaushik requested that as already stated by Professor R.P. Bambah and Shri Satya Pal Jain that they cannot withdraw the affidavit directly. He said that the process for withdrawing the affidavit as decided by the Syndicate and also

wanted by all of them, should be started. They should forget their ego and start the process for withdrawing the affidavit. This should be decided here today. Due to withdrawal of delegated powers, the whole work whether it relates to teaching or non-teaching has standstill Even the retiral benefits and the promotion cases of those persons who have to retire very shortly, have come to halt. He requested the Vice Chancellor and all the other members to give up their ego and start the process of withdrawing the affidavit from today itself and to his mind there is no need to form a Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would not touch and which is not under consideration. Shri Satya Pal Jain ji is not here he wished that he would have been here. Actually, it was he who suggested in the last meeting that they are a democratic body.

Shri Varinder Singh intervened to say that the things are being repeated again and again. On this some members also started speaking.

The Vice Chancellor, therefore, requested the members to have a break for two minutes.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that before asking anything, he thinks the issue which should have been thrown open before the Senate, is whether the filing of this affidavit by the Vice-Chancellor is right or wrong and the whole house has this sentiment, that is wrong. He said that the Committee is constituted only after knowing the sentiments of all the members, without knowing the sentiments of the members, they do not think that the committee could reach to a right conclusion. He remember, Jain Sahib is not here, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has been requesting for the last five and a half years to these so called neutral members of the Senate also, if they are neutral that please stop the Vice-Chancellor from giving such statements in front of the bureaucrats, in front of the Chancellor's office, the Governor, the media, in public and private, he knew, he was advised to please keep his calm intact. He kept on warning that a day would come when the things would not be under their control, please save this University, please prevail upon this Vice-Chancellor not to bring a bad name to the University. Probably, the way he requested was not liked by these seniors and neutral members. In the last meeting of the Senate itself, when he raised the issue that the Vice-Chancellor has called the Senators as stone pelters, he wanted to know from the Vice-Chancellor to please name those members who were involved in stone pelting by the students. He clearly remembers that Shri Satya Pal Jain said that nobody could appreciate but unless and until there is an agenda item on this, it should not be allowed to be discussed in the Senate. They should bring an item, they move a resolution, only then it would be discussed. Today, he (Shri Satya Pal Jain) also endorsed it that instead of discussing it democratically in this body of Senate, let they endorse the viewpoint which has been put forth by Professor R.P. Bambah. He wondered those who claims themselves to be the champions for the cause of democracy why they are afraid of discussing it in the democratically constituted body i.e., Senate, that too when the agenda item has come. Therefore, he requested Shri R.P. Bambah that while endorsing his viewpoint that a Committee be constituted by including those three members of the Syndicate also, please let they not deny all the members from expressing their viewpoint because unless and until they express their viewpoints, their hurt sentiments probably could not be healed. Now the question is why they are shying away from discussing it in this body. They are also equally concerned about the image of the University as Mr. Sanjay Tandon has told that all including the Vice-Chancellor should be concerned about the prestige of the University. They are shying away because they are afraid of getting all these things reported in the media. A body which is duly

constituted, its proceedings they are shying away from getting reported it in the media but at the same time in spite of the responsible members of the governing body, they have not been able to stop one individual from bringing bad name to the University through media. They could see that the meeting took place on 29th of April and see the newspapers of Ist May, what has been spoken by the Vice-Chancellor against the Senate and the Syndicate. Whatever he (Vice-Chancellor) speaks is like 24-carat gold and the mafia speaks what they know. What to say, let us resolve this issue within the four walls. Mr. Sanjay Tandon is right that they had tried their best, requested the Vice Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit, which he straightaway refused. It is only after the Vice Chancellor refused to withdraw the affidavit that a decision in the collective wisdom of the Syndicate was to be taken, which has been presented before the Senate, as well. These are four or five recommendations of the Syndicate, which has been placed before the Senate. The fact of the matter is that there is only one recommendation, which has been placed before the Senate, it should have been placed before the Senate. Rest of the recommendations are not for the consideration of the Senate. It is only one recommendation that the powers delegated by the Senate to the Vice-Chancellor, be also withdrawn. Rest of the things are vested with the Syndicate, so it is not for consideration of the Senate. Before that, on 21st April, when the Syndicate met, there also it was requested to withdraw the affidavit. One of the members who got up to say, how the members of the governing body were treated at the time of the visit of Dr. Manmohan Singh to the University and how shabbily they were insulted by allowing them the entry and who was the one who was allowing the entry at his wisdom and fancy and at his discretion, none other than the Registrar. It was he who was allowing some people even without pass and it was he who refused admission into the meeting to the Senators. They were treated like, the word he used and the Vice-Chancellor even without adjourning the meeting left the meeting and went out. Since the meeting was not adjourned, the Syndicate in its wisdom, elected one of the member to chair the meeting, and the meeting was going on. After a couple of minutes the Vice-Chancellor enters from the other door and from the standing of the door itself said he adjourned the meeting. While the person who was already chairing the meeting in his absence was completely dumbed as to what is happening? Anyway, he said the Vice-Chancellor has adjourned the meeting, let them not go into the technicalities' they should hold the informal meeting and they came to the Guest House, they were 13 members. Since they wanted the issues to be resolved within four walls of the University, all the 13 members went to the Vice-Chancellor and requested with a very - very liberal and lenient manner that please withdraw the affidavit to which the Vice-Chancellor replied which has been referred to by the Registrar also which is part of the legal opinion meaning thereby that he would not withdraw the affidavit. They could go through that the reply which has been given by the Vice-Chancellor, no where he (Vice-Chancellor) has mentioned that he has filed this affidavit in his personal capacity. The only thing he has mentioned twice is that this has been collated personally, that he has mentioned that he is responsible for filing the affidavit on 20th October 2016 and on 17th April, 2018. But nowhere he said that this has been filed in his personal capacity. Obviously he could not have said that because the affidavit has been filed on behalf of the applicant respondent, which is none other than Panjab University through the counsel of Panjab University. So the Syndicate passed that the affidavit has been filed on behalf of the University which needs to be withdrawn. When all pleadings, when all requests, he was not hesitating in using the word that when all kinds of begging did not get the desired results, the Syndicate took the decision which has been placed before you in four or five parts, one of which is to recommend to the Senate to take back the powers which have been delegated to the Vice-Chancellor. One part is that the Registrar be directed to withdraw the affidavit filed by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the University and three members committee was constituted. Everything has already been brought before your notice. Now, one serious matter he would like to bring to the

notice of the House, he does not know how serious they are going to take it. With due apologies to Bambah Sahib, if he wants, he could share this confidentially with the small Committee also but I think members of the House need to know what actually has happened. That at 3.30 when he met the worthy Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar, he did not know why the Registrar has missed that it was not a meeting of four members committee or five members committee as has been claimed by the Registrar. It was the Committee of the three members of the Syndicate, who was authorized by the Syndicate to take appropriate steps to get the affidavit filed, no such power was given by the Syndicate Committee to take legal opinion whether this could be withdrawn or not. The only power given was that the Committee would assist in drafting the affidavit and would get it gone through the Registrar. To their surprise, to the surprise of all the three, the Registrar told them that whether they know what the affidavit means. He of course educated them, they did not know earlier than that, he told that the affidavit is filed under oath by an individual and if at all, that affidavit is to be withdrawn, that could be withdrawn only by that individual who had filed under an oath in the court. So the Committee thought that they were of the view and in a lighter vein, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) asked the Mr. Registrar that they are of course in a soup, it is just possible that after three months, if he (Registrar) is not here, all the affidavits which have been filed by Col. Chadha in the High Court, tomorrow if some of the affidavit needs to be withdrawn, then probably they would have to look for him (Registrar) where he is. So, his contentions does not seems to be right, better it is you ask though that the Syndicate has authorized the three members committee to engage any of the lawyers for the purpose. But better it would be to talk to the counsel who already is handling this case and just ask him whether the affidavit could be filed under your signature for withdrawing the earlier affidavit. That in fact was the work entrusted to the Registrar. They thought that they must have departed from the office of the Registrar somewhere near five or may be little before five and the Registrar has now informed because he had something very serious in his mind that the Registrar is an efficient officer and he knew that he acts very fast that is something else that sometimes he acts very fast but not in tune with what the Governing Body want, but in tune with what the worthy Vice-Chancellor wants. So, he (Registrar) said that at 5.30, he went to the counsel personally followed by an e-mail at night somewhere at around 10.20 or 10.25 whatever he says and in the meantime he says whatever was discussed in the Committee or in the meeting has been conveyed. My Dear Sir, Registrar is not even a member of the Syndicate. What to talk of, the four members Committee which he (Vice-Chancellor) has mentioned, Registrar is only Secretary of the Syndicate and not a member secretary of the Syndicate. The Committee constituted was only of three members. He could agree that the Registrar visited the office of counsel of the University but he wants to bring it to the notice of the House that the contention of the Registrar that he never took the Vice-Chancellor into confidence, that he never took instructions from the Vice-Chancellor is completely false. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) could state under oath that the Registrar alongwith the Vice-Chancellor went to the office of the counsel of the University. They were there for complete 51 minutes and the reply was got drafted there and then only. If they see the reply of the counsel, what the Registrar says has been sent to him on 4th that too after reminding him at one O clock, they could see the reply of the counsel is dated 2nd May itself and it is not on 4th as has been claimed. If this is the situation that a Registrar could give a statement in this house that he did not even talk to the Vice-Chancellor on this issue, he went to the counsel's office personally, and it was he (Shri Ashok Goyal) saying that the Vice-Chancellor accompanied him and got the reply drafted there. What could they expect from such an officer of the University? The e-mail has been sent at 10.23 and if e-mail has been sent at 10.23, the next day early morning the Registrar leaves for Delhi. On 3rd day he comes back at one, he wondered where from that paper, which was not even, discussed in the 3-member Committee when they met the Registrar, that is the reply of

the Vice-Chancellor how he changed the term of reference by getting the legal opinion and what the Registrar was not aware that he was given the duty only to ask whether the affidavit could be withdrawn or not under the signatures of the Registrar and not qua whether there was any need. This has not happened for the first time, he has brought to the notice of the House earlier that the decision taken by the Senate in December, 2015 about a unanimous decision of the Senate again at the request, the proposal and suggestion of Professor Bambah that Chancellor be requested to constitute a Committee to look into a particular case, which has been infamous for the last three years. The unanimous decision of the Senate instead of being sent to the Chancellor, Registrar says in the capacity of the Secretary of the Senate, he has sent it for legal opinion to the legal retainer of the University. Meaning thereby that he has got the powers to get the decision of the Syndicate and Senate legally examined whether they are legally tenable or not that means Registrar, Mr. Tandon, is not the employee of the University, Senate and Syndicate, all of them, in fact, are employee of the Registrar and he has to adjudicate and pass orders whether they have taken right decisions or not and that too with the help of the counsel which has been engaged by the University, for the University to take a cause of the University. Now to say that the members should be denied an opportunity to express their views that through an item which has been brought as an agenda item by the Vice-Chancellor himself, it is in five parts, though only one part related to the Senate. They should tell that what wrong the Syndicate wanted from the Vice-Chancellor if they requested, they pleaded that you (Vice-Chancellor) please withdraw the affidavit. He is happy in the same spirit, the Senate also saying, requesting the Vice-Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit. It is only after he refuses, it is only after he does not appreciate the sentiments of the members of the Senate, it is the second step for the Senate that in the absence of his acceding to our request, what alternative step is to be taken. It is only after that they would see whether the affidavit is to be got withdrawn through the Registrar, through the present counsel who is handling the case in whose opinion there is no need or through another counsel. To say that it was his (Vice-Chancellor) personal opinion, he would go a step further that without taking permission from the court, to be impleaded as a party in person and without having engaged his personal counsel on his own filing an affidavit in his personal capacity, he wondered how could it be said in his personal capacity if the counsel of the University has been used. If the office of the University has been used, if for collating the whole information, the record of the University has been used, is it is not misuse and abuse of the powers and positions of the Vice-Chancellor, which he is holding and is it not the misuse of the powers by the Registrar who not only claims who always acts as if he is only to serve the Vice-Chancellor and nobody else. This is for the House to now see as to what action is to be initiated, if the allegations, which he has put is correct that the Vice-Chancellor went with the Registrar to get the legal opinion. According to his information, the reply of the Vice Chancellor which is being referred for legal opinion was placed before the Counsel there and then only between 5.54 to 6.54 p.m. The letter was also placed before him, which was given by the members of the Syndicate on 21st and the minutes of the so-called committee of four members, which the Registrar claims has been communicated to the counsel at 10.23, those minutes were not ready. Everything was discussed and it was agreed that he (Registrar) just send a formal communication so that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) might inform him informally though the opinion was prepared there only. This is how the things have been manipulated in the office of the University earlier also. He has been bringing to the notice of the House earlier also, he has been pleading with the senior neutral members earlier also that please save this University. He would not tell what he has been told off the record, about the attitude of the Vice-Chancellor but still they expect us to bear with whatever action the Vice-Chancellor takes and they have been bearing, they have been tolerating. See the plight of the situation Mr. Jain had read the note written by one of the Justices while taking *suo moto* motion that this Senate

despite its best efforts, hesitated to get the note of the Vice Chancellor's statements that Senate is Mafia, that Senate is vultures, that Senate is stone peltors, they hesitated, but subsequently, he is happy that with the collective efforts of all the members of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor was compelled to withdraw those words. He wondered even when a note has been issued by the Justice, why the affidavit on behalf of the University did not go to the court that the word Mafia already stands withdrawn and the statement was not to this effect to create an impression as if the Senate consists of Mafia. The Senate hesitated in taking note of such a serious connotation but the court takes serious note. Though as far his memory goes, in the meeting of September Senate where the Vice-Chancellor gave a very very alarming statement that if the Government of India refuses to release the grants, the University would be closed down from Ist January. He does not think there was any reference of Senate being Mafia on that occasion. Senate being mafia, the statement which was on different occasions but how both the statements have been taken into consideration by the Justice while taking *suo moto* motion. It is again a matter of debate. When such a serious issue was erupted, again Mr. Satya Pal Jain is not present, he remember, his proposal in one of the meetings of the Syndicate, about 7-8 years back that whatever case is filed against the University, whatever case University is representing in the court of law, that should be brought to the notice of the Syndicate and Senate. But without taking them into confidence, such serious statements have been made and the affidavits have been filed and all the affidavits in the instant case, to his knowledge, have been filed under the signatures of Registrar who in fact is the only person competent to file such an affidavit or if at all it has to be somebody other than the Registrar, it could be done only after the Senate resolves to that effect. In the instant case, all the affidavits have been filed by the Registrar except this one which in fact has created so much turbulence. Until and unless the Senate decides in one way that filing of this affidavit by the Vice-Chancellor is wrong *ab initio* he does not think that they have any moral right to request the Vice-Chancellor to withdraw it. Let there be somebody raise their hand who appreciates Vice-Chancellor's action in filing such an affidavit where such derogatory language has been used against the members of the Senate whether they are the nominated or elected. He just wanted to tell the Vice-Chancellor because he never got the opportunity to discuss the matter with him. He (Vice-Chancellor) says the situation has reached to such a stage where only with two to three thousand votes, people from graduate constituency come and get elected. Addressing to the Vice-Chancellor he said that he did not know they have progressed, they have not gone back. Here within his vision, there was a time when people from graduate constituency used to come with five hundred votes. They have been progressing as the figures has reached from two to three thousand votes, five hundred votes to three thousand votes, three hundred votes to three thousand votes and do not clarify, that how many voters have polled the votes. If 16 thousand votes have been polled, 45 candidates were in the fray, 15 after getting the maximum votes, i.e. 2000 or 3000 votes get elected to the Senate, instead of appreciating that they have got the representation of the society in the Senate, they are saying they are goondas, they are doing groupism. He does not want to comment on the comments given in the past, who is doing groupism in this University, who has been doing this in the last six years and who has been playing the policy of divide and rule and who is mafia actually, this could be proved by documentary evidence which is there on the record of the University. He drew the attention of Professor Bambah that he had never spoken on all these things but to talk of delegating the powers, he has never seen any Vice-Chancellor doing something contrary to what has been approved by the Senate and the Syndicate. The Senate has approved something unanimously and thereafter, say after a year or so even when it was brought to his notice that the Syndicate has passed this, he said, overruled and to his surprise when some of the members of the Syndicate gave in writing that this could not be done, they do not know what is the fate of that letter. Where that letter has gone? Why the letter has been

filed? This is how the members of the Syndicate and Senate are being treated and if they dare to speak, the preaching starts pouring in that please this is not the way of resolving the issue. He is happy that the friends with whom he has been pleading during the last five and half hours that the way he (Vice-Chancellor) is doing, the way he is approaching the system, the dignity of all the members of the Senate is in danger. They would realize one day that why did not they secure the dignity while sitting in the House. At last, this realization has come and he hoped that as has been suggested by Mr. Tandon, this realization comes to the mind of the Vice-Chancellor also. It is his alma mater also, it is his University also. He is equally concerned, whether he is interested in bringing bad name to the Syndicate and Senate, but he is sure that he is not interested in bringing bad name to the University as an institution. So in the interest of the institution, keeping in view the sentiments expressed in this Senate, notwithstanding the fact that he (Vice-Chancellor) did not bother about the request of the Syndicate at least keeping in view the sentiments of the Senate, please accept the request of the Senate to withdraw this affidavit in the same capacity in which he has filed this affidavit before the court of law. This is what he wanted to say and he would like in this meeting or outside the meeting response of the Registrar and the Vice-Chancellor as far as he has said that he has not consulted the Vice-Chancellor and he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is saying that he (Registrar) went with the Vice-Chancellor.

Dr. Ajay Ranga, Shri H.S. Gaur, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Sanjay Tandon requested the Vice Chancellor to instruct the Registrar to respond to what Shri Ashok Goyal has said.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked the Vice Chancellor as to why he is stopping the Registrar to respond.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is nobody to tell him not to speak and requested him to sit down and he would answer this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said why the Vice Chancellor would answer. The Registrar has to take the responsibility. He has to admit that he has tried to misguide the House.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would answer first.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua wanted to know as to why the Registrar has lied with House.

Shri Ajay Ranga said that since the Register has given the statement, therefore, he should respond to it.

Principal R.S. Jhanji requested the members to let the Vice Chancellor speak.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has said that he shall tell the Court that he gave the affidavit in his personal capacity etc.etc.. So he has to go back to the Court. How to go back to the Court to say all these things, he sought an appointment with Shri Girish Agnihotri on 1st of May. He said that he received an SMS received on 2nd May at 8.47 a.m. from Shri Girish Agnihotri which is long before the three-member Committee has gone and met the Registrar. He read out the SMS received from Shri Girish Agnihotri which states, “Sir, good morning, I will fix appointment with you today when I am done my cases and then come, regards.” So, he was to go to Shri Girish Agnihotri at 5.30 p.m. At 4.00 p.m., there was a seminar in the Physics department of Professor Bambhani, he attended that Seminar. He came to that thing by that time, the Registrar was in the VC office to discuss something. So he (Vice-Chancellor) gave

his (Vice-Chancellor) car to that visitor who had to go to see his family and he went in Registrar's car to reach Shri Agnihotri.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, wonderful.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have had their say. They have said whatever they wanted it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had only said that the Registrar made a wrong statement, he misled the House.

The Vice-Chanellor said that both of them went in the same car. He went and told Shri Agnihotri and exchanged what has happened between Syndicate members and himself where he said and whatever has said and whatever has happened on 29th. He shared with Shri Girish Agnihotri that this is what he has to say. The Registrar talked to Girish Agnihotri independently. He talked to him independently. The counsel was having two things in front of him, whatever he (Vice-Chancellor) has told, whatever they have told. Now counsel has done whatever he has to do. If it is blasphemy that the Registrar and the Vice-Chancellor are with the counsel at the same time, he (Vice-Chancellor) has sought an appointment on his own.

Shri Ashok Goyal interrupted by saying, why in the same car.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what is wrong in going in the same car.

Dr. Ajay Ranga asked the Vice-Chancellor as to why he is not allowing the Registrar to speak.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first they should allow him to finish. The Vice-Chancellor said that he has placed the part of document, which he has and shared the same with the Counsel and told him that he (Vice-Chancellor) has to give 2nd affidavit. The Registrar has said that whatever he has to say of giving a summary of whatever three of them discussed with him. This is all that happened, they came back in the same car. After that, he (Vice-Chancellor) is not a party to what the Registrar has communicated to the counsel because what Registrar has communicated is exactly what these three people gave. This is what the Registrar has given. The Registrar has not consulted him whether to drop a word here or there. Is the Registrar not supposed to talk to the Vice-Chancellor of what is going on in the University, so this is all he has to say. He is not responsible for what Justice Mahesh Grover would think in this case. From where Justice Mahesh Grover has picked up this thing of Vice-Chancellor having said mafia or this or that. On 1st September, there is no news, to the best of his knowledge, attributed to him that he has said mafia or this or that. The word mafia appears for the first time in the proceedings of the Syndicate on the basis of what Shri Ashok Goyal said on 8th March in 2015 when immediately after the NAAC team came and it went away. All of them are encouraged to read the Syndicate's meeting proceedings of 8th or 15th March, he precisely does not exactly know the date. The meeting is going on and suddenly Shri Ashok Goyal stands up and says that an odd picture of the Syndicate and Senate has been painted before the NAAC team and it has been stated, they have to read as he does remember the exact word, people who get elected repeatedly to the Syndicate, they are the mafia. If one gets twice, it is mafia and if one gets more than two, it is mafia don or something like that. This is something which Shri Ashok Goyal attributes to him (Vice-Chancellor) of having stated before the NAAC team. He did not state any such thing. Yes, when the NAAC team, the members of the governing body at the lunch time, late Mr. G.K. Chatrath was there, Dr. Gurdip

Sharma was also there. One of the members asked about how it (governing body) is constructed here and what is the vision of the governing body, etc. Then, Mr. Chatrath said, he (Vice-Chancellor) does not know precisely as to what he had said, that he is in the Senate for such a time and he gets the members elected to the Senate and people take his help something to that effect. When they asked him how does the Senate gets elected, he (Vice-Chancellor) shared with them an excel sheet where he had shown how the Syndicate members get elected, how it changes every 12 months and why some people are able to get elected repeatedly. He did share that excel sheet with the NAAC team when they asked him about the governance; this is all that is there. So groupism is there, but how does this groupism perpetuate, how some people repeatedly get elected, how this is there. So, there is an algorithm to this how it evolves. So all that he has told to the court in his affidavit on 17th of April, sketches the history of the Indian Universities Act. How the notion of faculty was introduced. How the notion of election on the Syndicate members on behalf of the faculty was introduced. How this changed from 1947 has been the Panjab University Act become the East Panjab University Ordinance and then Act. He has only sketched that. The matter of the fact is that this affidavit and he has not used any abuse for anybody. So, all things have been attributed to this, which he accepted humbly, no issue at all. The entire transcript of whatever has happened since 17th of April in Syndicate and Senate and he shall submit it as he make resubmission to this thing as to whatever he stated on 17th of April, it was his comprehension and he has already said that he is prepared for all the consequences. He has nothing more to add. The Senate and the Syndicate are free and he is nobody even to say anything at all. Please have an affidavit filed on behalf of the Senate and Syndicate. Let the Registrar file an affidavit. If they do not agree, they could state whatever they like. The affidavit could be in two parts – one is that on behalf of the Governing Bodies of the University that the affidavit filed by Professor Arun Kumar Grover while serving as a Vice-Chancellor ought to be allowed to be withdrawn and whatever punishment anybody has to give, whatever the Government of India has to decide, whatever the Chancellor has to decide, he (Vice-Chancellor) is ready to take everything in his stride. He has no hesitation in accepting whatever he has done since 20th of October, 2016. Now the Registrar is free to answer.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that everything has been made clear by the Vice-Chancellor.

Some members stated that let the Registrar speak on this issue.

On this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they would get it answered from the Registrar.

The Registrar stated that while it is true that he had accompanied the Vice-Chancellor in his car to which the Vice-Chancellor corrected that the car was of the Registrar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the appointment was sought by him.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the appointment was sought by him (Vice-Chancellor) for the Counsel to come to him and not to go to him (Counsel). Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice-Chancellor to read the message.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that since the mobile is with him (Vice-Chancellor) he could read out the message.

The Vice-Chancellor read out the message from his mobile which says 'Sir Good Morning, I have fixed up the appointment with you today when I have done with my cases and then come' meaning thereby that he (Vice-Chancellor) has to go there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that 'then come' means that he (Counsel) would come.

On this, the Vice-Chancellor clarified that most of the times, he used to go there.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath clarified that the client have to go to the Advocate.

It was requested (by the Registrar) that he may be allowed to speak.

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

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that at 5.38 p.m. he has got a whatsapp message and then he asked Shri Saurab Dhawan who was scripting it, to please send him the script he need it to give it to the Counsel. He gave him some scripted message which was not clear and he wrote him back that the message was not clear, send him the transcript of resolved portion or whatever has happened in the meeting. Then he forwarded it through e-mail at 5.44 as per his whatsapp message. There itself he showed it to Shri Girish without even a coma, apostrophe or without any value addition or anything. He had not consulted the Vice-Chancellor on this issue. He said to the Counsel that he has been directed by the Syndicate that he has to seek a legal opinion from him. At no point of time, he had sought any advice from the Vice-Chancellor for making any addition or deletion. Exactly, verbatim whatever was decided, he had forwarded that mail to all of them as well that this is what he has been seeking the legal opinion from him. Had there been any change in it, he would have been told that it is not as per the decision and he has added something or he has subtracted something.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the legal opinion was ready by 2nd instant and what they could have told to him (Registrar).

He (Registrar) said that he is also talking about the 2nd instant.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he has told them on 3rd at 10.50 p.m whereas the opinion was ready on 2nd instant.

The Registrar stated that what he has written on 2nd, he did not know. They could have a look on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Registrar) stated that he had gone alone and he had not consulted anybody.

The Registrar clarified that he never said that he had gone alone, he had not consulted anybody.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor is saying something and the Registrar is saying something else. What is all happening? The Registrar has misguided the House, opined Shri Ashok Goyal.

The Registrar said that he has neither consulted him (Vice-Chancellor's) nor taken his views and he vouched for it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor is becoming judge in his own cause. The Vice-Chancellor has been going to the Counsel, has been presiding over the meeting of the Syndicate and Senate.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that it is absolutely wrong to say so. He showed the envelope.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if the Vice-Chancellor had gone to the counsel, it does not mean that he has influenced the counsel (Shri Girish Agnihotri).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Registrar had not supplied him (Shri Girish Agnihotri) the reply of the Vice-Chancellor which has been sent to the Syndicate. How could it become a part of the Syndicate?

It was informed (by the Registrar) that he has not given it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that the (legal) opinion is based on his input.

The Vice Chancellor said that Shri Ashok Goyal could do whatever he wanted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the opinion is based on the input given by the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said, 'alright, fine'.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) could not talk like that, he also knows how to talk.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he is deeply concerned and share the concern of all his worthy colleagues here that they are in a crisis situation. They being responsible members of the Senate hold to themselves to the Senate, to the University and to the people at large that they would find an amicable way out from this crisis. Professor R.P. Bambah has made a suggestion, mainly, not to have this kind of an acrimonious debate that they are having for some time because their concern is to save the prestige of the University. They are not doing a good job. He would have waited long. He was silent to speak because he thought that this kind of discussion is not going to resolve the crises. He would even support and reiterate his suggestion to assign this task of resolving the crises, in the first place to a Committee of the kind which has been suggested. But he also understands the sentiments that have been expressed that they have to give some direction to that Committee and that direction has to be given in the form of the kind of debate that they are having. He would join and had his own comments or how he feels, the crises can be resolved. The crisis has had two very adverse impacts, one is what they have been witnessing, it has hurt the image of the University and it has, in his view, to which he is deeply concerned, it has hampered the process of reforms. He is completely committed to these reforms and he is sure that each member of this Senate is also committed of having the governance reforms. He has not confined himself to making speeches about it or he thinks writing in the press about it. He has attended almost every single meeting of the Committees that he (Vice Chancellor) has set up, two of them. He is still a member of the Committee which is looking into the regulations and he was a special invitee to the

other which is looking into the amendments to the Act. His views are on record and he is sure that the Committee in its final report will take due note of them. So, they are still engaged in that. Now he is willing to conceive that it would have been more appropriate, more prudent to wait for the outcome or wait for the final report of this committee before they take a decision. They have a Senate, or they as a University take a view. Unfortunate, that process is a bit slow and he would like to share with his colleagues here that yesterday in their meeting, they decided to conclude their work. They have concluded and only some loose screws have to be tied up, hopefully, by the end of next week, that report would be ready. His earnest plea to his colleagues is to wait for that and then they will decide how to go forward and that decision, he is sure, would be a democratic decision taking into account the view of everybody as has been repeatedly said. This is how he feels that reform process should go forward. Therefore, he would request all of them and he hopes that his colleagues would join him in endorsing that request, please ask these committees to speed up their work to submit their final reports and then bring those reports to the Senate or to the Court or the authorities because eventually the decision, how to go about the reforms will be taken by the Government because it also has to amend and the amendments through an Act of Parliament. But this democratic process should be gone through, it is underway, though a bit slow. Professor Pam Rajput who is here was also present in yesterday's meeting and she will also say but the fact that they themselves are very deeply concerned about the long delay which has occurred and they hope that very soon in a week or 10 days, they will have the final report of that Committee. So, this is how, he feels, that the process can move forward as far as the reforms are concerned. Now about the debate that they had about the affidavit. It is a very very complicated issue which involves many legalities. He is not a legal expert, but whatever he has heard and whatever the Registrar has told them that an affidavit is filed by an individual. Normally, is the question of withdrawing it legally tenable? Because when they file an affidavit, one swear to the correctness of the contents of that affidavit. Then they go to withdraw it, thereby, what do they say that one was wrong what he has said. He would also grant that what has been stated in that affidavit cannot possibly be reflective of the view of the Senate and he himself has granted that and if he now informs the Court that as he (Vice Chancellor) is proposing to do that it is his personal views and any contrary view and different views could also be put to the Court by way of a legal process by filing yet another affidavit. So, this is how he thinks that an amicable solution to that issue can be found. Now his second concern as to the impact of this crises is that it will virtually bring the work of the University to a halt. Now if they withdraw those powers, what would happen. Who will exercise those powers? Is it the Registrar? Are they then saying that the Syndicate withdraws these powers from the Vice Chancellor, to whom does it then delegate, to nobody, to the Senate, to the Syndicate, okay, they may keep in the Senate. Tomorrow, if a Class-IV employee retires and the retirement dues have to be paid, the Vice Chancellor could have done it by way of delegation of powers, but now they have to wait for the next meeting of the Syndicate. This is the first adverse impact on the process of administration, it is something that seriously worries him. Furthermore, there is also other implications, they may hold the Vice Chancellor guilty or something, it is okay, he grants them that. Is that the punishment in commensurate with the alleged offence. Though the Syndicate has the authority to delegate the power, it implies, though it is not written, that it has the authority to withdraw these powers. But should these powers be withdrawn, when he (Vice Chancellor) is not remotely connected with what the alleged misdemeanour is. If he has been member of the Syndicate, he would have felt that if any one of those powers have to be withdrawn from the Vice Chancellor that could only result from any evidence that he is not competent to exercise those powers, or if he has, in the past, has been misusing those powers. But to him, it smacks vendetta, that if one does not

like him, he would not like him and so they would do this with him. So, he feels that this is not the responsible way of doing this.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it is alright what Ambassador Chadha ji is saying, but his loyalty changes with the change of person.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, let him tell Shri Chadha that there is in built regulation that even when the Vice Chancellor does not have the delegated powers of the Syndicate or even if the powers are with the Senate or Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor within the regulation is competent to pass any order in case of emergency and report the matter in the next meeting of the Syndicate. It is part of the regulations. Secondly, they have been hearing in the last seven days that somebody's gratuity has been stopped, somebody's salary has been stopped because of this. He told Mr. Registrar on 2nd May about the regulation and the Vice Chancellor has been using it even when he does not have the powers in anticipation. The only difference is that some decisions which have been taken are to be reported for approval and some are to be reported for information. So, let they should not take that the functioning would stop.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in the last Senate he had requested, what Ambassador Chadha, the so called neutral man, that the punishment should be in proportion to the offence. He asked where his morality had gone on that day. At that time he (Ambassador I.S. Chadha) was adamant that he (Shri Komal Singh) should be awarded death penalty. Such people should not be called neutral. He is not neutral and come here after discussing everything with him (Vice Chancellor).

Shri Jarnail Singh objected to the statement of Dr. Ajay Ranga. He said that every member is free to express his/her view independently but nobody is allowed to threaten anyone.

Dr. Ajay Ranga while objecting to the statement of Shri Jarnail Singh, said that first Shri Jarnail Singh should listen properly what he had said. They have got the news reported in the newspapers. In the last meeting, he had himself said that the punishment should be in proportion to the offence. But Ambassador I.S. Chadha had objected to it on that day and today in the case of Vice Chancellor he is demanding punishment proportionally.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that what the Vice Chancellor has said at the last regarding the kind of affidavit, he finds a little ray of hope in that and requested the Vice Chancellor to repeat the same so that all the members could listen to it. Perhaps some amicable solution could come out of it. He again requested the Vice Chancellor to repeat his proposal.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that without discussing some other issues, to his mind, they should focus on one issue only. The collective wisdom is always better and they should follow that. He recalls that most of the members who are sitting here were part to that. A few years back this issue of governance reforms came to Senate and a Committee was constituted. As stated by Ambassador I.S. Chadha, the Committee is still working on that and he does not know how long it would take to finalize. Originally, the affidavit was filed through the Registrar by the Vice Chancellor. He thinks all the members are of the view that the Senate only in voice is deciding to direct the Registrar that the Senate wants to withdraw the affidavit. He was of the opinion that there is no need to consult the Counsel as the decision to withdraw has already been taken. If the Vice Chancellor feels that in his personal capacity he can file another affidavit and he can organize other Counsel of his own. But this time, he

thinks, this has already been filed through the Registrar, so the Registrar is competent to withdraw that and why to put the Vice Chancellor in that.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to inform that the affidavit was filed by the Vice Chancellor.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that if it is filed by the Vice Chancellor, then why not the Senate could direct the Registrar in one voice to initiate the proceeding for withdrawal of the affidavit.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that for the last couple of weeks whatever has happened is very painful for the Vice Chancellor, painful for the University and painful for everybody. He has personally great regard for the Vice Chancellor as he is an honourable man and so is for the Senate and Syndicate. In fact, he feels honoured that he has been nominated to work in the Senate and elected by the Senate to the Syndicate. These three institutions in the minds of the framers of the governance had their own values, their own responsibilities and their own central powers which have worked for the last 60-70 years. Now there may be governance lacunae here and there for which the governance committee has been set up. It is nobody's intention to demean these institutions, certainly to demean or any one because they have great regard for him (Vice Chancellor). But they have debating for about three hours and fifty minutes now, they can go on debating till the cows come home, but he is sure that they would reach a solution. The Vice Chancellor has made his point very clear that he is not going to withdraw it and nothing could change, he might have his reasons and he would like to go into the merits and demerits of anything. He had made a suggestion during the Syndicate towards the end, the suggestion which he (Vice Chancellor) has very kindly nodded also but then it got lost in the din. Now he would like to reiterate the same suggestion once again for his consideration and the consideration of the Senate. He would like to move a resolution here and if the members do not agree with the language of the resolution, they can change it. His resolution is: This Senate with the approval of the Chair unanimously decides as follows:

1. To direct the Registrar to approach the Honourable Court with a request to treat the affidavit filed by the Vice Chancellor on 17th April, 2018 as withdrawn;
2. To request the Court to allow the University to file a fresh affidavit in due course with complete facts.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this is the only solution and he endorses the view point of Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi that the Registrar, on the direction of the Senate approach the Court that this affidavit be treated as withdrawn. If the Court allows it, it is fine and then they would file a fresh affidavit on behalf of the University.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that if they include the words 'with the consent of the Chair' then it would be allowed to be withdrawn. This was endorsed by many members.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the Vice Chancellor should accept it as there involves not a very big issue.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that since he (Vice Chancellor) is chairing the meeting, so it is with his with his consent.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said there should not be any problem to the Vice Chancellor in doing so. Since the Vice Chancellor is chairing the meeting, so it is obvious that it has his consent.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he is compelled to point out that they cannot have a knee jerk reaction and a resolution like this because the procedure for resolution is provided for in the Calendar. This has to be given in advance, minds have to be applied. To do it like this itself is something which can be challenged.

Dr. Subhash Sharma requested that by not putting it in the form of resolution, they could say it a direction of the Senate. He requested not to go for technicalities.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the Senate has unanimously decided it and directing the Registrar for withdrawing it.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that if the Vice-Chancellor is willing to withdraw the affidavit, he should tell the Court that this affidavit is in his personal capacity and he is responsible for it. However, the Syndicate as the governing body has advised him to get it withdrawn and he is taking action accordingly.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that he is not going to withdraw it.

Professor Ronki Ram said that what they say is that the Senate directs the Registrar to withdraw the affidavit.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that what Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has proposed be approved.

Shri Sanjay Tandon requested the Vice Chancellor to announce what Shri Malhi has proposed. It will be resolved like that only.

Dr. Tarlochan Singh said that according to him there is some confusion and they should be very clear. They have been discussing the issue since morning which has gone free since they have not accepted the proposal of Professor Bambah. Everyone of them is in favour of resolving the issue. He suggested that the whole Senate including the Vice Chancellor who is chairing the meeting that they reject the comments given by the University counsel. The whole Senate directs the Registrar to file a new affidavit saying that the affidavit submitted by the Vice Chancellor is not the affidavit of the University. It should be made clear that they withdraw the earlier affidavit which is not concerning them. Secondly, as the Vice Chancellor himself has said that he is going to submit another that the earlier affidavit was his personal. With this proposal, both things would be solved. They are very clear and the whole House directs the Registrar and with this they close the issue. As far as the wording of the affidavit is concerned, the same could be drafted by Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Sanjay Tandon together.

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that since the three members committee constituted by the Syndicate could sit and prepare/draft the wording of the affidavit.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could draft and read out the fresh affidavit within five minutes.

Dr. Tarlochan Singh stated that no discussion of the Syndicate is final till it is passed by the Senate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they agree with the suggestion of Dr. Tarlochan Singh and direct the Registrar to withdraw the affidavit filed earlier.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that during the entire episode he has been listening to all the Hon'ble members. He has also been reading from the newspapers for the last 2-3 years. He has never expressed his views on it. He felt anguished, he felt hurt on the words which he later withdrew about choosing certain and unchecked words that is minimum he could say, those words in his wisdom choose collectively for the members of the Senate and the Syndicate and then the matter came to the House here, you distance yourself from those words which you used that is your magnanimity. He thought that matter would come to an end after that. But unfortunately, may be on some legal advice, you choose to go to the Court to file an affidavit, which you should not have because under the Act, it is the Registrar, who represents the University on all legal matter, even if the Hon'ble Judge has issued the notice to the Panjab University through the Vice Chancellor, it could be said by the Registrar that this affidavit is filed by the Registrar on behalf of the University and before filing the affidavit on behalf of the University, the Registrar should have brought to your notice and matter should have come to the Senate or the Syndicate and then to the Senate. He thinks about the reforms etc., there are two parts, as far as financial mater is concerned, he does not want to touch here at this moment and for this part which has become a very contentious and complicated issue for the members leaving aside to which group they belong to because he feels that in democracy, there are groups. In a democracy, the moment they start talk of elections, you do consulate groups, you do consulate politics. He is here in the University since 1968 as a student. He has good fortune of making or interacting with the then Hon'ble Vice Chancellor, Shri Suraj Bhan Ji. Then as a student with him (Shri Suraj Bhan Ji) he has been told as to how he will hold meticulous care and rising above smaller things, he dealt with the major strike of whom he was a part of and how leaving aside his ego, recalled the rustication orders of seven students. The things have been going on and he did not wish to really go back to all those matters. But coming back to this point only he feels that had this affidavit been filed by the Registrar, the issue would not have been there and today, he thinks that they were coming closer to some amicable solution when Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi suggested that, short of that he agrees what Shri V.K. Sibal will resolve to solve some problem again if they were to talk of the law as such. So that could easily be transformed to say that the Senate feels or if they do not want to use the word direct then they can ask the Registrar to do this. But he has a difficult which he would really want to say. He requested not to mind what he is saying. He really feels anguished over the entire matter. He has respect for him (Vice Chancellor), but he knows, how he (Vice Chancellor) felt even about his observation at times. Going back to that there were three items on one particular day, all directed against the Vice Chancellor. He happened to raise those, none of the three persons has ever contacted him. On two issues, he had to take a view contrary to his view. He also remembers there was a matter here on the appointment of Col. Chadha. It was facing rough weather here in the House. He has never discussed that matter here. For the first time, he is saying that it was facing rough weather. Dr. Bambah, for whom he has immense respect, implicit respect, he just signalled to him and he requested Shri Ashok Ji and others, they stopped speaking against. If that is the background in which they function, how can they come for conclusion. The people come with pre-determined mind. The people come within groups and speak in groups. If they speak in groups, they take particular view. Two sets of people take different views. What is wrong with it? He would never agree with what Shri Sanjay Tandon say outside on different matters, but he certainly, compliment him for what he said in what way he said and that was with no malice towards the Vice Chancellor or anybody else. That was intended to resolve the matter. He thinks that they are leaving one particular issue untouched. If they say to ask the

Registrar to file another affidavit, he thinks that is the solution. But unless they withdraw the affidavit germs of dissent, the germs of disaffection will remain and he does not really with to happen that as people has said towards the end of his tenure. He wishes that they all get together to accord that head off to use that has to be. He does not know what is going to be the situation, others would know better. They should all join, forget the acrimony of the past, forget all the difference that they may have had. Then what is the hitch, if he withdraws the affidavit. Here he would like to make this point because, he feels, even if the Vice Chancellor files this affidavit in his personal capacity, Does he justify the filing of this affidavit? Does he justify as an individual, a person who is occupying the senior most position in the University, does he justify the use of all those words, all those phrases, all that terminology against the members of the Senate. Who out of all them have said that the reforms would not be carried out? But one's individual view on reforms cannot represent the University. The Vice Chancellor has set up Committee for that. The Senate has set up Committee for that and the Committees are going into that. He does not know why those matters have been delayed. Ambassador Chadha has referred to those. He wished that those reports were there before them and those report would have been part, rather background of the discussion on reforms. Certain things, the members could agree with the Vice Chancellor, as to what has to be the number of Senators, but that is not for them to decide. They can only recommendation to the Government of India, who has to make the amendments, it is not the Government of India, but Parliament of India. They can amend the Act for that purpose. Why are they jumping the gun, why are they wanting to super-impose their views, his (Vice Chancellor) views, let him say frankly on the University towards the end of his term? Why should they not really try to create an environment which is congenial and which is conducive for the proper working of the University for the remaining time? Why should all of them together really not work for that. Why they are having this discussion. He could agree, he was keeping quiet. With all due respect to Professor Bambah ji, he could not agree with his views and, therefore, he kept quiet. He was of the firm view that this matter should have been resolved as there are seven days between 29th April and today (6.5.2018). Why Professor Bambah or anyone else has taken the trouble. He felt sorry to Professor Bambah for using such words. Why he (Prof. R.P. Bambah) could not/did not approach the Vice Chancellor, why did not he approach him (Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal) or anybody else to try together and to see what they can possibly do. Were they waiting for this day to come when the items are there? The Syndicate has sent that item. He does not agree and let him differ with Shri Ashok Goyal and others. He did not agree with the decision, it is his personal view. He cannot agree with the decision of the Syndicate to say that the powers of the Vice Chancellor be withdrawn. But what led to that situation. How has that situation come up? Why were they (Syndicate members) motivated to pass a resolution like that, why they should go into that aspect, have they thought of it. Why the situation has come to such a pass. That is the thing. With all humility, he would like to say without taking much time, the affidavit should be withdrawn. An amended affidavit or a new affidavit can easily be filed that the Committees are going into it. For financial part, that was the primary concern of the High Court, the second part also which the High Court mentioned, the High Court was prompted or got views only from a word used by the Vice Chancellor or attributed to, i.e. the 'mafia'. That was attributed to him (Vice Chancellor), let him put it that way. The second part of Court order was actually, that he (Judge) got the cue from that order or prompted by that to say that. Essentially, it was concerned with the item and he does not find fault with the Vice Chancellor when he use the stronger words like that the University would shut down. He does not disagree with him (Vice Chancellor). The squeeze has come to such a situation that it is difficult for the University to function. It is the responsibility of the government to give funds to the University. But he just treads on a different path and ruffles some feathers and he would not like to get into

that and confine himself only to this point. The High Court's primary concern was the financial aspect, the second has just crept in and they would have easily pulled it out, they could have withdrawn from it, had this affidavit not come. Finally, at the end of what he has said, duly request the Vice Chancellor, go by what Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has said, do not use the word resolved, say, that this is what they feel, this is how they do and then the Vice Chancellor should rise to the occasion and withdraw the affidavit because he personally feels, he must end with that note that he cannot personally appreciate such an affidavit with those contents coming from Professor Arun Kumar Grover, even as an individual who happens to be the Vice Chancellor of the University. So, ultimately, what he would like to say again is, go by those words and the matter should end.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he is handicapped as he has not seen the affidavit. He does not know under what circumstances it has been filed. How do they expect the members who have not seen the facts to respond in a rational way because they are talking in generalities and not a decision, it may be right or it may be wrong, but before he could say one way or the other, he needs to see the affidavit, he needs to know the circumstances before any substantive discussion can be held. Secondly, he would like to respond Shri Pawan Bansal that the withdrawal of the powers of the Vice Chancellor in the Syndicate is not in the interest of the University. Now, there has to be a reason why they have taken such a drastic decision. It has to be based on the misuse of powers, ceiling of jurisdiction or irresponsible behaviour. The Syndicate has a very respectable situation in the University and the respect which goes to an institution also ask for accountability in terms of sobriety and seriousness. It should not look that because one is angry with someone and so he would not give him powers. He endorses what Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has said that it was not correct to do so and he hoped that the Syndicate can review it so that the University can function.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to what he (Shri V.K. Sibal) has said about the affidavit to which Shri V.K. Sibal said that since he has not seen the affidavit, what he could say about it.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they have been holding discussion for the last three hours on the issue. He complimented Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji for the view he has given. If the Vice Chancellor had accepted their view point in the Syndicate itself, the controversy which has taken place in the last seven days could have been averted. He requested the Vice Chancellor not to allow anyone to speak and only the Vice Chancellor should speak.

Professor Chaman Lal intervened to say that this is not fair and it is his time which he (Shri Sanjay Tandon) has taken.

Continuing, Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he is just trying to solve the issue. If the Vice Chancellor would speak only then the matter would be solved otherwise there would various views would keep on pouring in.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he would also like to speak and his name has also been written by the Vice Chancellor in the list of speakers to which the Vice Chancellor said that he is not stopping anybody.

Professor Chaman Lal said that there should be a culture of the meeting. The culture of the meeting should be as an when people raise hands, the Chairperson should take the names in order and invite everyone without discrimination, whose name is first, he or she should be called first. But what is happening is, the people who

can speak more loudly, they grab time and those people who just listen, they keep on sitting and they are never allowed to speak. There is another part of culture of patience, that is on their part. They should not disturb people when they are speaking. They should let the person speak and only then one should respond. The Chairperson and members of the Senate, both have equal responsibility. If they want to conduct the meeting in a very disciplined manner, the Chairperson should be fair to everybody and audience and the Senate members should also be fair to other Senate members and they should not intervene. He has not to speak long. He was of the opinion that the issue is being solved in a very decent manner and he would also support what Shri Pawan Bansal ji and later Shri Sanjay Tandon has said that in the sense of decency and even in the sense of propriety, Professor Arun Kumar Grover, whether as Vice Chancellor, whether as a person should withdraw the affidavit on his own, he does not say that he does not have the right, he has the right, to file any affidavit. But he want to say that the reason cited by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji to if his (Vice Chancellor) affidavit has simply for the governance reforms. If it is simply referred that the University has made 3 or 4 Committees, those portions expected to come. As and when the reports come, the affidavit should be filed with the reports then nobody would have objection. But since the Vice Chancellor has taken some expression which does not go well with the Senate members, it would be appropriate to show a kind of decency by withdrawing the affidavit. He knows that every human being is an emotive person and when he/she is attacked unfairly sometimes, one feels hurt. He also feels it and they become impulsive and by becoming impulsive they use wrong words, he also uses wrong words and also withdraw when he realises that he has used wrong words and he has acted repulsively and he even apologises. There is nothing wrong in apologising if someone hurts some person intentionally. One should never hurt intentionally, but even when unintentionally, even then one should apology. What has happened to Professor Arun Kumar Grover, despite his being a good person, he is taking all the interest for the University, going personally to the High Court, doing everything which no other Vice Chancellor has done, yet by doing impulsively, he could ask anybody and everybody could tell him not to disturb the speaker. He said that he (Vice Chancellor) just lectures and does not listen, that is the biggest problem when they do not interact with the people. Actually, everybody has some idea, not that his idea is the final idea. So the ideas of others should also be taken into account and accepted also if it appeals to the reason. He thinks that the Senate would be so happy if the Vice Chancellor becomes humble, they would also become humble. So, the humility is two way process. If they become regressive, the other people would also become regressive. He concluded by saying that the Vice Chancellor could give his own affidavit of his own.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that he endorses the view point of Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji and Shri V.K. Sibal has said. He is unable to find his 24 Carat gold in this table agenda because the Vice Chancellors affidavit is not there what they are discussing since morning. So, if the Vice Chancellor could provide them even now the copy of the affidavit to but to all the members so that they could discuss what he (Vice Chancellor) has given in writing to the Court, to which the Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to print and give a copy to all members. The affidavit should not have been given in his personal capacity because he is representing a University and there is a case with the title, Panjab University and others.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Court of its own Vs Panjab University and others.

Continuing, Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa asked, what does it mean? He is very small and new to the profession as legal luminaries who were quite senior to him, they can very well make out of it whether that case which has been pending in the Court, can he

(Vice Chancellor) and give any document in personal capacity, not being a Vice Chancellor? Second, if he does not withdraw your earlier affidavit and if he files a fresh one and if there is some contrary fact given in the second affidavit, what would be the fate of the case. So withdrawal of the first affidavit and then looking into it and then making a new affidavit is an equally important process which he should follow. Once he has already initiated, if everybody want that there should be a change, it should be a change with the governance reforms and definitely it happens everywhere in the country and the society and so to happen in the University. He (Vice Chancellor) has made a Committee himself and he (Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa) is a part of that Committee. It is in process. What happened with him, just wake up, file an affidavit. He is infringing the process. He must have completed it. He (Vice Chancellor) has asked the Committee to hold day to day meeting, finish the process and then give them the recommendation, will place it before the Syndicate and Senate, whatever he could have asked, they could have followed it, he could have understood it as what is his intention. If he (Vice Chancellor) is saying about repetition, he thinks, he is repeating the second term, he might be trying for the third one. So, everybody is on the other side of this House. If he wants to make certain brackets, it could be two terms, there could be four terms, constituencies which need to be represented properly. He should have discussed it, it is not his individual mind, it is collective mind and the House is for that purpose. He said if everybody is asserting on this that take everybody alongwith and do not discard anybody which is a good thing and that should be understood. He has completed a term of six years, may God give you another term here or somewhere else and touch new heights, but what has made him after 5½ years that he has to give a new thought to the system.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the Vice Chancellor has started it two year back.

Continuing Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that then why the Committee has not been asked to submit its report within a stipulated time. Why it was not made time bound. He wanted to say that whatever has been said in the affidavit, that is wrong. He has just read about it in the newspapers. He cannot comment anything unless the document is placed before him. He further said that before they reach to the resolve part, the affidavit should be on their table, after that they could talk about it.

Shri Naresh Gaur first of all he appreciated Professor Chaman Lal for requesting the Vice Chancellor to prepare a sequence of speakers. Professor Chaman Lal has also said that the persons who speak loudly, they are given much time, but he did not agree with this point because, had it been so, then he could have got the maximum time. He also appreciated Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal for the views he presented, each word of which has touched everybody at the core of their heart. It is his 5th or 6th year in the Senate and he has also been raising his voice for the last three years to tell the Vice Chancellor that they have also come here after winning the election. They have come again to the Senate after working with the people for four years, so he should also listen to them, but in the last 4-5 years there is no affect. The people were asking about the Committee to be sent to a Ludhiana College. In that college, the problem is not only of the teachers but the bigger concern is that of the students where fee to the tune or Rs. ninety thousand is taken from the students. In order to run the Corporate, the Corporate house is looting the people. Many persons have requested to include his name in the Committee, but he knows that it would not suit them, so he kept mum.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his (Shri Naresh Gaur) is there in the Committee to which Shri Naresh Gaur said no his name is not there in the Committee. Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to include the name of Shri Naresh Gaur in the Committee.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he (Vice Chancellor) could not include his name in the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor has not to include his name, rather the Senate has to include his name.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the thing which pinched him a lot is that some people have said that he (Shri Naresh Gaur) used to bring the people in the Senate. He would like to say that everybody brings someone to the Senate. To bring someone in the Senate does not mean that he get the votes polled in his favour, rather it meant to guide someone as to how the election is to be fought. For example, if Shri Ashok Goyal who is his old colleague, guides him as to how to contest the election, it does not mean that he brought him to the Senate. He said that the next thing which the Vice Chancellor had said, why he did not appreciate him, is that when there was discussion regarding 'mafia' and 'vulture', their most respectable colleague was alive at that time. When this thing was being discussed, Shri Ashok Goyal had said to the Vice Chancellor that if he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is a 'mafia' then the Vice Chancellor is 'don mafia'. The Vice Chancellor could say this thing at that time that he has not said this thing and could clarify the way in which Shri Chatrath ji has said it. Why he (Vice Chancellor) has not repeated this at that time. Shri Naresh Gaur then said that he (Vice Chancellor) has not repeated this because this thing has actually not happened. But he is telling this thing now to them when their colleague is not alive, he does not appreciate this, the House may or may not do it. He has said one thing in the last meeting. Now Shri Sayta Pal Jain ji is not here, he has given a very long lecture to advise me because some person has the nature that when there is some crisis, get some credit and go away from the meeting. He (Shri Satya Pal Jain) had lectured him a lot that they should not discuss the issue like this and bring it as an item in the agenda. He has earlier also asked who are those Senator who have incited the students, but he did not get any reply so far. He would like to ask Shri Satya Pal Jain ji that even today he again wanted to save the Vice Chancellor just by saying that anything could happen and the law could be moulded in any way, but he would like to request the Vice Chancellor that before the fag end of his term, he should create a congenial atmosphere so that they could, perhaps, forget the atrocities committed by him during the last 4½ years.

Shri Raghbir Dyal while thanking the Vice Chancellor for affording him the opportunity to speak, said that after listening to respected Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and Shri Sanjay Tandon, speaking by him is not that much necessary. Whatever they have spoken, they spoke very marvellously and he is agreed to them. But still there are 3-4 things, which he feels, are necessary to say. He normally attends less meetings of the Senate and he is also not a member of the Syndicate, so whatever he came to know, he came to know of only through the newspapers or from his friends as to what is happening. As far as the issue of governance reforms is concerned, the Graduate Constituency is targeted time and again. He could remember that when he was a member of the Syndicate in the year 2016, the votes for Graduate Constituency were being prepared, he was that person to request the Vice Chancellor that the votes for the Graduate Constituency should be prepared with the photographs and identity of the voters. They are in favour of the fact that in the Graduate Constitute, the votes should be polled in a very fair manner. In one Syndicate the issue was clinched, but in the next Syndicate the peer pressure was such that they have to come to the prevalent system that there is no need of photograph, only degree or some other proof would be enough to cast the vote. Though they are from the Graduate Constitute, but they have been in favour of bringing reforms in that also. His name specially appeared in the newspapers that Shri Raghbir Dyal, a

Lecturer in Govt. College, Muktsar is a 'mafia'. Such persons are coming from the medical faculty. He had told the Vice Chancellor in a Syndicate meeting that the people with whose ideology he is attached and came to the Senate, they wanted to bring him in the Syndicate in the year 2015 so that he could contribute to it. Then the Vice Chancellor gave a statement that some of the University Professor have lost election to the Syndicate, even Professor A.K. Bhandari also lost. Then he told to those people that Professor Bhandari could contribute more to the Syndicate than him. But if they feel that he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) could contribute, but with this Professor Bhandari would have to lose his right. So, he did not ever come to the Syndicate for any post, though there may be some such persons who just come for having posts. The Vice Chancellor has said in the newspapers that whatever he is saying it 24 carat true. The Vice Chancellor has said that the Senate members get their work done by putting pressure on him. He would like to tell the whole Senate that it is his fifth year in the Senate, but he never went to the Vice Chancellor's Office. If the Vice Chancellor could tell even one occasion when he went to the Vice Chancellor office for his personal work, he would immediately go out of the Senate meeting and would not come back till the next election. It is his gentle man's promise. But, for the Regional Centre, Muktsar, he had been raising his voice, but he was not listened in the Senate. The University has given crores of rupees for the multipurpose hall. Recently, Rs. 5 crores have been given for Sector-25, but no money was given to the Regional Centre, Muktsar. Further, when he used to raise issues in the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor used to say that he is not the government of the University, Syndicate is the government of the University. He (Vice Chancellor) has not said this once, but he has said this many times. When he was coming to attend the meeting, he was very upset but was also satisfied at some point that when he used to talk, the Vice-Chancellor did not listen to him. Perhaps his name was not liked or perhaps the Vice-Chancellor used to think as to how this person conducts himself in the Senate or for that matter Syndicate. But here in the Senate has been told by all the members that the educated and experienced members of the Syndicate in the meeting of the Syndicate had requested the Vice-Chancellor with folded hands to withdraw his affidavit the interest of the University. So, he was thinking as to which style the Vice-Chancellor likes whether the style of requesting with folded hands or his style. He said that the statement which has been given by the Vice-Chancellor does not suit his status. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has rightly said that Professor Arun Kumar Grover, if not the Vice-Chancellor, should have kept his status in mind. He read out from his mobile, the statement which has been given by the Vice-Chancellor "their only purpose is to keep the pressure on the Vice-Chancellor to get their work done. They are all one and the reality is that the Vice-Chancellor has no option against them. Both Syndicate and Senate members had ganged up against him".

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not know as to from where he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) was reading.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is reading it from a newspaper.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not believe in the newspaper.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the Vice-Chancellor should have sent the rejoinder.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not his job to give the rejoinders.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then whose job is it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not his job and he would not answer any more to it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is not asking for the answer from the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the members to wait and he would give the reply.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why the Vice-Chancellor is threatening.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not threatening anybody.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he would like to tell as to how the Vice-Chancellor has treated the members. When he was in the Syndicate in the year 2016, he had won the election from the Registered Graduate Constituency for the second time. He had told the Vice-Chancellor that after getting 1700 votes from the constituency and fulfils the aspirations of his constituency as he has got 2900 first preference votes. In response to that the Vice-Chancellor had replied that it did not mean that he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) is right. At times, moments came when the Vice-Chancellor did not allow him to speak and he had to turn his face towards the wall. But today another moment is that the Vice-Chancellor is asking him to speak as long as he could. So, according to him today is an unfortunate day that the powers of the Vice-Chancellor have been withdrawn by the Syndicate. It could be understood as to under how much pressure those members must be and how much sad they must be that such a situation has arrived when Panjab University has to face such a day. Today he feels satisfied that perhaps the issues which have been raised by him during the last 4 years, he stand with them.

Dr. Nisha Bhargava said that she has been in the Senate for about 1½ years and have been taking guidance from the Vice-Chancellor regarding some issues related with her College and she has also got the feedback from her colleagues that the Vice-Chancellor helps the Colleges and has been instrumental in providing a fair amount of autonomy to Colleges. Whenever the Colleges face any crisis, the Vice-Chancellor helps them. She is not saying this in support of the issue of affidavit but on the basis of having observed the working style of the Vice-Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor always tries that justice should prevail. She has a layman's knowledge of law. If the old affidavit could become null and void by submitting a fresh affidavit, efforts in this regard should be done. Since the term of the Vice-Chancellor is going to come to an end, they should farewell him in a proper and decent manner and all his powers should be restored to him before his departure.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he has been listening to the discussion and what Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Shri Sanjay Tandon and Dr. Subhash Sharma have said. He has noticed that there is a confusion about the withdrawal of powers as if the Syndicate has committed a sin. He gave a brief background of actually what happened in the Syndicate. He happened to be there when Dr. Subhash Sharma had proposed. There is a affidavit which has not been provided to him but he has got a copy of it from Shri Prabhjit Singh. The language of Point No. 9 of the affidavit says that the "governing structure of Panjab University needs a serious reform. The groupism in the Senate has reached such a sorry state that the discussions do not happen on merit and factionalism prevails". He very humbly asked the Vice-Chancellor that he has submitted like this wording in the Court. His very simple question was that could he (Vice-Chancellor) tell him any just issue which was not passed which was on merit and could not be debated in the Syndicate and the Vice-Chancellor had said, 'no comments'.

Then the Vice-Chancellor further adds in the affidavit that "there are no officially recognised groups in the Senate. However, members take stand on important issues in a pre-meditated manner and such new initiatives for sustenance of the University are getting thwarted for want of consensus in the Senate/Syndicate". His second question to the Vice-Chancellor was that could he name any such one issue on which discussion had not taken place or they have thwarted his issue because of consensus. As far as he knows as he has been here for 1½ years, his very simple question is that during this period, there is not even a single issue which has not been passed by consent. Every issue has been passed unanimously and they are with the Vice-Chancellor and he told him that he is their leader and whatever comes to the Senate or the Syndicate is being passed unanimously. After that, Dr. Subhash Sharma added that since everything is being passed unanimously and there is no issue which was brought before the Syndicate or Senate which was crucial for the sustenance of the University and still the Vice-Chancellor's reply that he is not going to comment. Under those circumstances, when they are asking for the contents of the affidavit to tell any such issue and the reply is negative from the other side, they were left with whatever Dr. Subhash Sharma proposed or Shri Sanjay Tandon has said or Shri Ashok Goyal is saying, they were left with no other option. It is like that one is being charged for something for which one does not even have an idea. One could not just hold a person by the arm and take him to the jail that they are imprisoning him without even telling the fault. The Vice-Chancellor has added certain lines to the affidavit, they are asking one such issue or thing which has happened, just tell what was important for the sustenance of the University which is being thwarted for want of their consensus or consensus of the House and the reply is 'no comment'. This was the bare minimum. The Vice-Chancellor has all the powers, per se they have not taken anything. It is just very frivolous to say that the gratuity has been stopped. The issue is not about gratuity. So many words have been used against them as Shri Raghbir Dyal, Shri Naresh Gaur and Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal have pointed out. Everything apart, he is just going by the language of the affidavit, his simple question is which issue has been stopped in the Senate because of factionalism apart from that of sexual harassment case. Otherwise all the issues have been passed unanimously, there has been no voting during the tenure of the Vice-Chancellor. Still the language says that that the members are all against the University. The agenda preparation is not something which is done by the members. It is the duty of the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar to bring the agenda for the Syndicate and the Senate and the members have no role in that assignment. Still such kind of words which have been submitted by the Vice-Chancellor to the Court and the Vice-Chancellor failed to answer even a single issue before the House. In that perspective what options were there before the Syndicate, what else could they have done. This was the bare minimum way of showing their dissent or displeasure that the Vice-Chancellor did not want to answer something in the House but going to the Court and saying as if they have committed a mortal sin.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that as it has been discussed that the sentiments of the Senate members have been hurt. When they talk about the Senate members, that member could be any one. While discussing some issues sitting in Chandigarh when someone makes any comment that is a different issue. But when the members go for inspection in the remote areas knowing fully well that they would not get any support and the conditions under which they have to work and submit the reports even though they apprehend that no action would be taken. If the members are working under such conditions and even then the Vice-Chancellor gives such kind of a reward, then all these things pinch. He did not know as to which group the Vice-Chancellor is talking about. He said that it is because of the significance of Senate of Panjab University that the teachers of the Constituent Colleges are getting the full salary which their counterparts in Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University are not

getting. The inspection reports of all the Inspection Committees should be discussed in the Senate from which they could know that all the members are working for bringing the transparency. Then how the Vice-Chancellor could use such kind of words for them. He has been in the Senate for the last 14 years. There might be some differences on some issues between any of the Vice-Chancellors and the members but neither the Vice-Chancellor nor the members have used any such words which they have now read in the newspapers about them and also hear due to which the public questions them. He has been reporting to the Vice-Chancellor as to what a particular Senator is doing. All this is happening in the knowledge of the Vice-Chancellor. According to him, instead of the members discussing any issue, the Vice-Chancellor himself should point out as to what kind of a grievance he has with the members. Which is the thing that has earlier pinched the Vice-Chancellor or is now pinching or would pinch in the times to come due to which the Vice-Chancellor is using such words. Since the first meeting of the Senate he has been requesting the Vice-Chancellor not to use abusive words which the Vice-Chancellor is saying that he has not used these words against the members in any meeting. During the last two years, discussion on these words has taken place in the Senate but till date the Vice-Chancellor has not said that he did not use such a language. The members have never interfered in the working of the office as they read in the newspapers about the visits of the University officials to various places. The Vice-Chancellor should point out if any member has sent any letter or e-mail or used any such words. How the Vice-Chancellor could compare the members and treat all of them at equal footing. Lastly, he had requested the Vice-Chancellor to name some members due to which the Vice-Chancellor is facing some problem so that the members could mend their ways if someone has not a good way of working. But when the members ask the Vice-Chancellor, then he does not answer anything. All the members are dignitaries but he differs with them on one issue, as all the members are asking the Vice-Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit, he requested the Vice-Chancellor that if in reality he has such kind of thinking towards the Senate members which are written in the affidavit, then the Vice-Chancellor should not withdraw the affidavit. It should not be withdrawn under any pressure. During the last 14 years, he has not approached the Vice-Chancellor office for any personal work except the administrative office. If even after that he has to hear such kinds of words from a Vice-Chancellor that the Senate members work under some pressure or by groupism, it is not acceptable at any cost. The Vice-Chancellor with his consciousness should see himself about the withdrawal of the affidavit whether through Registrar or any other official, they do not want to go into technicalities, they do not need any certificate to give to the public. He also does not need a certification of his character from the Vice-Chancellor. If later on the Vice-Chancellor would say that he had the same viewpoints but he has withdrawn the affidavit under pressure, so he did not like, does not like and would not like the life of slavery and the Vice-Chancellor should keep his sentiments as he liked.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that at the outset he did not like to say anything at the outset. But after going through the affidavit starting from page 1, it says as 'Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice-Chancellor', the same thing at page 12, 13 and saying that it is in individual capacity is unbelievable. Had the Vice-Chancellor resigned from here and then given this affidavit, he could make a sense of it. Had the Vice-Chancellor given this affidavit after 22nd July, then it could be said to have been filed in a personal capacity. If the affidavit has been given at this time still holding the chair, then it does not make any sense that the Vice-Chancellor has filed it in his individual capacity or personal capacity. He requested the Vice-Chancellor not to say such thing.

Professor Shelley Walia said that before first half it is quite horrifying what has happened. He speaks with a sense of déjà vu of the time when derogatory language is used for this House, for the people here. He is reminded of George Orwell's very interesting essay on politics and the English language. All people might be aware of it. But the important thing that he says there is that bad politics debases language and misused language questions political thought. He is appalled at the decline of the use of language for such august body. He would not repeat the language as it has already been repeated. But he is disturbed like many of them are. He speaks also as a member of the Governance Reforms Committee. He complimented the Vice-Chancellor for the idea that he set up this Committee. According to him, there is no meeting which he has missed. They have very diligently spoken about the whole idea of getting rid of any kind of obsolescence which all of them are allergic to. They know that the University is dynamic and has to grow and they do need to change it. They do need to bring reforms. But he wanted to correct the Vice-Chancellor that the meetings (Governance Reforms) are still going on and there was a meeting which was held yesterday and they are again meeting on 12th May, 2018 in the evening. They meet every Sunday and do think about some kind of a vision that this University would grow and change and become a better place for learning and teaching and knowledge. But according to him, the Vice-Chancellor made one mistake and according to him that mistake is that the Vice-Chancellor prematurely hijacked the whole agenda of this Committee. This Committee was still in the process of suggesting reforms. In any kind of democratic situation or an institution, what are Committees. Are the recommendations of the Committee the final word or they are put to some kind of discussion? He is arguing for debate, for dissents, for feeling that in his mind there is a certain kind of ambiguity. He is very happy that they are talking of reforms. But he is very unhappy at the fact that if he has to accept these reforms, they come to him as a decree or as a free act or an ordinance. He would like these reforms to come from within the institution. When they debate and talk about them and do some kind of brainstorming on them, not the judiciary or the Chancellor sitting in Delhi sends a decree to them and says to obey that and they obey that. They have to put that under the scanner, they have to take the same to their colleagues, to all the stakeholders. Therefore, his suggestion, a very friendly suggestion to the Vice-Chancellor because the Vice-Chancellor and he met first at the interview for the Vice-Chancellorship. He also thought that because they had met together for the interview for the same post that he (Vice-Chancellor) could have had some kind of a kind word for him. One month into his Vice-Chancellorship quite outside here during lunch, he had told the Vice-Chancellor as to what he has against him. He had raised his hands and he was not invisible but the Vice-Chancellor never saw that. Hours past from 9 O'clock morning, he had been raising his hand and his turn came at 3 O'clock. Then the Vice-Chancellor was silent as he was silent always when people speak to him because very concrete suggestions made by him on the education have been swept under the carpet. His suggestion to the Vice-Chancellor today as a friend whom he met in IIT Delhi for interview of the Vice-Chancellorship is that he should take back his this kind of interjection, this kind of intervention that he made in the running of such a good University. He respects the Senate, the constitution but at the same time he knows that this constitution has to grow. But how would it grow, not with this kind of intervention that the Vice-Chancellor has made. Now the Vice-Chancellor has to go to the Court and ask and tell them that yet the Committee has to meet, it is again meeting on 11th May. He did not know whether it would be the last meeting or not because according to him, they are hurrying into it and there is a reason for hurrying into it because he perceives that there is a hurry in the Vice-Chancellor' step also of going to the Court thinking that this is going to be given some kind of nudge and it is going to be implemented. The Vice-Chancellor never thought that the colleagues, the PUTA, the members (of Senate) are actually going to think about it to tear it apart. When he made

those suggestions then he did not think that he is issuing such kind of very dominating suggestion to be accepted by all. To his mind, it is not the end of the debate, it is the end of ideology. In this University if it is going to remain academic, debate has to come about, groups have to come about and the Vice-Chancellor could not put an end to that. Therefore, he requested the Vice-Chancellor to go to the Court and tell them that yet they are in the process of carrying out the reforms, as yet they are thinking about them. Since they are thinking about them, the Vice-Chancellor should apologise to the Court that he was a little premature, he was a little hasty which might be because he has only two months to go and he had thought that he would change the University. The Universities are not changed like this. He wanted to tell the Vice-Chancellor that if they wanted to change a syllabus of M.A., it takes 2-3 years as they have to talk to the people in the Colleges, they have to see whether they have the books and ask them to attend the meetings of the undergraduate and postgraduate Boards of Studies and then decide. How did the Vice-Chancellor think that Hon'ble Justice Grover sitting there is going to issue a fiat to them and they are going to accept that. He is saying this as a member of the Governance Reforms Committee and saying that he is all for it and a signatory to it but he is not for any kind of this kind of force, this kind of dominance that the Vice-Chancellor is thinking of. He wanted each colleague to have a view on it that they sit together, debate and then come to a resolution. So, his request to the Vice-Chancellor, not as simple to have a Committee like Professor R.P. Bambah says. Professor R.P. Bambah is instrumental in selecting him to this University and he respects him. But this kind of idea of having a Committee, no debate and they not talking about it should not be there. Let they talk about, talk as much as they could till the midnight and then come to a decision and the decision is that the Vice-Chancellor should tell the Court that he is sorry and accept the fact that they are in a process, they are going to carry out the reforms and would come back when the need arises. When the Syndicate, Senate, teachers and the non-teaching community, all of them, feel that these reforms are really needed because they do not believe in a static stagnant University, they want a progressive University.

Dr. Sarabjit Kaur said that she had joined the Senate with an opinion that she would get an opportunity to contribute significantly and there would be discussions about research, welfare of the students and Colleges. But the scenario which she has seen during the last 1½ years, it does not happen even in vegetable market. The discussion which took place about something wrong in the Vice-Chancellor's statement, why such a discussion had taken place on a particular agenda for which a member needed to take the permission, she asked all of them whether their way of functioning should be like this. She has observed the working style of the Vice-Chancellor who has worked a lot for the betterment of the Colleges even by going out of the way, has promoted the research. She appreciated the efforts of the Vice-Chancellor for getting the proper pay scales paid to the teachers instead of consolidated salary. She has a personal opinion on the affidavit submitted in the Court that she is not a part of any group and if such a label is attached to her that is quite objectionable to her. If any rectification is possible in the affidavit, she requested on behalf of the Senate that the objectionable wording should be corrected and fresh affidavit should be filed. She requested the members that since the Vice-Chancellor has done very good work and they all are like a family and they should restore the powers of the Vice-Chancellor so that the pending work of the Colleges could be completed and the Vice-Chancellor could carry good memories and he should also have good memories of the members. It is her request to the Vice-Chancellor and the members.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when the discussion took place in the Syndicate, in the end he had also participated. Today also a similar situation has arrived that they are not trying to reach an amicable solution but they are asking the Vice-Chancellor to

withdraw the affidavit. They are also thinking that it is a process that the affidavit was filed in the Court and the Court is not going to make a fiat or to give a diktat as they have faith in the judiciary and the judiciary would not look into it as ultimately the reforms have to be made by the Parliament. The matter has gone there. Thereby this is a democratic process as Dr. Subhash Sharma and he himself were talking on that day also and today also that one democratic move is this that Professor Arun Kumar Grover as a person has given the affidavit and if there is a doubt he has agreed earlier also that he would file another affidavit saying that this was his personal view. So the question and the issue are clear. Secondly, the Vice-Chancellor is saying that what he had said, had said with his full commitment on this issue but when everyone says they respect it. But who stops them from giving their views, to file their own view and they could file two affidavits in the Court. One is to direct the Registrar to withdraw the affidavit filed by the Vice-Chancellor. Secondly, they could file their viewpoints on the reforms. As far as the Committee is concerned, it is in the process of submitting the final report. When the Committees are there, they are also free to file. The debate has gone to personal that the matter was there and somebody said something to which the Vice-Chancellor had said something. He agreed with Dr. Sarabjit Kaur who has rightly said that they should try to come out as the issue is now resolved. Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. Subhash Sharma have rightly said that the Senate would take a call so that they could proceed further. It is a democracy. If the Vice-Chancellor is right then he would be given the relief and if wrong, then the relief would not be given. Then where is the problem. Why should they keep on saying one after the other to withdraw the affidavit? They are all educated and Senate members. Once said is okay. If the Vice-Chancellor agrees or not otherwise, is there a need to again and again to ask the Vice-Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit. He appreciated Shri Harpreet Singh Dua's view, this is a democratic view because he is their colleague and he has very rightly said. So, now the matter should go further. They have already reached to lunch time and he requested the members that whatever Dr. Subhash Sharma, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi have proposed, they go ahead with it otherwise they would not be able to proceed further. He requested to take up the agenda immediately after that because they have a responsibility to the society.

Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that he is a first timer in the Senate and attending the meeting for the second time. If this is the Senate, then it has some different approach and he had a different concept of Senate in the mind. In the last meeting, he did not participate in the discussion and just listened it. Since a lot of discussion has taken place on the issue of affidavit, he requested the Vice-Chancellor to give his concluding remarks and take up the other agenda.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they have been discussing this issue since morning and they have arrived at this conclusion that the affidavit should be withdrawn. When the affidavit would be withdrawn, the problem would end itself. Due to the affidavit, the powers were withdrawn. Actually, the powers are not of the Vice Chancellors, the powers are of the University. So, with this the University would suffer and not the Vice Chancellor. Rather, the Vice Chancellor has become free as he has not to see the files. The piling up of files would lead to hampering the work of the University, it may relate to finance, results, examiners or it may relate to gratuity, etc. So, he requested that when the issue for withdrawal of affidavit has been solved, so the powers of the Vice Chancellor which were withdrawn be restored.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal whether the issue regarding withdrawal of affidavit has been resolved to which Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it has been solved. Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it has been resolved, then Principal Gosal should request the Vice Chancellor to say so.

Principal B.C. Josan endorsed the view point of Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he was thinking these two things separately, one is the affidavit case and the other is the reaction which arose out of it. Almost the issue is clinched. What will happen to the affidavit, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and Dr. Subhash Sharma has said about it. Out of it one thing is clear that the issue seems to be resolved. Now, the next question relates to the withdrawal of powers of the Vice-Chancellor. It might have taken twenty years to delegate powers to the Vice Chancellor because different Syndicates must have delegated different powers at different times to the Vice-Chancellor because they could not function so efficiently because they meet only after one month or two months and like that. It appears to him that it is not justified. Actually, it arose out of reaction and when there is a reaction, then the things may not be logical. To his mind, immediately, the powers of the Vice Chancellor should be restored. If the new Vice Chancellor comes after 2½ months, then they would say to restore the powers to the new Vice Chancellor. Let they should see that the functioning of the University should be normal and efficient. In the absence of the powers of the Vice Chancellor, it will not be possible run the University. This is his humble request to the members of the Syndicate and Senate also to consider this urgent issue. It was the Syndicate who delegate the powers. It appears to be a decision in haste. If the first part is resolved, the second part should automatically be seemed as resolved.

Dr. Subahsh Sharma said that he wants to clarify that the powers which were withdrawn was not because of any anger, it is not the result of any retaliation. The simple issue was that the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor did not have faith in the Syndicate, he took a very big issue relating to governance reforms to the Court. All the members of the Syndicate requested the Vice Chancellor, in writing, to withdraw the affidavit, but did not accepted it. In the next meeting they pleaded the Vice Chancellor for one hour to withdraw the affidavit, but he did not accede to their request. He did not accede to their request is one issue, but he did not even feel it appropriate to discuss on this issue. If they see the minutes of that meeting, the Vice Chancellor was having a very consistent stand that he has not to have any discussion on this issue, he has given the affidavit, that is it and they should talk only about the agenda. In such a scenario where the Vice Chancellor has no faith in the Syndicate and in such an atmosphere where there is lack of trust, how the Syndicate can allow the Vice Chancellor to use its powers. This was the only issue and there was no anger, no retaliation, even now there is no anger and no retaliation, the issue is that of trust. If the Vice Chancellor has no trust on the Syndicate, then how the Syndicate can afford that the Vice Chancellor should use its powers. It was very painful for them. The members can read the minutes of the Syndicate where the members time and again requested the Vice Chancellor that they did not want to do all this. . He would like to say all the members of the Senate that some members are saying that it happened in anger or retaliation, but it was not the case, it was the case of lack of trust. Until and unless that trust is not restored, till that time no one could allow to use his powers. It is a very simple formula. One can allow someone to use his powers only if they have trust on each other and if there is no trust, it would be very difficult. Secondly, some of the members were saying that the powers of the Vice Chancellor should be restored, he would again like to reiterate that they have not taken any power of the Vice Chancellor, they have withdrawn only those powers which have been delegated by the Syndicate to the Vice Chancellor. The inherent powers of the Vice Chancellor are with him as earlier. Further, in response to some members, he would like to give his view point. He said that they see the debates of Parliament, different State Assemblies and discussion, he feels proud on it that the Panjab University Senate also has discussion and debate in the same way. There is nothing like that if someone says that he feels strange in attending the Senate meeting, rather he feels proud of it that very serious discussion

took place in the Senate. So, debates, discussion, different viewpoints, contrasting view points, all these things are the beauty of the democracy, so there is nothing to be disappointed. They should appreciate such discussion. He said that much discussion has already taken place, so he requested the Vice Chancellor to explain briefly about the resolve of this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that before that if he may be allowed, he thinks, on behalf of the Syndicate, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) want to make a proposal that if as per the consensus of the House, as Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal has said that the affidavit stands withdrawn, his simple submission is that Syndicate also requested that the affidavit be withdrawn, Senate also in its wisdom has suggested that the affidavit be withdrawn. If the affidavit stands withdrawn or is withdrawn, then probably, they do not have an occasion to discuss what has been done by the Syndicate. Whatever has been recommended by the Syndicate or whatever has been decided by the Syndicate that goes without saying that if the root cause is removed, automatically Syndicate also will do what it is supposed to do by withdrawing its earlier decision. So, keeping in view the sentiments of the House, it is almost unanimous that the affidavit filed by Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, in the case titled as, Court on its own motion Vs Panjab University and others be withdrawn. If it is acceptable to all, rest of the things will automatically follow, he has already made the proposal. Whatever has been described in 4 or 5 parts, April dated 13th April, filed on 17th April, 2018 and whatever has been recorded in the proceedings of the Syndicate on 29th on this issue will automatically stand withdrawn. When Professor Ronki Ram said that Registrar would be directed, Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that he (Professor Ronki Ram) has again said a new thing.

Ms. Anu Chatrath, clarified that Professor Ronki Ram would like to add that they have to inform the Court also that it is deemed to be withdrawn.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, that is what he is saying. In all propriety Professor Arun Grover should withdraw it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not going to withdraw it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, right. If he is not going to withdraw it, then why everybody is lecturing to give the powers to the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already stated that it was his personal view and he shall inform the Court that he did not take the Senate and Syndicate into confidence. The Syndicate and the Senate has desired that this affidavit should be treated as withdrawn, but since some of the members started speaking together, the Vice Chancellor could not complete his version. The Vice Chancellor went out of the meeting saying that he would come back after two minutes and answer them.

After the resumption of the meeting Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he would move his resolution once again. Let the House decide on the resolution in 'yes' or 'no'.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested Shri Gujot Singh Malhi not move it in the form of resolution. He said that he would like to inform the House only with a view to clarify, because it has been said again and again that Professor Arun Grover has filed the affidavit in his personal capacity. First of all, in reply to the members of the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor has not said anywhere that he has filed the affidavit in his personal capacity. He has only said that he has personally collated, that he is personally responsible, but nowhere he has said that he will also write that it is not the opinion of

the Governing Bodies. What they want that it is not the opinion of the University and not governing bodies. Because the affidavit which has been filed is on the basis of a request, which the affidavit starts from, he has read it in the Syndicate also, that on the last date of hearing dated 26th March, 2018, the University sought the permission, he is repeating 'the university', to place on record its submissions and relevant documents regarding the governance reforms in Panjab University, Chandigarh. It was based on this permission by the Court to place on record the affidavit that the affidavit signed by Professor Arun Grover has been filed. To say that this affidavit has been filed by him in his personal capacity is *per se* not correct, because as per his knowledge if anything is to be filed in the Court in personal capacity, one has to file an application to be impleaded as a party in person and get permission to file anything that one wants to, which has not been done. While taking the decision he (Vice Chancellor) must keep in mind that this is the stand of the University and unless and until this affidavit is withdrawn, they just cannot say that remedial steps have been taken. In view of this, alright, the Vice Chancellor has categorically stated that he is not going to withdraw the affidavit. That means, first of all, he submitted it without the sanction of competent authority, thereafter, he has been pointed out that he does not have the permission of the Syndicate and Senate that the University is to file such an affidavit. He has taken a defiance stand that he is not going to withdraw it. The Senate must direct the Registrar to file an affidavit on behalf of the University that the earlier affidavit dated 13th April, 2018 filed in the Hon'ble High Court on 17th of April, 2018, may please be allowed to be withdrawn and that is enough, no reason, nothing. That should be the decision and a very serious action has to be taken by the Senate as to what is to be done to the defiance by the Vice Chancellor in not taking into consideration the collective and unanimous decision of the supreme body of the University which is the Senate, that is what he wanted to say.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the Vice Chancellor would go and request the Hon'ble High Court that the affidavit filed on 17th April may kindly be treated as withdrawn. This is the statement which the Registrar should make on behalf of the Senate to Hon'ble Court.

Professor Ronki Ram requested to let him say one thing in continuation to what Shri Ashok Goyal has said.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa intervened to say that only the Vice Chancellor or his Counsel could withdraw the affidavit. On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal if the Registrar could withdraw it or not, Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said, 'no'.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the affidavit has been filed on behalf of the University, so the Registrar could withdraw it.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, that it is stated that on the last date of hearing 26th March, the University sought the permission to place on record its submission and relevant documents regarding the governance reforms in Panjab University, Chandigarh. This is in pursuance to that permission which the University sought that this affidavit should be filed. Now it is again the University, through the Registrar, would say that they wish to withdraw it and consequently they would allow it to which several members said, yes, it is right.

Professor Ronki Ram said that in the resolved part of the Syndicate it has been very clearly written and now it has come as a matter for Senate to be discussed. He read out point No. (iii) on page 13 of agenda papers which states as under:

'resolved to direct Registrar to file an affidavit stating that the affidavit filed by Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice-Chancellor on behalf of Panjab University in the Punjab and Haryana High Court on 17th April, 2018 without authority be treated as withdrawn. The Registrar be directed to file an affidavit on behalf of Panjab University before 6th May, 2018'.

Professor Ronki Ram said that this was done within one minute in the morning itself.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that nobody has the objection what the Syndicate has resolved. He said that the Senate should also resolve to direct the Registrar by raising their hands to which many members consented to it by raising their hands. Shri Subhash Sharma then said that it is resolved.

The Vice Chancellor said, alright, he accepts, no issue. But let him respond. So much has been said as to what he did and what he did not do. What this governing body ought to have been doing and it did not. Tell him any University in the country where a sitting Syndicate member can put a false sexual harassment case against the Vice Chancellor. The matter was placed to the Syndicate within a week and the groups in the Syndicate have a tacit understanding that they will not raise this matter. The matter does not end here. Five weeks later, the case is filed with the U.T. administration under so many Acts or some acts that he has done. The police tried to contact him**,** they did not do anything and no harm was done to him, but the matter does not stop here. Another 15 days later, the MHRD Minister was contacted and an explicit complaint is made against him that there should be a special investigating team etc.etc. The members are all aware of it, every paper has been placed before this Senate and the Syndicate. This Senate and Syndicate as Bodies have failed to protect the office of the Vice Chancellor. If they go and Google Arun Kumar Grover, in the Google, it is mentioned as an accused Vice Chancellor. In his entire 2nd term, in fact three months before and three years later, they have all functioned under an accused Vice Chancellor. Accused by whom, one of them and they have done nothing. As soon as his second term commenced NSUI, the student wing of a major political party of India came and gave him a memorandum that loot and plunder is going on in this University for the last 25 years. As soon as his second term comes in on 13th or 14th of April, NSUI dropped that agenda, but ABVP goes and the same text and same everything, it is loot and plunder is going on in this University. The MHRD sets up a Fact Finding Committee. The Finance & Development Officer, Registrar and he himself has to go and respond to two Fact Finding Committees of the MHRD and the UGC. The UGC conducted the Fact Finding Committee and never gave the report of the Fact Finding Committee. Did the Governing Bodies of this University take any initiative at all as to why the University has been subjected to all this penance. They did not get money for one year. The previous government did not solve the problem of the University. The MHRD did not give the money. He went and pleaded with the MHRD Minister, MHRD Secretary, some of them P.U. alumni, and they did not solve the problem. The matter was to go to be Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs, but it did not go there, arbitrary decision was given that this University in the year 2013-14 would need Rs. 163 Crore, earlier it was Rs.161.5 crores. He kept fighting, but nothing was done, an 8% increase would be allowed. There was change of government, when the change of government happened, what do they get with the change of government, they got an enquiry into loot and plunder that is going on which the previous government did not accept when the NSUI had put in. The new government came and there is siege on it and they did not get the money, so there is a shortage of money and next year the shortage has enhanced, then in the third year the previous money did not come. Not one member of the Governing Body of this University had bothered to see as

to how to go and to fight politically or publically. Then it is in that background that he had to make a statement that they already have a deficit of Rs. 45 Crores and would have many more crores deficit at the end of the financial year and from January 1, they would have Rs. 100 Crore short. When they would be Rs. 100 Crores short, then how would they survive. If they admit students, they have not money to pay to the teachers or so on, not only they have to pay salary to the teachers but also to the employees who conduct examinations, but the fate of 2.50 lacs students was also involved if the University comes to a standstill. If there is no work going on, if the salaries are not paid, everyday, there will be 'Dharna'. Here they have 'Dharna' for small things even if the wheat loan is stopped. They are not realising that this University, only if it is seen to be functioning efficiently and properly, it will survive. If they do not generate their own income, the Centre will not give them the remaining money. What has the Centre done today? The Central Government has said that they cannot recruit anybody. They have cut their heads and taken assurance from them that in the next five years they would not recruit any employee in place of those who would retire, there would be no replacement. So, under all these very severe conditions, they have been promised 6% increase over the previous year. What has the Punjab government done? They also increased 6% like the Central government with great difficulty. The previous Punjab Government did not increase money. In fact in fifteen years various parties in the Punjab government did not give us any money. They have Chief Minister in the House, they have Education Minister in the House, they have M.L.As. in the House, they have VIPs in the House. Do they come? Do they bother? Not. This is the governance of this University in which the Syndicate members lodge complaints against each other. There should be this enquiry or that enquiry. What is the Syndicate doing, is it doing its duty? They are worried about their own honour and ego. What about the honour and ego of the Vice Chancellor? Is this way to behave with the Vice Chancellor. What answer the Syndicate and the Senate have to the humiliation that have meted out to him over the last three years, in fact over so many years. There is a system in which the Senate and Syndicate members stage a hunger strike in front of the Vice Chancellor's Office because the Vice Chancellor has referred a matter to the Syndicate for consideration. Why did they do that as the Syndicate meeting was going to be held a week from then. Please do not do this. But the groupism here is such that everybody was there in front of the Vice Chancellor's Office. So many members sitting in this hall, he has photographs of all of them sitting in front of the Vice Chancellor's office and staging a hunger strike. The honourable member on hunger strike is continuing to be a member of this Senate as well. He saved him by sending a medical doctor at 5 a.m. in the morning, because he (Vice Chancellor) knew that he was suffering from high blood pressure. Somehow he managed as to how that hunger strike is stopped, otherwise they would have a fatal situation on this campus. Did any governing body member felt that something is wrong with them. What was this governing body doing? What do the successive Syndicates do? The very first year, Professor Ahluwalia is there, he was continuing as D.S.W., he put him as D.S.W., but the D.S.W. has a vote, he could be a Senator, he is removed. Few years down the line, now it is time to do reverse. He put the D.U.I.'s name, he is removed, he had put the D.S.W.'s name which was not approved, he is now Secretary of PUTA sitting in this hall. Is this the way to govern this University? What are they talking? Where are the political parties of India who are responsible for causing problems to this University?

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that the Vice Chancellor must control his voice and do not preach.

The Vice Chancellor said that since morning they have had enough time. Will they not allow him to say?

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that now the cat is out of the bag. Now he (Vice Chancellor) is behaving out of anger. He is reacting out of his personal issues.

The Vice Chancellor said, that was a personal issue under which the D.S.W. was removed.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that where is the personal reason that his resignation was not accepted in the last five months from the Board of Governors of TEQIP.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could put thousand and one questions right now asking about his (Vice Chancellor) conduct. Dr. Subhash Sharma is right that the cat is out of the bag. It is only because of the personal vendetta that he (Vice Chancellor) wants to finish Governing Bodies, Government of India, Government of Punjab, MHRD, NSUI, ABVP, etc.

The Vice Chancellor said that he accepts their resolution that the Registrar will ask for removal of his affidavit. He would file his affidavit in three parts, one, about some factual information giving what the history is, second is his observation and third is the solution that he has articulated once again which was there, a part of the original affidavit that he submitted in October, 2016. He shall inform the Court that from point 7 onward everything be treated as withdrawn because it was his personal observation. Finally, he will also say that there are Committees working for the governance reforms, as and when those Committees will give the report, these will be placed before the governing bodies of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal while saying, no, said that what the Registrar is to file, is to file on behalf of the University. He asked, in what capacity, he (Vice Chancellor) is going to file the affidavit now.

The Vice Chancellor said, he will not file.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are only concerned with the University and the University has to withdraw the affidavit as it is.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will do nothing about it.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that he should only file for withdrawal of the affidavit and for a new affidavit, it should come before the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that whatever has been passed by the Syndicate, that would stand.

The Vice Chancellor said, it is alright.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa further said that on Para 8 of the affidavit he (Vice Chancellor) has mentioned only suggestions from PUTA, but where are the suggestions of non-teaching and where are the suggestions of students, the same have not been placed before the governing bodies.

When the Vice-Chancellor announced lunch break, Professor Keshav Malhotra asked as to what has been passed.

After the lunch, when the meeting resumed, the Vice-Chancellor suggested to take up the Items C-38, C-39 and C-40 before they go back to the left over agenda. Shri Jagdeep Kumar made a request to the Vice-Chancellor to have a Zero Hour which was not accepted.

At this stage, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that for a while he was not present in the meeting before lunch and at that time the Vice-Chancellor had given a statement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that matter is over now.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it does not mean that whatever statement the Vice-Chancellor gives and then says that matter is over.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the Vice-Chancellor was continuing at that time.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that when he had sat on a hunger strike before it he had written 3-4 letters to the Vice-Chancellor which is on record with the University as well as with the teachers. The Vice-Chancellor is protecting. He was forced for this as even after having written repeated letters, the Vice-Chancellor did not bring up an agenda item for the Syndicate for a year. Today all those persons are working democratically while earlier they were not working when the Vice-Chancellor was protecting them. The Vice-Chancellor had not done any favour to him. The Vice-Chancellor should forget that he had done anything for him (Dr. Ajay Ranga). If at that time the Vice-Chancellor had felt that he would die (while on hunger strike), only then the authorities must have accepted the request. If it was so, then why the request was not accepted a year ago, why the demand was not placed as an agenda item. It was the Vice-Chancellor who had forced him to sit on hunger strike.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that another objectionable statement has been given about the case which is pending against him (Vice-Chancellor) because where he says and claims that he is an accused. What does the Vice-Chancellor want to say, what does he expect from the governing bodies, what is the responsibility of the governing bodies. If a complainant out of grievance has filed a case as per the law of the land, what does the Vice-Chancellor expect from the governing body? The Vice-Chancellor always tries to sensationalise and scandalise the things. Unless and until the Vice-Chancellor explains it in detail, if the idea was only that he has brought these governance reforms and filed the affidavit only on account of these things, then probably Dr. Subhash Sharma has rightly said that the cat is out of the bag. The Vice-Chancellor should explain and say as to what he expects from the political parties of India. He should explain as to what he expects from the student bodies of India. He should explain as to what he expects from the Government of India. Let they see that there is a genius who does not bother about anybody and unless and until the things move according to his whims and fancies, every institution would be finished. Let they also appreciate the fact. Now he is requesting the Vice-Chancellor to speak as he wanted to speak on so many things. Again compelled by the circumstances, when one say that otherwise they would be compelled to condemn the words used by the Vice-Chancellor about the governing body, about all the parties, about all the people concerned in the Government and non-Government sector .

RESOLVED: That the Registrar be directed to initiate the process of filing an application for withdrawal of the affidavit filed by Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice-Chancellor in the Punjab and Haryana High Court on 17th April, 2018 in CWP No. 18745 of 2016.

Since the Items C-38, C-39 and C-40 were related with the fee structure and at some times, the discussion took place on these items simultaneously. The whole discussion has been put together and the resolved part of each item is mentioned separately.

III. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-38** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-38. That minutes dated 20.11.2017 of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to work out a road map for rationalization and revision of fee structure, and all other charges for the session 2018-19 to achieve the task of augmenting the resources for constituent Colleges of Panjab University, be approved.

NOTE: Professor Keshav Malhotra, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Finance and Development Officer have been authorized on behalf of the Syndicate to look into and rationalise the students holiday home fund and other similar charges with that of the charges to be paid by the University students and the same be incorporated in the fee structure.

(Syndicate dated 30.3./21.4./29.4.2018 Para 21)

IV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-39** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-39. That minutes dated 30.01.2018 of the Committee of the certain syndics, in term of decision of the Syndicate dated 10.12.2017/ 19.12.2017 (Para 32) regarding rationalization and revision of fee structure, examination fee and all other charges for P.U. Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres, for the session 2018-19 to achieve the task of augmenting the resources for P.U., be approved.

NOTE: Professor Keshav Malhotra, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Finance and Development Officer have been authorized on behalf of the Syndicate to look into and rationalise the students holiday home fund and other similar charges with that of the charges to be paid by the University students and the same be incorporated in the fee structure.

(Syndicate dated 30.3./21.4./29.4.2018 Para 21)

V. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-40** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-40. That recommendation (Item 4(b)) of the Standing Committee dated 27.11.2017 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to Examination fee of the PU Constituent Colleges, be approved:

(Syndicate dated 30.3./21.4./29.4.2018 Para 21)

Professor Chaman Lal said that although he knows that the financial situation of the University is very tight but for that the students should not be held responsible and raising the fee every year, according to him, is not a good thing as the students are coming from poor background, from backward areas. He would like to put his dissent on it that no fee should be raised every year. Maybe they could adopt a formula by which rationalisation could be made and 1-2% fee could be enhanced every year. But he sees no justification in enhancing the fee by 10% for new students and 5% for old students. Last year, they have faced the problem on fee hike. This year, he does not know as to how the students are going to react or not. Still he feels that it should not be enhanced and would like to put his dissent.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if they have to run the University, they have to enhance the fee every year. For the last so many years, they could not enhance the fee. When they raised it up to 100%, there was protest all over in the University. So, felt that they should enhance the fee by 5% and 10% as proposed.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that enhancing the fee is not a problem. But the unrest amongst the students is that they are not getting the facilities proportionate to the enhancement in fee. If they go to the students' community, most of them say that they do not have any problem in enhancement of the fee but the proportionate facilities have also to be there. There are some Departments where the laboratory equipment has totally become obsolete and are de-calibrated completely but still they are using the equipments. When the Departments ask for facilities and write the letters, he did not know where those letters go. During this time, they have made lot of roads and buildings. These things have been done. E-rickshaw and public cycle works have been done. But they have not done anything for education, for the basic classroom teaching which is the first thing required in the campus that has to be done. Let they forget about the environment. First they should make the manpower competent enough so that when the students come here for the M.Phil. and Ph.D. they have enough good conception to start with. They are trying to produce the students who are not really very good although they could say that at the level of teachers, they are number 1 or 5, that hardly has any meaning. During the last 5-6 years, academics has reached a mediocre level which has been a rather low.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he expresses his agreement with Professor Chaman Lal and Professor J.K. Goswamy on this issue. While speaking earlier in the beginning, he had just mentioned that the University is not getting the required funds. He would not like go further on it except saying that the Governments should take care of the Universities and if the Government justifies itself in enhancing the grants a little, that is not good. The people are not getting the required facilities and the University could not run without the enhancement of funds. But essentially the Government should meet the total deficit of the University. If they feel that any expenditure is on the higher side or excessive or wasteful, they should analyse that as a continuous

process as an exercise and try to reduce that and should not put the burden on the students.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that his contention on the fee hike is different. He pointed out that on an average the fee of B.C.A.-I is Rs.30,765/- meaning thereby about Rs.2,500/- p.m. So, a normal family could not get BCA education for its children. Since the last to last year, he has been questioning it if by enhancing the fee, the budget deficit is covered, then it is okay. But if just for a small amount, they would put burden on the under privileged sections who want to educate their children especially the girl students and want to deprive such students, that is a separate issue and he has a dissent on it because already the fee is on the higher side. They have been increasing the fee since the 2012-13 and putting a burden on the students. So, instead of enhancing the fee, they should put pressure on the Government because the political parties are the stakeholders that it is the responsibility of the Government to provide the education and health and the budget for these should not be curtailed, rather it should be increased. He has complete disagreement and dissent on the increase of fee. So, it should be kept as it is.

Dr. Neeru Malik enquired whether the fee is related to the Panjab University campus as the fee for Colleges has already been increased by 5%. She is in favour of enhancing the fee and if they see the rationale behind it they have to plan it at a big level.

The Vice-Chancellor suggested that they take up the Items C-38 and C-39 together.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that if they compare the fee of Panjab University with other universities in Punjab, it comes to the lower side. If they are proposing the hike by 5%, it would mean that definitely they are enhancing the quality of education.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Dr. Neeru Malik is relevant. The part of this money must go towards improving facilities to the students which they have not been spending. The income to be generated through enhanced fee this year must be spent to improve the facilities and infrastructure. Then they could approach and tell the Government that they have enhanced their income which would be spent for providing quality education to the students and the Government must meet the enhanced deficit. This is a very sensible thing which Professor J.K. Goswamy has also raised. They could also make a case to the Government. This is a rational thing.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that the increased fee would be from the students, by the students and for the students.

Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that the benefit of enhancement in fee should be used in Regional Centre at Kauni, Muktsar should go to the students. Some telecom companies have installed their towers to provide wifi facility to the students and the teachers. So just by having an MoU with the companies as has been done by the UIET and UICET, they could provide free wifi facility to the students and teachers as is available at the Panjab University campus.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that last year they were discussing the fee hike as there was a substantial fee hike. At that time, every member agreed that there should be a regular fee hike and not a high fee hike after few years. Whatever now has been

proposed is a regular fee hike which has to be there. If they hike the fee after a few years by 20-30%, there would always be a problem. The proposed hike is better. Simultaneously, when they talk about infrastructure and other things, those must be improved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let they take a decision that whatever excess income would be generated this year, it would be spent on infrastructure development. A Committee could be formed to decide on the requirements.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the members were discussing amongst themselves about the infrastructure at Muktsar. She suggested that the infrastructure should be provided as their only purpose is not to grant only the degrees but provide the teaching also. If there is no infrastructure, there could be no teaching.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he is a member of the Committee which has suggested a nominal fee hike. There is another issue which he had tried to raise in the meeting of the Committee and would also share here about which the Finance and Development Officer could clarify. They are charging a fee of Rs.230/- from the SC students which is reimbursed after passing the BA. He is in favour that the students should be given the benefit but they should be encouraged to attend regular classroom teaching. He pointed out that the students are taking admission in such Colleges where non-attending students' culture is growing up. He had made a request in the meeting of the Committee to encourage such students to attend the regular classes. There are some good Colleges which are charging the fee from the students which is reimbursed by the Government later on. If a student is taking the admission free of cost and gets an identity card of the College, he is sorry to say that such students do not attend the classes. However, on the other side the students belonging to poor families take admission by paying the fee of Rs.3000-5000. They, including their families, have a responsibility that they attend the classes and not to waste the hard earned money. But the names of such students are being struck off the rolls due to marginal shortage of attendance (5-10%). Every Principal has a responsibility that if the regular classes have to be organised, the students would have to be regular in classes. He suggested that the University should charge the fee from SC students as is being charged by some good Colleges, which could be later on reimbursed by the Government to their parents. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal is also saying that it is the duty of the Government to provide education but it is running away from its responsibility. He did not know the exact amount but it is a big amount which the Government is not reimbursing to the University. The Government has reimbursed only about 60-70% of such fee during the year 2013-14. But thereafter, according to him, the Government is not reimbursing the fee about which the Finance and Development Officer must be able to clarify. If they charge the fee from the students at the time of admission, it would be beneficial in two ways – one is that the students would devote time to studies and the Colleges would get the fee from the students.

It was clarified (by the Finance and Development Officer) that the grants from the Punjab Government are not coming as is desired because there are some arrears with it on account of reimbursement of SC/ST fee which is to the tune of Rs.2 crores. But that decision is to be taken considering the situation of the students because they could insist that as per the policy of the Punjab Government, the fee is to be reimbursed to the University. But the Senate could take a decision whether the University should implement that at the first instance some amount has to be deposited by the students or the present system has to be continued.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he has worked in the College whose Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mahajan is the Principal. Some Colleges are charging the fee from the students and it is the responsibility of the College to reimburse the same to the students. The College of Mrs. Dhaliwal and Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha were facing the same problem because the Government was not reimbursing the fee. Then they decided that the Colleges should charge the fee which would create a pressure on the Government to reimburse the fee as otherwise there is no pressure of the students or their parents on the Government at present. The institutions could not make a pressure on the Government which the students and the parents could make because of the vote bank. If the fee is not reimbursed to the students/parents, they could pressurise the Government. If such students are not paying any fee and getting admission, they do not take interest in studies and roam freely. He wanted that the students should come forward for education. He is heading a College in which most of the students belong to poor families. Therefore, if they charge the fee from the students at the time of admission, the Government would be under pressure from the students to reimburse the fee. He requested the House that they should charge the fee from the students. Such students are even paying a fee of Rs.18,000/- in some big private Colleges whereas the fee in the Constituent Colleges if Rs.6,500/-. So, this amount is not such a big amount which the students would not be able to pay.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that the examination fee mentioned at page 48 of the agenda is not clear as to for which courses it is mentioned. He enquired whether the examination for B.A. is the same for the Colleges and the University or it is different at both the levels.

It was clarified (by the Controller of Examinations) that the examination fee is the same for the College and the University.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that the examination fee which earlier was Rs.2,500/- has been enhanced by Rs.200/-. He pointed out that the examination fee is already on the higher side. He suggested that the examination fee should remain the same as for the last year.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that earlier the students used to pay the examination fee once in a year under the annual system but with the introduction of semester system, the students have to pay the examination fee twice a year.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that an examination fee of Rs.3,000/- for a B.Sc. course is being from the Colleges whereas in the University it is Rs.2,500/- which has been hiked to Rs.2,700/-. So, this fee should be the same for the College and the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that such a fee has been charged, it is wrong.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu said that the examination fee for B.A. was being charged @ Rs.1,500/- and if it involved practical, then a fee of Rs.1,000/- was also charged. If a student had to appear in the environment subject, then another fee of Rs.700/- was also charged. Earlier, the examination fee was Rs.1,500/- which has been now enhanced to Rs.1,650/-. He requested that this fee should remain as Rs.1,500/-. The students who get re-appear are paying double/triple examination fee. Such students are not in a capacity to pay the fee. The students who have to appear in multiple semesters, their fee goes up to Rs.7000-8000.

Dr. Dalip Kumar pointed out that if they read the Items C-38 and C-39, the items are not related with the Colleges.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that all the others fees are okay but the examination fee should not be hiked. As said by Principal I.S. Sandhu, it was discussed in the Syndicate also, the economically weaker students along with the SC/ST students should be charged the existing fee as it is very difficult for them to pay the fee. This should be applicable to the students falling in the income of up to Rs.2 lac as the number of such students is very limited.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they are discussing Item C-39 which is regarding rationalisation and revision of fee structure, examination fee and all other charges for Panjab University Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres for the sessions 2018-19 whereas they are discussing the issues related with the Colleges.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it has been seen for the last many years that they are enhancing the fee, a financial statement of what would be the benefit it should have been prepared. He said that the fee of PGDCA and BCA courses is mentioned at page 18 and 19 (Annexure-I). He is aware that in the newly opened two Constituent Colleges at Ferozepur and Moga, these courses are not being run but he is not sure whether it is being run in the other 4 Constituent Colleges. According to him if he is not mistaken, there must be about 100 students in these 4 Colleges in BCA and PGDCA. By increase in the fee for these courses, only an amount of Rs.50,000/- to Rs. 1 lac would be collected which is not a big amount. According to him, the BCA and PGDCA courses which are not successful in the Constituted Colleges situated in the rural areas, there is no need to hike the fee. The Committee has not gone deep into these facts, it is his opinion. There is no need to enhance this fee. If as a symbolic just for the sake of increasing the fee, they are hell bent on increasing the fee, then he sees no logic behind the increase. While referring to page 34, he said that the fee for PUPIN has been increased tremendously to Rs.400/- which earlier was Rs.270/-. Similarly, the migration fee which earlier was Rs.270/- has also been enhanced to Rs.400/-. So, it is a 50% increase.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that it is a 50% increase whereas it is being said that the increase is just 5%.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they are charging so many kinds of fees from the Colleges like PUPIN card, migration etc. He has been pointing out for the last few years that they do not have a citizens' charter for the students of Panjab University. There are so many departments in the University where the students have to face a lot of problems, one of which is migration certificate counter where he has seen a lot of rush of students all day long whenever he happens to visit the University. They are getting a lot of revenue from the fee being charged for the transcripts required by the students who need verification for going overseas. The other such section is duplicate certificate section where there is a shortage of staff and Controller of Examinations could agree with it. They have to wait for one month or so to take a certificate. They do increase the fee every year, but they do not provide the services accordingly. The Panjab University is a very good University, but they have not been able to evolve a citizen's charter and he has been demanding it for the last five years. There is need to see that they should not increase the fee only for the sake of increase, it should be augmented by improving the facilities also. He further said that the fee which has increased to Rs. 2700/- would affect the colleges. The strength in their college is already decreasing and the students are heading towards IELTS and PTU. Thus, with

the increase of fee, the overall revenue would decrease due to decrease in number of students. So, he requested that the examination fee should not be increased.

Shri Nareah Gaur said that earlier there was annual system and now they have shifted to semester system.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said earlier the fee was 1500/- but now it has been increase to Rs. 5000/-.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal while referring to page 56 of the agenda papers said that they have resolved in the Senate that they would not charge the Students Holiday Fund till they start construction. Crores of rupees are lying in the corpus. During the last five years they have not moved even an inch on this project. The infrastructure at the Regional Centres has completely damaged and he feels very difficult in saying that in the next rainy season if the roofs of the building collapsed, the responsibility would be that of the University. The Committee which they have constituted to look into the issue of renovation has still done nothing. They have held a meeting of that Committee and it was opined there that tender should be collected on the spot. But he had said that one year has already passed and now there is no meaning of having the tenders on the spot. But still they have not been able to start the renovation so far. The situation is very bad, they are increasing the fee, but doing nothing. He visited Kauni Centre, the grills of newly constructed buildings have completed rusted. The other point which he would like to mention is that the University did not have any check on the colleges, though some of his colleges might not agree with it. The fee structure which they received from the Dean College Development Council, there is separate fee for Chandigarh and Punjab colleges. There is about 15000/- fee for M.A/M.Sc. for Chandigarh colleges and they take the examination fee of two semesters together. So, if the student leaves his studies, he cannot claim his refund. It has been seen that the candidates belonging to the backward areas have to pay a fee of about Rs. 50000/- per semester. So, he requested that it should be checked whether the colleges are charging fee as per the University norms. The colleges are taking some additional funds about which the University is not aware of. He requested that the especially good private colleges where the students of that area are converge for pursuing studies, their fees should be checked thoroughly as to whether they charge the fee as per the University norms or not. He requested to pay heed to his submissions.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would like to add something to what Professor J.K. Goswamy and Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji has said. She could understand that the income of the University has to be increased, rationalisation has to be done, but earlier also she has been saying that they also have to think about the expenditures. In the recent years the University has appointed some visiting Professors. She is not aware where there is a budget head for Visiting Professorship and she like to be educated on this. In the UGC SAP etc. they have a provision for Visiting Professorship. But the University has been appointing Visiting Professors and in one such case even when the Chairs were given. She was attending a meeting on the budget and in that meeting she noticed in the budget estimates that there was a provision made for Think Tank and Gian Setu and when she asked as to what does it mean, she was told that there is a Chair in Defence Studies Department which to be provided an office and some grant for seminars and to each Visiting Professor. The University would be giving Rs. 5000/- per visit and eight visits are allowed in a month meaning thereby that Rs. 40000/- to be given in a month. She thinks that they should make an assessment as to how much the University is paying to such Visiting Professors and what is the utility of these Visiting Professors. Are they delivering

lectures? It may be that Rs. 40,000/- would going to one person, though she is not sure, but then they have to cut down this expenditure. She requested that she should be told whether there is a budge head for Visiting Professorship.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he is not in complete agreement with what Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu has said. It has 2-3 reasons which he would like to tell. The proposal which was submitted by Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu had been accepted by the previous Punjab Government, perhaps Shri S.S. Maluka was the Education Minister at that time. The then Punjab Government had issued a letter that the colleges would take fee from the SC students and then the government would be pay the fee amount to the respective colleges and subsequently the colleges would refund the fee to the SC students or it would be put in their bank account. But due to resentment against it, the Punjab Government withdrew that letter. It is a matter of welfare and to his mind, they are not competent to take any decision. It is the policy of the Punjab Government and the Punjab Government should decide on it. Secondly, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu has stated that there is a rural area college, in which about 30-32% students belong to Schedule caste and the rest of the 68% population belong to other categories. He said there is no rule for 68% students, but only 32% students are being targeted. He was of the opinion that they should not discuss on any gender or any particular caste. Further, he would like to say that in that area there is great problem of girls' education. He requested that the education for girls should be provided free of cost. The students go to a college by covering a distance of 2-3 Kms. and if he/she does not go constituent colleges which are opened in the rural area for their development, the local administration should do introspection as to what are the lacunae or what are the problems. Sometimes the people do not attend the classes even after paying fee of IELTS. The question is not of paying the fee. What is needed is whether the infrastructure is there or facilities are provided. He also requested that the girl students and the students belonging to the weaker section of the society irrespective of their caste, should be allowed to deposit their fee in 3-4 instalments. There are many students who do not belong to reserve category, but their economic position is not so good. He requested that such people of weaker sections whose income is below Rs. 4 lacs per annum should be allowed to deposit their fee in 4-5 instalments and girl education should be given free of cost. The boys may not continue their studies after taking admissions, but he is of the opinion that there could be any such problem in the case of girl students. The girl students would come and also study in the colleges, but university has to open the doors for them. He further said that examination fee was enhanced last year and it has again been enhanced this year also from Rs. 2500/- to Rs. 2700/-. He requested that at least the examination fee should not be increased for some time because enough burden has already put on them. A person who is not able to pay Rs. 6500/- in a year, he is unable to understand how he could pay Rs. 2500/- at one time.

At this stage, Mrs. Anu Chatrath raised the issue of extension of the Deans Student Welfare and the discussion on this item has been separated from this discussion.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu requested the Vice Chancellor to complete the discussion on Item C-38.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he would like to talk on two issues. The first issue was that some of the college. Colleagues have said that the fee of SC students is not being reimbursed to them. He informed that a latest amendments to this has come about which the F.D.O. could explain better. He further said that they have to take the other charges from the SC students because the government would be reimbursing only

the minimum basic fee. So, they should study the latest amendments in the policy which is being implemented from the session 2018-19. The reimbursement of fee by the government for the year 2017-18 is only half. They have also to think about the fee of the SC students of constituent colleges. As regard the payment to the Guest Faculty, as Professor Rajesh Gill has stated, there is a research centre namely, Population Research Centre, which running under MHRD/ Ministry of Health. In that Centre, the faculty is teaching, but the MHRD and the Ministry of Health has also written to the University that they do not come under the teaching faculty. They have made payment to them in thousands. He requested to think about it and why they have allowed that person. While showing a letter of the Health Ministry, he stated that the said person does not have the required qualification.

Dr. K.K. Sharma stated that the said person is teaching Economics subject whereas his own subject is Anthropology.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are discussing Item No. C-38 and why they are mixing it with PRC.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that since they are talking about the finances and so they are discussing how to acquire the money.

The Vice Chancellor said, 'no' they are not talking on finances. He requested not to mix up the things. The Vice Chancellor asked to send an agenda item and they would then discuss it.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he is talking about the Guest faculty.

The Vice Chancellor said that nowhere there is the issue of guest faculty.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the zero hour is being discussed in between the items.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar asked Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu that they raise the issue when they like, but do not allow them to raise the issues concerning their college, which is not fair. He was not allowed to talk about his college.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Vice Chancellor) has not stopped him.

A din prevailed when several members started speaking together.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu said Principal R.S. Jhanji has given information regarding reimbursement of fee of SC students. Last year in November, the colleges got an email from the government where they have made a class wise capping and that the government would not reimburse beyond that amount. But he felt that the university fee could be less than that of the capping given by the government, so that have to study before taking any decision.

It was informed (by the F.D.O.) that the government has not actually mentioned as to what basic part is to be given, but they have actually fixed a ceiling and that is the maximum ceiling which the government would be reimbursing. In most of the courses, this ceiling is much more than the fee structure of Panjab University.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu informed that the capping is less than the fee of the colleges, but it is more than the fee of constituent colleges.

It was further informed (by the F.D.O.) that where the fee structure is more than ceiling, then they have to recover the fee from the concerned students.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu requested that they should first take a decision on Item No. C-38. He said that the University is already suffering a loss of Rs. 2 Crores as it is not getting fee. As Dr. Ajay Ranga has said that it is very difficult for the poor students to pay fee, he also agrees to that. But, about the letter which he (Dr. Ranga) says that it has been withdrawn, he (Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu) would like to inform that 50% colleges are charging full fee. Why that letter is not applicable to them?

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu on a point of order said that there are both the options available to the colleges from the government. If a college takes fee from the students, it has to give an undertaking that the college has taken the fee from the students, then the fee is reimbursed to the student. If a college gives an undertaking that they have not taken the fee from the student, then the fee is reimbursed to the college.

Continuing, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they also want that the fee should be reimbursed to the students and the college would like to take the fee from the students so that the University be not put to any further loss as the it is already suffering a loss of Rs. 2 crores. The SC candidates pay only Rs. 6500/- fee, but when such candidates take admission in self financing courses in the Universities, they pay a fee of Rs. 40,000/-. He would like to apologise from Dr. Ajay Ranga for saying so as he has no grudge with that category. While citing an example, he said that three students belonging to the SC category in his college come to the college on car but they pay fee of Rs. 230/- only. He never talked about the general category. He is just talking in the interest of the University. If the House agrees to him, then they should be allowed to take fee from the SC students. If Dr. Ranga ji or any other colleague has some objection on it, he could give his dissent. If the House does not agree to his proposal, he has no objection to it. The University is already at a loss of Rs. 2 crores and in the next years it would go on increasing, so it is the loss to the University. It is now for the House to accept it, they could resolve it, otherwise it is their will.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu and several other members said that Item No. C-38 is passed.

Principal I.S. Sandhu enquired whether the fee would be charged from the SC/ST students.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that as Principal I.S. Sandhu is saying that the fee would be charged from these students, he requested the Vice-Chancellor to clarify it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the fee would be charged.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that since there is a policy of the Punjab Government and if a student is not able to pay the fee, then how could they charge the fee.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they would charge the fee under the policy and an undertaking would be given that they are charging the fee and the same be reimbursed to the account of the students.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that earlier problems were faced on account of reimbursement in the accounts of the students because some students leave the courses in-between. It would lead to depriving the education and would vitiate the

academic atmosphere. Since the students got the reimbursement in their accounts and leave the courses that is why this practice was stopped by the Government.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that except two members, the whole House agrees to his proposal.

The Vice-Chancellor said, alright.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that it is not an issue of agreeing or disagreeing but of a policy. He said that another policy is being framed that the Colleges which are not charging the fee are threatening the students and are not issuing the degrees and certificates to the students. The issue of reimbursement of fee is between the Government and the University and there is no fault of the students in this. There are some students who are not able to pay even a fee of Rs.2,000/- whereas they are asking the students to pay the fee in advance.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal requested Shri Sandeep Singh as to which are the Colleges which are not issuing the certificates to the students without charging the fee.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that one such College is Khalsa College, Mahilpur and other one is DIPS College. The Registrar has also issued a letter to such a College namely Government College, Hoshiarpur asking the students to pay even the late fee of Rs.2,000/-. He could provide a copy of that letter. The students were not issued the degree at the time of Convocation.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if any student is fault, then the late fee has to be paid by such a student.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that he endorses what Shri Sandeep Singh is saying and action should be taking on these Colleges.

Shri Sandeep Singh pointed out that the faculty of Rayat and Bahra College has not been paid the salary for the last 7 months whereas they are just talking about the issue of only the fee.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the item under consideration is regarding enhancement of fee in Panjab University Constituent Colleges. The Panjab University Constituent Colleges are situated in the rural areas and the rural area under Panjab University is mainly lower hilly area and he has already pointed out many times that it is a low income area in the lower strata of Punjab. One such College is at Balachaur. If they enhance the fee for these areas, it would directly affect the students of this area. So, they should think over it and only then take a decision. He pointed out that in one of the Colleges whatever is being done to the teachers is very shocking, he would speak on that in the next item. They could enhance the fee in a very reasonable way by 1-2% so that it could not directly affect the students. If they are not able to impart education to the students and leave it to the private institutions running like shops, then what is the role of the University.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that what is the difference between those institutions and the University. He recorded his dissent against the fee hike.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he agrees with Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa that they should not even hike the fee by 5% but the issue which he is

raising is a different one. A lot of loss is being faced by the University as the students are not attending the classes. At least a nominal fee should be charged which could be reimbursed in the accounts of the students. His plea is that the University should get the fee.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that then what Dr. Ajay Ranga has said is the best way that the fee should be reimbursed in the accounts of the students who are proved to be economically weaker.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that what Principal I.S. Sandhu is saying is totally wrong. There are some students who could not even pay a fee of Rs.2,000/-.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there are students who are even paying a fee of Rs.12,000/- in DAV College, Abohar, then why such a student could not pay a fee of Rs.6,500/-.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Principal I.S. Sandhu is saying rightly that in his area the students are studying even by paying a fee of Rs.50,000/-.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he is in favour of the students but at least a nominal fee should be charged from the students. If a student is paying of Rs.14,000/- at a College, then why such a student could not pay a fee of Rs.6,500/- at some other College.

Dr. Surinder Kaur said that they should charge at least some fee from the students. If there is no pressure on the students whether girls or boys, they would not come to the College and attend the classes due to which their attendance also falls short. The University should fix some minimum charges which the students have to pay compulsorily only then the students would regularly attend the classes otherwise the studies are being affected.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he is in favour of the welfare of the students. If some fee is charged from the students, they would be regular in attending the classes.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the attendance of the students could not be connected with the payment of the fee. It is wrong to say so.

Dr. Surinder Kaur said that such students even do not turn up for appearing in the practical examination and have to be called from their homes.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this item has come to them after consideration by some of them only, some of them who are running the Colleges, some who are teaching in the Colleges. They are well aware of the circumstances under which the item has been placed before them. After that this kind of a discussion where they want to scuttle everything, what is the proposition in that. The proposition is just very simple and nobody is having a look at that but having a verbal duel testing each other's lung power and testing his patience. He has no problem and he is ready to sit up to 12 O'clock midnight. The increase in fee is just 5%.

Dr. Surinder Kaur said that the students neither attend the classes nor come to appear in the practical examination.

Shri Sandeep Singh suggested that the names of the students who do not attend the classes should be struck off.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these are the recommendations of the Committee comprising of Principal N.R. Sharma, Principal I.S. Sandhu, Dr. Dalip Kumar, Dr. P.S. Dhingra, their own colleagues of long standing who have given a small proposition.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that the items C-38 C-39 and C-40 should be approved which was endorsed by a few other members also.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there is another issued related with the SC students.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu requested Principal I.S. Sandhu that he would clarify it that there is a condition of the Government that if a student does not complete the degree within a period of three years, the institution would have to refund the money to the Government. If a student leaves the course without completing it, then it is the responsibility of the institution to refund the money to the Government which a student has availed. Only the students who have fulfilled the condition of 75% attendance are eligible for seeking the benefit. If this condition is not fulfilled, then the money is to be refunded to the Government.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that it is right that the students have to fulfil the conditions of the Government.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to whether it is an agenda item to which the members said, 'no'. He said that then why they are discussing it. The items C-38, C-39 and C-40 are approved.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if the University did not like his proposal, he withdraws his proposal. He is just suggesting this for the welfare of the University. They should just discuss on the item regarding proposal of 5% hike in fee.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to bring an item for consideration.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he would discuss the Item C-39.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this item is passed.

Shri Naresh Gaur and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they want to discuss this item as earlier the Vice-Chancellor had stopped them from discussing Item C-39.

Shri Jarnail Singh also said that earlier they were stopped from discussing Item C-39.

Thereafter, the Vice-Chancellor allowed the discussion on Item C-39.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that this item relates to the enhancement of the fee and the examination fee. Referring to page 48 of the agenda, he said that the examination has been hiked with reference to what it was earlier. When they increase the fee, it creates confusion amongst the students. He suggested that the examination fee should not be increased at least for three years. Due to confusion about payment of examination fee, the students pay the old fee due to which their results are either not declared or are held up. Otherwise also the results are not declared in time. The results of the earlier semesters are not declared in time before the commencement of the examination for the next semesters. So, the examination fee should not be

enhanced and it should be given a proper thought in consultation with the Controller of Examinations.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the fee had been enhanced from Rs.1,500/- to Rs.2,500/- per semester which has now been enhanced to Rs.5,400/-.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that there should be no hike in fee at least for three years. He recorded his dissent against the hike in examination fee.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that the examination fee should not be enhanced it is already on the higher side.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that since this is a table agenda item, nobody knows about it and they are unnecessarily discussing it.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that this item should again be placed before the Senate in its meeting to be held on 27th May, 2018.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal recorded his dissent against the fee hike.

Shri Raghbir Dyal also recorded his dissent.

It was clarified (by the Finance and Development Officer) that in order to rationalize and augment the University resources so that they could meet the default increase in expenditure, the expenditure on salaries of the University which is bound to increase @ 8-10%, so a Committee was constituted. This Committee was to see all the fee of the Departments, Regional Centres as well as the examination fee. The Dean Student Welfare was a member of the Committee, even the representative of the Students' Council was also there. Initially, the proposal was to enhance the fee up to 20% but with the persistent insistence of the representative of the students, then the upper limit of enhancement was restricted to 10% only. Rather in case of the ongoing students, that limit was fixed at 5% only. In the case of examination fee, it was not enhanced last year rather for the last two years. So, this is the third year. Keeping in view that next year, they should not enhance it drastically it was proposed that the examination fee be also enhanced by 10% but again with a rider that in no case the enhancement in per semester examination fee should be more than Rs.200/-. In view of all these things, the recommendation was made by the Committee which was considered by the Syndicate which formed a Committee headed by Dr. Subhash Sharma and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma as one of the members. This Committee recommended certain further reduction in the fee and after that reduction, this fee was proposed. Regarding certain observations on the miscellaneous charges that some charges have been enhanced from Rs.270/- to Rs.400/-, rather with the process of rationalization certain heads have been combined. That is why it seems that the enhancement is more than a reasonable percentage.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that when the fee was hiked from Rs.1,500/- to Rs.2,500/-, then what was the hike in percentage.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that they have enhanced the fee by 300% which otherwise would have been enhanced in 30 years.

The Vice Chancellor said that the budget of the University is presented to all of them every year and they are well aware that certain projections have been made, the way the annual income of the University will enhance. So, those projections have to be

met. If they do not meet those projections, the Central Government and the State Government are not going to meet those shortfalls. So, he requested that they should be conscious of it. The projections which have been made are not exorbitant as has been explained by the Finance & Development Officer just now. The projection which has been made, in the last two years, has not been increased. Now in the subsequent years it is being recommended to be increased by a very small amount. If they would not even do this and this Committee was asked to have this thing in view, what the projections are or the University is going to financially sail through, it is okay with him if they want to cut down these things to bare minimum. He requested to be conscious that nobody is going to come to replenish that. If it is not to be replenished, then the salary paid to the employee of the University, teaching and non-teaching, again they will say that he is making a statement which he ought not to make today, but the salary would have to be frozen, there is no option.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that they are not talking about any other fee, but they are talking only about the examination fee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the examination fee is a very big component of the University's income. If that big component is not enhanced, how would they survive.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu said that it is not a question of just Rs.200/-, the enhancement is Rs.200/- per semester which means an increase of Rs.400/- per year. The fee of the Colleges has been hiked by Rs.1,000/- for a year whereas the examination fee hike is Rs.400/-. He pointed out that the Colleges have to pay the salary to the teachers for whole of the year whereas the examinations are to be conducted only for a period of few days. It is not a proper rationalisation way. If they feel that the University is in trouble, then why the fee for the campus students should also not be enhanced.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had done it but they did not approve it and reduced the same last year. They are not conscious but taking only populous decisions. They should take this unpopulous decision also that the salaries paid to the employees of this University shall remain frozen until they resolve this problem.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu while referring to page 51 of the agenda papers said that for B.A./B.Com LL.B (5 Year Course) LL.B (3 Year Course) the University is charging Rs. 1650/- whereas for B.A.-1, they are charging Rs. 2500/-. They are increasing the fee in the colleges but not in the campus.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that for B.A. Examinations, the fee is Rs. 1650/-.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that as per the fee mentioned at page 51, Rs.1650/- fee is for the professional Course and in the colleges the University is charging Rs. 2500/- for simple course with practical.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal requested the Controller of Examinations to enquire about it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the contention of the members is that for the same course when it is run in a college, the students have to pay Rs. 2500/-. The Vice Chancellor asked the Controller of Examinations if this is a correct statement.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that while referring to page No. 48, Sr. No. 3 of the agenda said that the fee for B.A. (without Practical) is Rs. 1650/-.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that this fee for those who do B.A. after doing Shastri.

It was clarified (by the Controller of Examinations) that this fee is for all B.A. candidates.

Principal S.S. Sangha enquired about the B.A. fee written under Sr. No. 4 to which it was informed that this fee is for B.A. (with practical).

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that for the information of the House, this Committee met two years back, it was headed by Professor Navdeep Goyal. Earlier, the fee used to be Rs. 1200+300 i.e. Rs. 1500/-. Rs. 300/- was the practical fee and now they have clubbed that and made it a standard fee of Rs. 2500/-. Now it is proposed to be Rs. 2700/-. The increase is from Rs. 1200/- to Rs. 1500/- and there is no increase of Rs. 2500/-. This had happened in 2014-15 and not in 2015-16 and 2016-17 and after that there is no change. The fee for B.A./B.Com LL.B (5 Year Course) LL.B. (3 year Course) was Rs. 1200/- and it has been change to Rs. 1500/- and proposed fee is Rs. 1650/- because there is no practical involved. The fee has been streamlined, the categories have been reduced. Earlier there were ninety categories but now there are twenty categories. Earlier there were 9 annexures but now there are three annexures for all the classes.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he has total dissent on Item No. C-39 for increase in the fee. It has been said that for the ongoing students the increase in the tuition fee is 5%, but the other charges are increased 10%. When they claim that the fee has been increased by 5%, then why the other charges have been increased by 10%. They are doing it very cleverly so that the others may not know about it. He said as per his (F.D.O) statement, the fee for ongoing students has been increased by 5% and for the new students the fee has been increased by 10%. He asked the reason behind it.

It was informed (by the F.D.O.) that the fee structure has two components, one is tuition fee and the other is usual charges. It is specifically and explicitly mentioned in the recommendations of the Committee. No concealment has been there, the students representatives were there. For tuition fee, the ceiling was 5% and usual charges across the board have been increased by 10%. It has been specifically mentioned in the recommendations of the Committee which are available at page 37 of the agenda papers.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that such a thing had happened when Shri Budhi Raja was the Dean College Development Council. He further said that that they cannot decide the fate of twenty thousand students just inviting one representative of Students Council, this is wrong. He further said that there many teachers who get the fees of their children remitted; why do they do so? Can a teacher not pay the fee of his/her children? Do the children of a teacher get reservation and fee remittance because they are children of a teacher? The teachers are paid salary to the tune of Rs. 1.5 lacs p.m. or so, but when it comes to remittance of fee of poor students, then they say, how the University would run and thus they start thinking of all these things. They do whatever suits them. They should take a decision that the children of the teachers would not be given any type of facility. Notwithstanding the fact that even by having huge salary, the

teachers get the fees of their children remitted. He can give a list of such teachers. He requested that the enhanced fee should be set right.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that in Annexure-1 Item No. 18 for the Course Master in Governance & Leadership was introduced last year and its fee has been enhanced. The students have also given a representation in this regard. Since the fee is already very high, so she requested that the fee should not increased at least for this year.

Professor Pam Rajput said that the she just wants to reinforce what Dr. Ameer Sultana has said. First of all, she would like to say that the Course of Master in Governance & Leadership is one of the special courses. She thinks that in this region, Panjab University is the only University running this course. Only the Pune University or some I.I.M. is running this course. The fee is already very high and the idea behind it was to encourage the students.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what profit the University got from this course.

Professor Pam Rajput said that whole profit from this course went to the University. The building which is being used belong to Centre for Women Studies, all the faculty are from within the University, no guest charges, however this Rs. one crore has been earmarked this time. No Clerk is there in the office. All the fee is coming to the University. They could not create a library, not a single book has been purchased for the students. If the things would go like this, then how the course would run. She requested that the Course is still in its first year so the fee may not be increased as already requested by Dr. Ameer Sultana. If the fee is to be increased, it could be increased in the next year. She further said that for the new courses the fee might not be increased for three years.

Professor J.K. Goswamy said that he is very happy to know that some course like Governance and Leadership is coming up but he wanted to know as to how many students have joined that course. They are trying to be innovative but there are not many takers for such courses. In the first instance, they start self financed courses but later on they convert such courses to partial financed then leading to marginal self financed. Why do they want to be in that loop of self financed courses when they know that they could not sustain for a long time? Same is the scenario with PU-ISSER, where there are no students and teachers as in the course on Governance and Leadership.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the course in PU-ISSER is successful.

Professor Pam Rajput said that the course on Governance and Leadership is also successful.

Continuing, Professor J.K. Goswamy said that unless there is a teacher to teach, there is no meaning of successfulness. They all are discussing the issue of fee. There are so many Visiting Professors getting hefty amount and some of them are here on the pretext of free survey. So, they should control such things at some level and adopt austerity measures instead of putting all the burden on the students who could revolt at some stage. He had worked at Government College, Ropar and his first experience was that when a student paid a fee of Rs.320/-, it was in a sullen pack of Rs.10/- notes. He knows about the poor condition of the students and they should concentrate on them. In addition, they should adopt some austerity measures stack.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that during the last year, i.e., 2017-18, they did not hike any fee. The Vice-Chancellor had given a statement in the Syndicate and he had also asked about it. The Director, Sports had issued a letter which might have been issued inadvertently. On the basis of that letter, some Colleges had deposited the fee. Now the Director, Sports is issuing a letter to the rest of the Colleges saying them to be the defaulters whereas no fee was enhanced during 2017-18 by any regulatory body, i.e., either by Senate or the Syndicate. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to look into that matter also.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the examination fee is considered as income generation for the University. As far as he remembers in the last budget, there was approximately a profit of Rs.88-90 crores from the examination. As is being discussed that the examination fee of Rs.5,400/- is being charged from the affiliated Colleges and this fee for the Constituent Colleges is Rs.6,500/- for a year. About 1.5 to 2 lac students from all over the Punjab pay the examination fee to the University. The University has allotted private Centres to the Colleges where 200 to 400 students appear in the examination for which the University has to create the infrastructure and other facilities as every College does not have the required sitting capacity. He suggested that whenever an examination centre is created in the Colleges, some fixed amount should be provided to the Colleges for the infrastructural facilities.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, 'it is well said'.

Continuing Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that about two years go, examination centres were created in the Colleges in response to which the Colleges had written the letter to the University that some Colleges are not able to take the private students or before creating an examination centre they be asked as to how much students they could accommodate beyond the capacity of their own students. Earlier, the examination centres were created for a strength of about 250 students but now the strength has been enhanced to more than 450 students. Since the sitting capacity of a room is about 35, it becomes difficult for the Centre Superintendents, Deputy Superintendents, Principals to inspect the rooms. This is also a problem for the Flying Squad. He suggested that an ideal strength of students for creation of an examination centre should be around 250 otherwise it would affect the quality of examination system.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, 'well taken' and directed the Controller of Examinations to look into it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that now a time has come that under the garb of meeting the expenditure of the University, hiking the fee of the Colleges is not justified. He had earlier also pointed out that there are some courses which have been started by the University and are a burden on the exchequer of the University. There are some courses of B.A. which are not useful but a burden on the faculty and the non-teaching staff. He had earlier also requested that they should start the B.Sc. (Honours School) courses in the 'A' grade or Colleges for Potential Excellence particularly in Chandigarh. Time has come to have a relook on the ongoing graduation courses. According to him, it is not good for the financial health of the University. They should dismantle the graduation courses from the University and pay attention to the self-financing courses like B.Com. LL.B. and master degree courses. He again requested that the Colleges which are charging higher fee than the one prescribed by the University should be got checked. He suggested that the examination fee should not be hiked as it is very difficult for the students to pay the fee. The rural students face a lot of problems in paying the fee and the drop-out rate of these students is very high. He pointed out that

out of a revenue of Rs.250 crore of the University, they are collecting about Rs.100 crores from the Colleges but there is no improvement in the facilities. He requested that the examination fee should not be hiked. If the Vice-Chancellor does not care for what he is requesting, then his dissent be recorded.

Shri Naresh Gaur enquired as to what is the resolved part of the Item C-39.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested that the examination fee should not be hiked for this year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members have to take a decision.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that this power of the Vice-Chancellor has not been withdrawn.

Dr. Sarabjit Kaur said that in the Education Colleges, the whole of the 3rd semester of the B.Ed. course is for school internship and the University charges the full examination fee for that from the students. Many Colleges have faced the problem as the students are not ready to pay this examination fee. Even the parents also approach the Colleges that why they should pay the examination fee as no theory examination is conducted for the internship. She requested that a cut could be put on it and a clarification be issued to the Colleges as they are facing the problems on this count.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as pointed out by Dr. Sarabjit Kaur, the M.Sc. Microbial Biotechnology course also has a full semester as project work and there is no examination. So, that should also be looked into.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they are having the problems at larger level whereas they are trying to find out a solution to the same at microscopic level. This is the main problem. The Constituent Colleges were opened with a purpose to provide sustainable education to the students of that region. Now they are facing the problem on the issue of fee. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu has raised a good issue. Dr. Ajay Ranga has also raised a good issue. If the fee of the students of the Constituent Colleges is to be reimbursed by the Government, then according to him Principal I.S. Sandhu could also agree that the money is reimbursed. But there are some conditions like that if a student does not fulfil the requirement of 75% attendance, or the students leave the course, then the money is not reimbursed. This problem could not be solved only with the issue of payment of fee but it has to be sorted out at the level of the DPI Colleges or the Central Agency dealing with the Constituent Colleges. As Shri Raghbir Dyal has rightly pointed out, the issue of fee is not linked with the payment of the salary of the teachers and the employees but also with the facilities to be provided to the Colleges. If this body does not take a decision on a larger level because the issues are of macro level whereas the solution being suggested is of micro level. Everyone agrees that the fee should not be enhanced as it would put the students to difficulty but they are also facing the problem of finance and infrastructure, how that problem is to be solved. They have to take a call on it. It is right that they could take a decision regarding the Constituent Colleges and self-financed courses but with that the problem of the University which has more than 191 affiliated Colleges would not be solved. So, they should have a very rational view on this. For the time being, they could take a decision. But this problem would further continue in the years to come. They have to think over as to how to resolve the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the examination fee was hiked, it was hiked hesitatingly under very compelling circumstances and was increased manifold. Since

at that time, it was not possible to enhance the tuition fee, the only way out was to enhance the examination fee so that they were able to project with the Government, in the Court and also to the Board of Finance that this is how they are going to enhance their revenue. At that time, this decision was also taken that since they are increasing the examination fee manifold, they must take into account that it does not become a regular feature. As the Finance and Development Officer has explained that they are enhancing the tuition fee by 5% for ongoing students and 10% for other charges across the board. There it has not been distinguished between the ongoing students and the new entrants but the increase is 10% for all. He could understand the anxiety of the University authorities, Senate and Syndicate to enhance the revenue of the University as the Vice-Chancellor has already said that unless they are able to reach the projected figure, they could not expect anything from the Government of India or other funding agencies. But they are forgetting one thing that along with this decision in principle that in phased manner they must increase the fee, this decision was also taken that they must cut down their own expenditure also. He did not know as to why they are only trying to project that by 5% increase, such a revenue would be generated and by 10% increase, this much revenue would be generated. He has yet to see any proposal which has been put before the Senate, Syndicate or the Board of Finance that by a specified cut, they would be saving this much money which ultimately would enhance the revenue only, as he had told that penny saved is penny earned. Rather his observation is that immediately after increasing the examination fee in the name of generating more revenue to meet the deficit, they have increased the expenditure also because they got some money in the name of revenue generation and they immediately took the decision to increase the compensation for so many other purposes. Similarly, if they take the decision to increase the expenditure, he does not know, but the Finance and Development Officer must be knowing about it, for any project especially these days, a viability report is made like that if a new course is to be started, they have to see the viability, desirability from all angles. The most important angle is the financial module that how much money they would be able to generate, how money would have to be spent year-wise and whether it would be possible for them to run any course on the basis of self-financing pattern or as the case may be. But here never any proposal has been made while starting a new course as to how much faculty is required.

The Vice-Chancellor said, 'well taken'.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that as he was just having a look, if by increasing the fee, for example increasing the fee from Rs.2 lacs to Rs.2.25 lacs, if they are not getting the seats filled for Rs.2 lacs only but by increasing the fee to Rs.2.25 lacs, they would be losing the fee of Rs.1.75 lacs which they were earning. So, they have to see by way of comparison that if somebody is getting a degree for Rs. 2 lacs, for example in MDS, there are some branches where the MDS degree is available for a fee of Rs.2 lacs and they are proposing to increase it to Rs.4.85 lacs, then who would come for this course. To his knowledge, there are some vacant seats also. Like it has been done on Baba Farid University that in PG courses, they have got different fee structure for different PG courses. For example, if the Orthodontics is in demand, there is a different fee, for non-clinical PG, the fee is half. So, they must see that the maximum revenue is generated by increasing the fee or may be by decreasing the fee. Simultaneously, they must see that how the expenditure could be curtailed. If on one side they are increasing by 5% and 10% and on the other side they are saying that Rs.40,000/- be paid to the Visiting Professor irrespective of the fact whether they have got the revenue or not and if they are doing all this to meet the permanent liability of the permanent faculty and staff, then they must see the minimum expenditure which is required for the welfare of the University and its students. In view of that, his simple proposal is that if 5% fee has been increased for ongoing students, the other charges

should also not be more than 5% for ongoing students. As far as new students are concerned, as far as possible as he has mentioned about PG courses in Dental College, let they see with a view to increase the revenue to fix the fee even if it is to be made 10%, then that 10% be 10% only and they should be clear enough that it should increased to next 10 only. They are not very much against the increasing the fee also. Along with this if they are charging higher fee from the students, are they not responsible that the facilities which are basically meant for the students should be provided. He is very happy with the recommendation of the Committee for Constituent Colleges where it has mentioned that Amalgamated Fund be spent on some specified activities. He wondered whether the University has got any control over affiliated Colleges as far as the Amalgamated Funds are concerned. Is it not the responsibility of the University as per the Statutes of the University to ask for the details of the Amalgamated Funds which are available with the affiliated Colleges and it is so sorry state of affairs in the Colleges that the Amalgamated Fund which is meant only and only for students for particular purposes mentioned in the Panjab University Calendar, is being misused as Management Fund, as a fund which is at the sole discretion of the Management. So, these things should also be kept in mind while taking the decision of enhancing the fee.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that Professor J.K. Goswamy and Shri Ashok Goyal have talked about how to curtail their expenditure.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Ashok Goyal would chair the Committee on how to curtail the expenditure which would include Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. Subhash Sharma and Shri Naresh Gaur as members.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the Deputy Registrar (General) has prepared a whatsapp group of Syndicate and Senate members. He suggested that sending of the invitation cards for lunch should be stopped and a message could be sent through this group. They save a lot of money by saving each penny. Secondly, the tea or the lunch being served during the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, that should be a working lunch. Let they start curtailing the expenditure from here only.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if this is the message that they want to give, he had suggested in one of the meetings that let they take a pledge that they would forego the TA/DA connected with the University work. What message Dr. Dalip Kumar is giving that they should skip the lunch.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let this Committee be given some time to work on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested the name of Professor Keshav Malhotra for the Committee to which the Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine and Shri Ashok Goyal could co-opt anybody for this Committee.

Shri Naresh Gaur enquired as to what is the resolved part of the item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the resolved part is that for the new students the hike in fee and examination fee is 10% and for the old students, the hike is 5%. As suggested, the fee for the newly introduced courses would not be hiked during the first 2-3 years. The extra money to be generated due to the hike in fee would not go towards the salary bill but would be utilised for improving the labs on the University campus.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Shri Jarnail Singh, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha suggested that the examination fee should not be enhanced.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the examination fee has not been enhanced for the last two years.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the fee is being hiked from Rs.1,500/- to Rs.2,500/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could take a decision that the University's income would be looked at while granting the increase in DA.

Shri Jarnail Singh, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Shri Sandeep Singh recorded their dissent.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that it should be got reviewed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that somebody has to look at revenue.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the maximum ceiling is of Rs.1,000/- whereas the examination fee is being enhanced more than it.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they had enhanced the fee by Rs.1,000/- a year ago.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the fee has been enhanced by Rs.2,000/- per year.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he is with the authorities to take up the issues with the Government but the burden should not be put on the students.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if they enhance the fee, there could be agitations in Punjab.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the students could agitate on the issue of fee hike, they have to face the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the income of the University would not increase, there would be problems and somebody has to look at as to what is the inflow and outflow otherwise the figures that they have submitted to the Central Government that how the income of the University would increase. If the income does not increase, they should be conscious that the Centre may not adhere to meet their shortfall.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they are requesting for not enhancing the examination fee. The examination fee is the income of the University. He is here only for two months and after that they would to face the problem.

Shri Sandeep Singh suggested that the remuneration for the evaluation which has been hiked should be stopped.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar objected to it and said that the fee should not be enhanced.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that the examination fee could be enhanced by Rs.50/-.

Professor Ronki Ram also endorsed it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the fee could be hiked by 10%.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the marking fee should be enhanced.

Professor Ronki Ram suggested that the examination fee be enhanced by Rs.50/- which means Rs.100/- per year and they would be able to tell the Government that they have enhanced the fee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they did not enhance the fee, they would have to face the problems.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that since the enrolment in the College has already decreased and if they enhance the fee, it might not be that the enrolment reduces further.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is okay with it but they should be conscious that they have to take hard decisions which means that at the end of this year, look at the income that has got generated in the previous two semesters and when the Board of Finance meeting would occur to send the revised estimates before 30th September, they should look at their inflow and outflow status and whatever it is, it should be handled there. If the only option left at that stage is freezing the DA or decreasing the salaries, then they should be prepared to take the hard decisions. He is just making them conscious of that. Even if they increase the examination fee in view of diminishing number of students writing the University examinations, it is possible that their income is going to continuously decrease every year. If the students are not enrolling, University's income would continuously decrease, then they have to find some innovative ways to handle the University's affairs. One innovative is to get the technology into place so that the expenses towards the conduct of examinations go down. The other is as suggested by someone that they should look at where the courses could be squeezed, which courses could be discontinued without affecting the University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that a common school be created to have a common clerical staff.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is not the time to discuss these things.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Haryana Government is requesting for affiliating its Colleges, the University should grant the affiliation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he accepts that a total fee of Rs.400/- (Rs.200+Rs.200/-) was enhanced and there is a general perception that it should be Rs.50+Rs.50 and he had proposed Rs.100+Rs.100. So, they could enhance the fee by Rs.75+Rs.75/-.

Most of the members agreed to it.

Shri Sandeep Singh recorded his dissent against this. He said that in S.D. College only 120 students took the admission year and only 80 in DAV College.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha asked whether the final decision is enhancing the fee by Rs.50+Rs.50/-.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that the increase is Rs.75+Rs.75/-.

RESOLVED (C-38): That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-38,** on the agenda, **as per Appendix-I**, be approved.

The following members recorded their dissent:

1. Professor Chaman Lal
2. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
3. Shri Jarnail Singh
4. Shri Naresh Gaur
5. Shri Raghbir Dyal
6. Shri Sandeep Singh

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

(i) the income generated from the enhanced fee be utilised for providing quality education to the students by developing infrastructure;

(ii) to provide free wifi facility to the students of regional Centres, an MoU be signed with the companies which have already installed their towers.

RESOLVED (C-39): That –

(i) recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-39** on the agenda, **as per Appendix-II**, be approved with the modification that the other charges from the existing students be hiked by 5%. The examination fee be hiked by Rs.75/- per semester;

(ii) the fee for the newly introduced courses especially Masters Program in Governance and Leadership be not hiked for three years.

The following members recorded their dissent:

1. Professor Chaman Lal
2. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
3. Shri Jarnail Singh
4. Shri Naresh Gaur
5. Shri Raghbir Dyal
6. Shri Sandeep Singh

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Committee be constituted to suggest the ways of curtailing the expenditure:

1. Shri Ashok Goyal (Chairperson)

2. Professor Navdeep Goyal
3. Dr. Subhash Sharma
4. Shri Naresh Gaur

RESOLVED (C-40): That recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-40** on the agenda, **as per Appendix-III**, be approved.

While raising the issue of extension of the Deans Student Welfare, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that with due apologies from all the honourable members and the Chair, she stated that she and Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji has to go somewhere. They just like to add on one agenda, because yesterday she was reading the decision of the Syndicate on extension given to the Dean Student Welfare. In the past they have been giving extension to the D.S.W. for a period of one year. It has never been in the history of the University that they have given extension as if they are doing mercy to the D.S.W. because in the past D.S.W. has proved his capability. So she requested that instead of giving extension to the D.S.W. till August only, it should be for a period of one year, she believed that everybody would agree to it.

The Vice Chancellor said that they take it up when this would come up.

Continuing, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she and Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji both have to speak on this issue, but they have to go somewhere. She said that all the members have agreed to it and she has taken their permission.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that this issue is not on the agenda.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that they have left the earlier items and started discussion on Item No. C-37, C-38, C-39 & C-40 otherwise this issue could be discussed at Item No. C-14. Since they have left the earlier items, so they are requesting to take up this issue now.

At this point of time some of the members suggested that Item No. C-14 should be taken up first for discussion. Some of the members said that this item is passed. However, some other members said that Item No. C-14 should be taken up for discussion so that Ms. Anu Chatrath and Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji could present their view point.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that on Item No. C-14, they want to add that the extension in the term of D.S.W. (Men) as well as D.S.W. (Women) should be at least for a period of one year.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the term of Associate Dean (D.S.W. Office) should also be extended for one year.

The Vice Chancellor after looking into the agenda papers said that this item is not on the agenda.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the Syndicate has done it in the recent meeting and since the Senate meeting would not be held in the next 4-5 months so they raised the issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has promised that he will have a Senate meeting before his term comes to an end.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that all the Senate members have agreed to it. If the Senate members could do it in the next meeting, they could do it in this meeting also. If all the members have agreed to it, she was of the opinion that D.S.W. should be extended.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that this item used to come to the Senate after it is approved by the Syndicate. The other items have come to the Senate, but this item has not been placed before it. Therefore, they are making this request to consider alongwith other items.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not know why it has not come.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that it should have come.

The Vice Chancellor said that the items which they are considering, these are the left over items of previous Senate meeting.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she proposed before all the honourable members of the Senate that the term of D.S.W. should be extended for another period of one year which was endorsed by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Dr. D.P. Randhawa, Principal S.S. Sangha, Dr. Gurmit Singh and some other members.

The Vice Chancellor said this is not the item under consideration at the moment.

Dr. D.P. S. Randhawa requested the Vice Chancellor to listen on this issue and said that it is a very crucial time when the students election takes place. A new appointee would not be having that experience.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not taken a decision. They have a very long agenda to discuss and requested not to start another war.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that the Syndicate has taken the decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that there were some persons who forced this decision.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that any number of persons as prescribed under the Act, if they move a resolution, that is supposed to be considered in the Senate.

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

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not fair to do like this. There is going to be a Syndicate and Senate meeting before his term concludes.

Ms. Anu Chatra said that it cannot be considered in the Syndicate meeting because the Syndicate has already granted extension till August. The Syndicate's decision can only be modiefied by the Senate. The Syndicate has granted extension only upto August and they are saying to extend it for one year in the Senate which is a supreme Body.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Senate meeting is being held on 8th July.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said, that is a special meeting and it cannot be considered in the special meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that they can overrule him. This is not proper. He has not put the agenda item on the table.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that all the members resolves that by raising hands, she thinks, they can approve it to which several members endorsed by raising their hands.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma suggested to bring it as a special item.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that the item is already on the agenda.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not circulated it and there might be some members who may come and object to it.

Shri Jarnail Singh requested that the Vice Chancellor can bring the item right now.

The Vice Chancellor asked, what is the hurry?

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said the hurry is because till today it has not happened that any D.S.W. has been given extension only for three months. It is mockery of the system.

The Vice Chancellor said that Syndicate's composition has done it and requested not to start another war amongst themselves.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that they are modifying the decision of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the decision has not be put forward to them and so they cannot modify it.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that in the subsequent Senate they can do it. Whether the Vice Chancellor agrees to it or not that is the second question. But all the members unanimously resolve it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not recommending that they should follow this practice. The meeting of the Senate would be held on 8th July and the matter would be put up and they can then change it. At the moment the extension is there and whatever they want to change, they could change it on 8th of July.

Shri Jarnail Singh enquired whether it is a special meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that the 8th July meeting of the Senate would be a regular meeting.

Ms. Anu Chatrath that all the members present unanimously resolve it. Let it be a violation of the practice.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma requested to consider this on 27th May, 2018.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it cannot be considered on 27th May.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that since the power to extend it lies with the Syndicate so they should first get it done from the Syndicate to which some of the members objected.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested to consider it on 27th May.

Ms. Anu Chatrath told Shri Jarnail Singh that this is wrong practice, if one member has proposed, he must at least support.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that they could extend it on 27th May even for one year.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that on 27th May also, only they have to do it. If they can do it on 27th May, why not today itself.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have just kept one item on the agenda on 8th July so that they could do it even if it goes long.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that 8th July meeting is a special meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said, 'no' it is not a special meeting. At the moment only one agenda item is scheduled and he could add to few more agenda items.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she has proposed one thing. At least on that issue, there must be a resolved part. The Chair should assure that for extension of another one year, the matter would be placed before the Senate in that meeting or today it should be resolved.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would put the item on 27th May meeting of the Senate.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that on 27th of May, extension would be given for one year.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that item would be brought before the Senate.

This was agreed to.

VI. General Discussion

1. Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that when the results of the examination held in the month of March/April are declared, some students are placed under compartment and some of them get the result re-evaluated. The students fill up the forms for re-evaluation and compartment and have to pay the fee. The result of re-evaluation and compartment is declared after the last date of submission of forms for the compartment and the students have to pay a fee of Rs.2,500/- which is a burden on the students. He suggested that the evaluation of the compartment and re-evaluation should be got done on-the-spot and a timeframe of 30 days could be fixed to declare the results before the last date for submission of examination forms for the next semester.

Ms. Inderjit Kaur added that sometimes the result of the re-evaluation is declared before the commencement of the examination in which the student is declared as pass and the students have already paid the fee and have to suffer the financial loss.

The Vice-Chancellor requested to give in writing the full details so that it could be properly recorded and checked.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is in the knowledge of the Controller of Examinations and perhaps such results are delayed because it adds to the income of the University.

2. Dr. Surinder Kaur said that some of the Principals are harassing the teachers. The duties of Centre Superintendents for the conduct of examinations are to be assigned. If there is only Centre in a College, then the Principal should send the name of only a single person. The College teachers do not come to know whether they are being assigned the duties or not. She pointed out that some of the Principals recommend the names of the teachers for such places where they are not interested to go. The Principals use the scanned signatures of the teachers for this purpose. She suggested that a check should be put on such Principals who are misusing their powers.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that as pointed out by Dr. Surinder Kaur, this issue came to the notice of the University on 2nd May, 2018. It was related to a College of Moga whose teachers came to him and informed that their scanned signatures have been forwarded by the Principal without their consent. The teachers came to know about it when they got a SMS that they have been put on duty. There was a Screening Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to decide the duties of Superintendent, date sheet, etc. Immediately an SOS was sent to all the members. He was out of station on 2nd May and came back on 3rd May and a meeting was held on 4th May. Many members of the Committee are sitting here. That data was not misused, the only difference was that all the College teachers have been issued the examiner ID. Once a person logs in, the data itself is retrieved. The issue was that when the Principal forwarded the name, they did not follow the roster as to who is to be sent at which place. That was the mistake on behalf of the Principals. On 2nd May itself he had sent communication to the Principals as to why the names were sent to the University without the consent of the teachers. The reply to which was received on 3rd May which was given to all the members of the Committee. Ultimately, it was decided that the teachers whose names have been sent to the University without their consent, they should be removed from the duty of Centre Superintendent unless and until they opt themselves. The e-mail in this regard had been sent on 4th May itself. Three such names of the D.M. College, Moga have been removed. Same incident happened in one of the Colleges at Ferozepur. So, the University has sent a communication that if Principal could send get the signatures of the teachers or get their consent, only those would be treated on duty otherwise their duty stands cancelled.

3. Dr. Surinder Kaur said that the teachers appointed against the grant-in-aid posts are going to complete 3 years of service. She requested that the University should take care of their career.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would write a letter to Shri Manpreet Badal as earlier he had promised that those teachers would be paid the full salary.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor announced the items for Ratification and Information to be taken up. When Professor Rajesh Gill enquired about Item C-10, the Vice-Chancellor replied that it could be taken up on 27th May. The discussion related to the items under Ratification and Information has been made part of the concerned items. After discussion on Ratification and Information items, some discussion took place on other issues which has been made part of the general discussion.

4. Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that many issues have been raised in the meetings, but no action has been taken on them. In the last three meetings, he has raised the issue of S.D.P. College, Ludhiana that the teachers are not being given duty leave, casual leave, they are forced to have earned leave. Besides this they have been granted four year B.Ed. integrated course which is a profitable course. They have not been told as to what action has been taken against that college. Further, it has been stated that the teachers are deputed on duty without their consent. It is a good thing that the examination duties of the teachers of the DAV College Ferozepur and D.M. College, Moga have been cancelled. He requested that it should be ensured that in future no teacher should be put on duty without his consent. An undertaking should be taken from the Principal whether the consent of the teacher has been taken or not. The Panjab University has issued a circular on 21st August to all the affiliated colleges to give the status report with regard to the retiral benefits for which a separate budget head has to be opened by the colleges. No information has been given by the college, no enquiry has been made and no inspection has been done on this issue. In maximum of the colleges either the retiral benefits are not given or these are given after 3-4 years. They had a meeting at Ferozepur, the teachers of Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur has given a written representation stating that the college has not opened any separate account for this purpose, the retiral benefits are not given for years together. He requested that action should be taken against such colleges. If they cannot take any action, what type of governing body they are.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to take the action.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the action has to be taken by Vice Chancellor. He said that the Vice Chancellor should make a Committee and their affiliation should be cancelled and they should be fined for the lapse.

The Vice Chancellor asked Shri Jagdeep Kumar to submit a report on the functioning and lapse of the college.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Dean College Development Council to get a Committee constituted comprising Shri Jagdeep Kumar, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mahajan to look into the issue as pointed out by Shri Jagdeep Kumar.

5. Shri Ashok Goyal asked what action they have taken against the Principal who has sent the scanned signatures of the teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said what he can do. He has asked the Punjab Government to remove him, but the Principal comes again.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it does not mean that they have stopped the University from calling the explanation of that Principal who has done it. He requested to call for the explanation of the Principal so that it should come on record that such things are not taken lightly.

Dr. Dalip Kumar asked to make changes in the software.

6. Principal R.S. Jhanji while raising the issue of re-evaluation said that one of the students of his college got position in first three semesters. He applied for re-evaluation in the third semester in the month of May and the result was declared in the month of December i.e. after the gap of seven months and the D.M.C. was sent in 24th March i.e. after three months. Thus his result of 4th semester was held up and his result was declared as 'RL' because the third semester re-evaluation result was not declared. After a gap of one year his 4th Semester result was declared and the student was denied degree by saying that the Convocation has already been held on 4th March. After holding up his result for a year, the same was declared on 26th March and the student got first position, but due to this, he could not get any position in the top ten. He wanted to know as to what was the fault of the student. He further informed that the student did submit representation to the Registrar, Controller of Examination and the Vice Chancellor to this effect. Continuing, he further stated that he himself has written regarding this and he got the reply that since the Convocation has already been held, so nothing could be done. Though the student has got first position, but due to non-declaration of timely result, the student was deprived of getting the medal in the Convocation and the student is very much frustrated. Rather the University advised the student that the result has been sent to the Principal and same be collected from him.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the student should be awarded gold medal.

7. Shri Ashok Goyal said that Principal Jhanji is talking about the students, but he would like to tell what is happening in this University. There are some colleges who do not call the nominees of the University and nominees of the D.P.I. in Selection Committees throughout Punjab and those college teachers and the Principal of those colleges are not granted approval by the Government of India or by Guru Nanak Dev University and the Punjabi University. But here in Panjab University on what basis they are granting approval to those teachers where their nominee has not even gone, under what rules, under what statutes and under what practice, this should be looked into and the approval should not be granted where the Panjab University members have not gone as part of the Selection Committee. He further said that there are some people who are not even eligible for appointment, they are being appointed and the approval is being granted. This should be looked into.

The Vice Chancellor asked, which are those colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, D.A.V. Colleges to which the Vice Chancellor asked to send the cases. Shri Ashok Goyal said, all the D.A.V. Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that all DAV college people are their colleagues.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, alright, but are they within their prerogative to grant approval where the nominees from Panjab University have not gone.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to how many people are there in the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, let them reply.

The Vice Chancellor said, then he should raise it in the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, is he debarred to raise it in the Senate to which the Vice Chancellor said, okay, raise it.

The Vice Chancellor said unless and until it is reported, how does he would know.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is telling it now.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they should get prepared a list of such colleges to whom the approvals have been given by the Panjab University and whereas such cases are denied approvals by the Guru Nanak Dev University and Punjab Government. Such a list could be provided by the Dean College Development Council.

The Vice Chancellor asked Dr. Amit Joshi if he is having a list of such colleges.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested the Vice Chancellor to order the Dean College Development Council to prepare the list.

8. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that only the Principals of such colleges are exercising dictatorship. The Principals who have sent the letters with scanned signatures, their explanation should be called for as this is a fraud. A legal notice has also been issued to the University in this regard. These are the Principals whose appointment has been done without the presence of the University nominee in the selection committees and are acting like dictators. There is proforma devised by the University for taking consent of the teachers, but here no consent has been taken from the teachers. The college Principals should devise a procedure to depute the teachers on seniority basis. In this college, there are only eight teachers, out of them four teachers were recommended to outside duty so that the he (Principal) could do whatever he likes. He also requested that flying squad team should be sent to this college every day. Leaving aside senior-most teachers, temporary teachers are assigned the examination duties. As pointed out by Shri Ashok Goyal, such temporary teachers have been granted approval. He pointed out that out of the 12 books published, 6 have been copied by Mr. Gill and they have been granting approval to such teachers. Such Principals become dictators. He is also a Principal and so he would like to say that they have to remain within their prerogative.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has brought this thing to the notice of the Vice Chancellor when they were sitting in the office of the Registrar four months ago and the Register countered by saying that their information is wrong and the nominees of the University are going in the Selection Committees and he

said that they are sending the nominee in DAV College, Hoshiarpur and Garhshankar. Probably he does not know, those are not DAV Colleges. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) countered by saying that his simple proposal is, irrespective of the fact which college it is, where University nominee has not gone as part of the Selection Committee, they cannot grant approval.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the University office does not know whether these colleges fall under the DAV Management (of Delhi) or not. These colleges fall under a local management.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested to show displeasure of the Senate be conveyed to both these colleges, i.e., D.M. College, Moga and DAV College, Ferozepur.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first the explanation of these colleges be called for.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu also said that as the whole Senate wants, the explanation of these college should be sought.

Professor Ronki Ram said that whenever any Selection Committee meeting has to be held in a College, the University nominee must be present.

The Vice Chancellor said, let a Committee of eight Principals from the Principals Constituency attend and discipline their peers.

Professor Ronki Ram said that there should be a procedure. The names of the nominees and the experts should be sent by the Dean of College Development Council to the office of the Vice Chancellor. Accordingly, the team should go to the College and after holding the Selection Committee meeting, the proceedings should be submitted to the Vice Chancellor office. If the Vice Chancellor had not sent someone as his nominee, he could question how the interview took place in the College. How that appointment is made in that college and how it was sent for approval. How the file reached the Vice Chancellor's office when the nominee of the University was not there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is what he is saying.

Continuing, Professor Ronki Ram said that the appointments which were made without Vice Chancellor's nominee should not be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that those teachers are voters of the lecturers' constituency.

The Vice Chancellor said, what he could do.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that in one of the colleges in Jagraon, a teacher above the age of 50 years and having only M.Phil. degree is appointed a teacher without following the procedure due to which the teacher has suffered. Two years back the said teacher was appointed through the Selection Committee. The management is not at all aware of the eligibility.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar endorsed the view point expressed by Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and said that the management did a wrong thing.

9. Dr. K.K. Sharma raised the issue regarding change of referred journals by the UGC. The UGC time and again changes which are the approved journal and which are not approved journals. The teachers has got published their papers in the already approved list of 4500 journals, but now these journals have been disapproved by the UGC. He requested that the papers already published in these journals before their disapproval should remain valid.

The Vice Chancellor said that for this, they should approach the UGC.

VII. The information contained in **Items R-1 to R-24** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

R-1. That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has re-appointed the following (Sr. No.1 to 9) as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) and Sr. No. 10 (Ms. Simranjeet Kaur) as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) (subject to her nature of appointment will be decided after the final decision) at P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, Distt. Moga, w.e.f. the date they will start/started work for the session 2017-2018 upto the start of summer vacations 2018, against the vacant posts or till the post are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and condition on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Dr. Parminder Singh	Punjabi
2.	Mr. Sandeep Buttola	Sociology
3.	Dr. Shashi Kant Rai	Hindi
4.	Dr. Harjeet Singh	English
5.	Ms. Rajni Bhalla	Commerce
6.	Ms. Monica	Commerce
7.	Ms. Ritu Mittal	Economics
8.	Mr. Rajiv Kumar	Political Science
9.	Mr. Ashim Kumar	Mathematics
10.	Mrs. Simarnjit Kaur	Computer Science

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 38(i))

R-2. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the re-appointment of the following as Assistant Professors on contract basis at P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur, w.e.f. the date they start work for the session 2017-2018, against the vacant posts or till the new advertisement is released and appointment are made, whichever is earlier, at a fixed salary of Rs.30400/- on the same terms and condition on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

Sr.	Name of candidate	Subject
1.	Shri Varun Maini	Computer Science
2.	Shri Pawan Kumar	Computer Science

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 38(ii))

R-3. That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the appointment of Shikha Dhiman as Part time Assistant Professor in Law, University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U. on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) w.e.f. the date she starts work, for teaching 12 hours week in the UILS for the Academic session 2017-18.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 38(v))

R-4. That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Doctors working in B.G.J. Institute of Health, P.U. w.e.f. the dates noted against each, till further orders, with one day break after every six months, on the previous terms & conditions:

Name	Designation	Term upto	Date of break	Term start w.e.f.
Dr. Deepak Kaushik	Full-Time Medical Officer	28.10.2017	30.10.2017 **(29.10.2017 being Sunday)**	31.10.2017 onwards
Dr. Kajal Chawla	Part-Time Paediatrician	The Vice-Chancellor has already extended her term w.e.f. 11.07.2017 onwards i.e. upto the date on which new Doctor Joins duty in her place after afresh appointment, vide office orders No.11221-22/Estt. dated 28.07.2017		11.07.2017 onwards

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 38(vi))

R-5. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Neha Singla, Assistant Professor (Temporary), Department of Biophysics, w.e.f. 04.09.2017, by waiving off the condition of giving one month notice, under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, as she has joined as an INSPIRE faculty w.e.f. 05.09.2017 in the same department.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 38(vii))

R-6. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Rabia Narang, Assistant Professor (Temporary), at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, w.e.f. 17.07.2017 (F.N.) under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 41(i))

R-7. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Sonia Kapoor, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), w.e.f. 30.10.2017 (A.N.) instead of 30.09.2017 i.e. the date of resignation as already approved by the Vice-Chancellor vide order dated 30.08.2017 or so that her salary of one month may not be deducted, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 41(ii))

R-8. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Nidhi, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), w.e.f. 29.12.2017, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 41(iii))

R-9. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Inderjit Singh, Assistant Professor in Political Science (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College, Mohkam Khan Wala, Distt. Ferozepur w.e.f. 13.01.2018 (A.N.) under Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Calendar Volume-III, 2016.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 48(iii))

R-10. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the term of appointment of Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies, as Dean of International Students upto the date of Syndicate meeting, i.e., 19.11.2017.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 41(xi))

R-11. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Ms. Shaffy Girdhar, Assistant Professor in Computer Science, on Contract basis, P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib w.e.f. the date she starts/started work for the session 2017-18, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in on regular basis whichever is earlier, at a fixed salary of Rs.30400/-on the same term and condition on which she was working earlier for the session 2016-17.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 41(xii))

R-12. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the term of appointment of Professor Anil Monga, Centre for Police Administration as Dean Alumni Relations for another year w.e.f. 1.3.2018, on the same term and conditions.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 48(i))

R-13. In terms of the Syndicate decision dated 19.11.2017 (Para 6), the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Senate, has approved the promotion of Dr. Ravinder Kaur, Associate Professor, Department of Geography, from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) with effect from 30.06.2014 i.e. the last date of last publication in June, 2014 instead of 08.01.2014 as mentioned in office order No. 10492-10505/Estt. dated 15.11.2014, as she fulfilled the requisite API score of 120 (with capping) on the said date.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 48(ii))

R-14. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has:

(i) re-appointed afresh the following faculty, purely on temporary/Contractual basis w.e.f. 13.12.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 12.11.2018 with break on 12.12.2017 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation & Nature of Appointment
1.	Dr. Satya Narain	Associate Professor (Temporary)
2.	Dr. Maninder Pal Singh Gill	Associate Professor (Temporary)
3.	Dr. Rajdeep Brar	Assistant Professor (Contract)
4.	Dr. Prabhjot Cheema	Sr. Lecturer (Contract)

(ii) re-appointed afresh the following faculty purely on temporary/Contractual basis w.e.f. 11.1.2018 for 11 months i.e. upto 10.12.2018 with break on 10.1.2018 (Break day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation & Nature of Appointment
1.	Dr. Shally Gupta	Professor (Contract)
2.	Dr. Neeraj Sharma	Associate Professor (Temporary)
3.	Dr. Ikreet Singh Bal	Associate Professor (Temporary)
4.	Dr. Simranjit Singh	Sr. Assistant Professor (Temporary)

(iii) re-appointed afresh Dr. Vandana Chhabra, Associate Professor, on temporary basis w.e.f. 20.1.2018 for 11 months i.e. upto 19.12.2018 with break on 19.1.2018 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 48(iv))

R-15. That in terms of judgment dated 20.12.2017 passed by Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 1104 0f 2014 titled Khushpreet Singh Brar Vs Vice-Chancellor, P.U. & Others, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the appointment of Shri Khushpreet Singh Brar as Assistant Professor in the Department of Library & Information Science, P.U., Chandigarh in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100 +AGP Rs.6000 (subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh in LPA No. 62 of 2018 and CWP No. 17501 of 2011).

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 48(vi))

R-16. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted permission to Chandigarh Pollution Control Committee (CPCC) to set up Continuous Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Station near parking area of Centre for Public Health, Sector-25, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 48(i))

R-17. That Vice-Chancellor, has sanctioned Rupees One crore as application processing fee for applying the status of "Institute of Eminence" to the University Grant Commission out of "UIAMS (Exam) Fund".

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 48(iv))

R-18. That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Board of Studies dated 07.11.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following minor addition in Eligibility criteria for admission to M.Sc. (Instrumentation) to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information for the session 2018-19:

M.Sc. (Instrumentation) 2 years (4 semester)	**(Previous Eligibility)** B.Sc.(Physics/Electronics/Instrumentation Science/ Computer Science/ Vocational Physics/ Electronics) or B.E. (E & TC/ Instrumentation/ Electrical and Electronics/ Electronics & Electrical Communication Engineering) with minimum 50% marks in aggregate.

	(New Eligibility) B.Sc.(**Medical/Non-Medical**/ Physics/ Electronics/Instrumentation Science/ Computer Science/ Vocational Physics/ Electronics) or B.E. (E & TC/ Instrumentation/ Electrical and Electronics/Electronics & Electrical Communication Engineering) with minimum 50% marks in aggregate.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 48(viii))

R-19. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendations of the Board of Control in U.I.E.T. dated 13.11.2017, regarding admission criteria for M.E./M.Tech. Courses being run at U.I.E.T. P.U., Chandigarh for the session 2018-19.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 48(x))

R-20. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has:

(i) accepted the additional donation of Rs. 2.25 lac (Rs.1 lakh from Professor Satinder Vir Kesar and Rs. 1,25,000 from Ms. Vandana Manchanda) towards Dr. Urmi Kessar Oration/Lecture Endowment Fund; and

(ii) enhanced the honorarium from Rs. 1 lac to Rs. 5.25 lac (including T.A.) for the speaker and any amount to be incurred with respect to local hospitality would be borne out the University Funds.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 48(ix))

R-21. That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Board of Control in Library & Information Science dated 29.11.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has enhanced the number of seats in the following courses from the session 2018-2019:

i) B.Lib.I.Sc. to 60+5 NRI

ii) M.Lib.I.Sc. to 40+5 NRI

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 48(xiii))

R-22. That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Varinder Kumar Sharma, Senior Technician/A.T.O. (G-II) as Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U., in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/- with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as per University rules, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant posts in said institute.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 41(xiii))

R-23. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Senate, has approved that the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name:

Professor (Dr.) J.K. Goswamy Secretary, PUTA University Institute of Engineering & Technology Panjab University Chandigarh	1. Medical Sciences 2. Languages 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Business Management and Commerce

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 19.11.2017 (Para 28) (Appendix) has resolved that it be recommended to the Senate.

2. The above item was included in the Agenda of Senate meeting dated 16.12.2017 as an item C-76. However, the Vice-Chancellor has approved in anticipation of approval of the Senate, vide order dated 1.12.2007 (copy enclosed) as the Faculties were met on 18.12.2017 and 19.12.2017.

R-24. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Senate, has elected Professor Jagat Bhushan, Principal-cum-Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, Sector-25, P.U., Chandigarh as a member of the Dental Council of India, from amongst the members of Faculty of Medical Sciences, as the term of present member Dr. K. Gauba representing the University on the Dental Council of India is ending on 23.03.2018

Referring to Item R-24, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should not be an item for ratification. Instead, he proposed the name of Professor Jagat Bhushan to be elected as a member and be sent to the DCI.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to how the election of Professor Jagat Bhushan could be held.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is proposing the name and the election could be held.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the election could be held only if the election is announced.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment let they leave the Item R-24, the name would be sent to the DCI only after the the election is held.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested that the election be announced, the nomination be taken and then hold the election.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that how the election could be held at this moment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let they follow the proper procedure.

RESOLVED: That –

(i) the information contained in **Sub-Items R-1 to R-23 on the agenda**, be ratified; and

(ii) **Sub-Item R-24** be not ratified and proper procedure for election be followed.

VIII. The information contained in **Items I-1 to I-40** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

I-1. That the Syndicate has felicitated to the following:

(i) Ms. Amanpreet Kaur, Ph.D. research scholar in the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) on her having brought laurels to Panjab University by bagging Young Scientist Award for her research in the field of drug delivery.

(ii) Dr. Devinder Preet Singh, Senior Lecturer in the Deptt. of Orthodontics, Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences, PU, on his having been honoured with 'Profile of the Month' Award.

(iii) Ms. Shivanshi Vashist, a Ph.D. Scholar, under the mentorship of Dr. Rohit Sharma, the Coordinator, CIC for developing the first product launched by Cluster Innovation Centre in Biotechnology, promoted by BIRAC.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 1)

(iv) Prof. S.K. Tomar, of Department of Mathematics, on having been elected Fellow of National Academy of Sciences, India (NASI), Allahabad.

(v) Dr. Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examination and Dean, College Development Council on having been honoured with Chandigarh Ratan Award for his contribution to streamline the online examination system, online fee deposition and online disposal of complaints.

(vi) Ms. Reetinder Kaur, Ph.D. scholar, Department of Anthropology on having received 'Shastri Research Student Postdoctoral Fellowship 2017-18' to undertake research at the University of British Columbia from June to September 2018.

(vii) Dr. Devinder Preet Singh, Senior Lecturer in the Deptt. of Orthodontics, Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences, PU, on his having been honoured with 'Profile of the Month' Award.

(Syndicate dated 07.10.2017 Para 1(1))

(viii) Smt. Krishna Sobti, a noted writer of Hindi literature and an alumna of University of Panjab at Lahore on her being selected to receive Jnanpith Award-2017 for her outstanding contributions in Indian literature.

(ix) Dr. Baljinder Singh, Fellow, PU and Professor at Department of Nuclear Medicine, PGIMER, Chandigarh, on his being elected as President of the Society of Nuclear Medicine-India.

(x) Professor Indu Pal Kaur, on having been transferred the three technologies developed by her out of her research to the two industries i.e. Hitech Formulations Limited, Chandigarh and Unique Biotech Limited, Hyderabad.

(xi) Professor Karamjeet Singh of University Business School on his being selected for Best Business Academic of the Year (BBAY) Award, 2017 for his research contribution in the field of commerce and management and got silver medal at the 70th All India Commerce Conference held at Jaipur from October 12-14, 2017.

(xii) Enactus Dr. SSBUICET, PU, on having bagged 2nd position nationally in the prestigious Enactus Mahindra Competition 2017-18 and the prize money of Rs. 1.5 lakhs and a grant money of Rs.50,000/- for its ongoing project 'Unnati'.

(xiii) The following persons on being conferred with the Best Researcher Awards (2016) and Best Publication Awards (2016) under the aegis of 'Smt. Prem Lata and Prof. D.V.S. Jain Research Foundation' at the 2nd Research Award Ceremony:

Best Researcher Awards (2016)

1.	Dr. (Ms.) Navneet Kaur Deptt. of Chemistry	Prof. D.V.S. Jain
2.	Prof. O.P. Katare University Instt. of Pharm. Sci.	Smt. Prem Lata Jain

Best Publication Awards (2016)

1. Dr. (Ms.) Nishima Wangoo
   University Instt. of Engg. & Tech.
2. Dr. Rohit K. Sharma
   Dept of Chemistry
3. Professor B.S. Bhoop
   Univ. Institute of Pharm. Science
4. Professor O.P. Katare
   Univ. Institute of Pharm. Science

5. Dr. (Ms.) Sonal Singhal
Dept. of Chemistry

6. Dr. (Ms.) Bimla Nehru
Dept. of Biophysics

(xiv) Professor Kanchan K. Jain, Department of Statistics, on being elected as Member of International Statistical Institute, Netherlands.

(xv) Ms Kanika Thakur of University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, doing research under the supervision of Prof. O.P. Katare, on being selected for Chamber Event 2017 at UK Parliament (House of Lords), London, on 1st December 2017.

(xvi) Professor Devi Sirohi, Department of History, on being appointed as Chairperson of one of the Committees on Family Welfare on the direction of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, District Legal Services Authority, UT, Chandigarh.

(xvii) Mr Vinod Kumar Chauhan, research scholar in the Dept. of Computer Science and Applications, on his receiving a Travel Grant Award from the organizers of Asian Conference on Machine Learning (ACML) for his research work presented at Seoul in ACML-2017.

(xviii) Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor, P.U. on his being appointed as Member of the CSIR-Recruitment and Assessment Board (RAB) w.e.f. 13th October, 2017, for a period of three years by Hon'ble Dr. Harsh Vardhan, Minister of Science & Technology, Minister of Environment, Forest and Climate Change and Minister of Earth Sciences, in his capacity as Vice-President, CSIR.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 1)

(xii) Professor Dhirendra Pal Singh, Director, National Assessment and Accreditation Council, on his being appointed Chairperson of University Grants Commission by the Government of India, for a period five years.

(xiii) Professor R.C. Sobti, Vice Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow and former Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on his being honourred with INSA Senior Scientist position from January 2018 for a period of three years.

(xiv) Professor Rumina Sethi, Department of English and Cultural Studies, on her being nominated as a member of General Council of the Sahitya Akademi (National Academy of Letters), New Delhi for a period five years w.e.f. January 2018.

(xv) Dr. Vandita Kakkar, Assistant Professor in University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU, on her receiving the

Biotechnology Ignition Grant (BIG)by the Biotechnology Industry Research Assistance Council (BIRAC) for her work on Pediatric Dermatitis.

(xvi) Dr. Rohit Kumar Sharma, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, on his being nominated as a member of the Indian National Young Academy of Sciences (INYAS) and also receiving a research grant of Rs.63 lakhs from Science & Engineering Research Board (SERB) for a project in collaboration with CSIR-IMTECH, Chandigarh.

(xvii) Dr. S.K. Upadhyay, Department of Botany on his being invited by the National Academy of Agricultural Sciences to join Academy (NAAS) as Associate from 1st January, 2018 and to his Ph.D. student Ms Shivi Tyagi who has also been honoured with the NASI –Springer Award in Biological Sciences for presenting the paper in the Symposium held at Savitribai Phule Pune University.

(xviii) Dr. Purva Mishra, Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration of U.S.O.L., PU, on her being honoured with Empowered Women Award for her services in the field of education, by the Pratima Raksha Samman Samiti.

(Syndicate dated 10.01.2018 Para 1)

I-2. That the syndicate has noted the following:

1. Shri Prakash Javadekar ji, Minister of Human Resource Development, released the 'SWACHHTA' Ranking 2017 of Higher Educational Institutions in New Delhi on September 11, 2017 at an Award Ceremony held in New Delhi. Post-Graduate Government College for Girls, Sector-11, bagged the 6th position and Panjab University, Chandigarh stands placed at the 7th position amongst 174 Higher Education Institutions which were shortlisted for evaluation in a contest for promoting Hygiene & Cleanliness under Swachh Bharat Abhiyan. 4500 Higher Educational Institutions had participated in this national contest by providing data voluntarily for this. Our inspection happened on a day when it rained very heavily in Chandigarh. So it is a matter of great satisfaction that the two institutions managed to get position on a day when it was very difficult to defend against heavy odds.

2. Dr. Kiran Bedi, Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor of Puducherry and alumnus PU, delivered Prof. J.C. Anand Memorial Oration hosted by Department of Political Science and interacted with the students who have joined the new courses on 'Leadership and Governance' and blessed them on September yesterday. She has expressed a desire that she would like to come and teach the students for few days. The new students who joined this year and would like to be continuously associated with this course as the time would go back. It would be honour for the University. If you permit me, he would get a CV from her for offering her the position of Honorary Professorship at least for

the time being. This course has been implemented because she has insisted that this University is the peoples' University where everything happens by election and the students leaders aspire to be a part of the national politics, they should be sent ahead by educating them properly. The whole of India comes under the jurisdiction of national politics, therefore, they should be taught about the different political parties from different regions of India. They should be taught about the federal structure and the constitution of every party and the way they are working.

3. 6th Panjab University Foundation Day Lecture will be delivered by Lal Bahadur Shastri Chair Professor Shri Kailash Satyarthi, Nobel Laureate, on October 12, 2017 in the University Auditorium. He was honoured with Doctor of Law (*Honoris Causa*) during the 64th PU Annual Convocation held on March 14, 2015. He has only yesterday sent a message that he will spend full 24 hours staying in our Guest House. He will arrive on 12th morning and leave from here on 13th morning.

4. The Patent No.297380 for Non-Staining, Novel Lecithinised Coal Tarformulation has been granted to Professor O.P. Katare and his associates on September 14, 2017 for their innovation towards development of novel coltar nanotechnology based pharmaceutical product. TIFAC, New Delhi, Govt. agency along with Punjab State Council for Science & Technology has been instrumental in filing and processing of this Patent granted.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 1(i, ii, iii and iv))

5. The acknowledgement received from Shri N. Yuvaraj, IAS, Private Secretary to the Vice President of India, New Delhi, vide letter dated 27.09.2017, with regard to felicitation conveyed to the Vice President of India & Chancellor, P.U., pursuant the Senate decision dated 10.09.2017.

6. The thanks letter dated 09.10.2017 received from M. Hamid Ansari, Former Vice President of India & Chancellor of Panjab University, with regard to the felicitation conveyed pursuant to the Senate decision dated 10.09.2017.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 42(i)

7. At the request of Hon'ble Governor of Punjab & Administrator, UT, Chandigarh, Shri V.P. Singh Badnore, Hon'ble Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu, Vice-President of India and Chancellor, Panjab University, presided over a meeting convened in his office at New Delhi. Hon'ble Governor of Punjab apprised the Chancellor about the financial concerns of Panjab University and its importance as a premier academic institution and its pivotal role in bringing together all academic institutions and national laboratories under the umbrella of CRIKC. Vice Chancellor, Prof. Arun Kumar Grover, Registrar, Col. G.S. Chadha and FDO, Shri Vikram Nayyar and Director, UIAMS Prof. S.K. Sharma from PU and representatives from the UGC, MHRD and

Vice President's Secretariat, were present in the meeting. Hon'ble Vice-President of India and Chancellor, PU, appreciated the role of Panjab University as a National Institution with its rich heritage and he assured support on behalf of his office to attend to the needs of PU.

8. Bio-Incubator, Cluster Innovation Centre in Biotechnology, PU, has won the national jury award at the "Startup Contest-2017" organized by the All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) in collaboration with Vijnana Bharati (VIBHA) under the aegis of India International Science Festival (IISF) from October 13-16, 2017 at Chennai.

9. Panjab University is continuing to perform well in the various sports events during the current academic year (2017-18). In this regard an update on the performance in 2017-18 has been made available by the Directorate of Sports for perusal of the Syndicate.

10. Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor and Prof. Anil Kumar Monga, Dean Alumni Relations, attended the Fourth Annual Reunion of Panjab University Campus Students Alumni Association (Regd.) at Surrey, British Columbia, Canada on 22nd October. Prof. Grover and Prof. Monga also visited University of British Columbia, Vancouver on 23rd October, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver on 24th October and University of Fraser Valley, Abbotsford on 25th October, 2017 to fortify relationship(s) of PU with them.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 1 (i), (vi), (xiii) and (xiv))

11. PU Hindi Department has launched a joint student-exchange forum with Pennsylvania State University (Penn State) at University Park.

12. Padma Shri S. Balbir Singh Senior, PU Alumnus and recipient of PU Khel Rattan award inaugurated Panjab University Hockey Astro Turf in the presence of another alumnus Padma Shri S. Pargat Singh, MLA in Punjab, on 28th December, 2017 on the day of inauguration of Inter University tournament at Panjab University.

13. Shri Jitender Yadav, Commissioner, MC Chandigarh-cum-Director, Swachh Bharat Mission, Chandigarh, launched the Swachhata-MoHUA (Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs) App during the seven days NSS Camp at Panjab University, Chandigarh. It is a complaint redressal platform with the opportunity for citizens to post civic-related issues (e.g., a garbage dump).

(Syndicate dated 10.01.2018 Para 1 (viii), (ix) and (x))

I-3. That the syndicate has approved the following:

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

(Syndicate dated 10.01.2018 Para 1)

I-4. That Dr. Kushwinder Kaur, be re-appointed (afresh) as Assistant Professor in Department of Chemistry, P.U. purely on temporary basis for another one year w.e.f. 05.03.2018 with one day break on 01.03.2018 and 02.03.2018 to 04.03.2018 (holidays) or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on the same term and condition on which she was working earlier.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 36)

I-5. That the Vice-Chancellor has approved the appointment of Dr. Kamlesh Narwana as Assistant Professor in History, purely on temporary basis, at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for one year w.e.f. the date she joins, against the vacant sanctioned post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 (a) (i) at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign teaching duties to her in the same subject in other teaching departments of the University in order to utilize her subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied departments at a given point of time, within the limits of the workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 42(ix)

I-6. In pursuance of orders dated 30.10.2017 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 22726 of 2017 (Dr. Gauri Sharma Vs. Panjab University & Ors.) in the same terms as LPA 1505-2016 and posted the matter for hearing along with said LPA on 09.11.2017. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 29.11.2017:

(i) the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that Dr. Gauri Sharma, Professor of History, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.11.2017 as applicable in such other cases of

teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing as on 31.10.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of this case filed by her. The payment to her will be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking.

(ii) all those teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 42(x)

I-7. That recommendation dated 30.10.2017 of the Administrative and Academic Committee, of PURC, Sri Muktsar Sahib that the following three Assistant Professors, be re-appointed as such (without NET qualification) in the subject of Computer Science and Applications at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for the remaining period of odd semester of session 2017-2018, i.e. from 31.10.2017 to 10.12.2017 and for even semester of session 2017-18 i.e. from 08.01.2018 to 18.05.2018 on the recommendation as per the decision of Board of Finance in such cases, be approved:

1. Mr. Ranveer S/o Shri Amarnath
2. Mr. Gagan Madaan S/o Shri Darshan Lal
3. Ms. Prinka Rani D/o Shri Suresh Kumar

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 26)

I-8. That the Vice-Chancellor has appointed Dr. Devinder Preet Singh as Associate Professor in Orthodontics & Dentofacial Orthopaedics at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis, against the vacant post, for the period of one year in the pay scale of Rs.37400-67000 + GP of Rs.8600/- + NPA and allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 (a) (i) at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 and has also been permitted to retain the lien for a period of one year, against his substantive post of Senior Lecturer in Dr. H.S.J. Institute at Dental Sciences & Hospital.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign teaching duties to him/her in the same subject in other teaching departments of the University in order to utilize his/her subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied departments at a given point of time, within the limits of the workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 42(ii)

I-9. To note the action taken by the office in respect of the decision of the Syndicate dated 23.07.2017 (Para 17) regarding sanction of prosecution against Professor Om Prakash Katare, UIPS, P.U.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 42(iii)

I-10. That the Syndicate, expressed its anguish over the disobedience of the directions of the Senate by Dr. Neelam Paul, Associate Professor, Department of Music.

NOTE: Dr. Neelam Paul, Associate Professor, Department of Music vide letter dated 15.12.2017 (Appendix) (sent in continuation to her letter dated 19.09.2016) has written that she also expresses regret for the inconvenience caused to all concerned in the University.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 29)

I-11. That letter No. PFC/JAC/2017/361 daed 27.10.2017 received from Punjab Financial Corporation, Jalandhar, regarding Loan account: M/s Chopra Industrial Corporation, Jalandhar, a partnership concern of Shri Vijay Kumar Chopra S/o Shri Prem Nath Chopra alongwith legal opinion received from Shri Arvind Seth, Advocate and Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate, be accepted.

(Syndicate dated 19.12.2017 Para 49)

I-12. That request dated 10.11.2017/15.11.2017 of the Coordinator, Centre for Medical Physics, U.I.E.A.S.T., Panjab University, that the following recommendations of the Academic Council dated 21.06.2017 (Item LXX), be approved with the modifications and the same be allowed to incorporated in the Handbook of Information 2018 i.e. for the academic session 2018-2019:

1. Total number of seats in M.Sc. Medical Physics shall be 10+2 NRI only from the academic year 2018-19. There are no additional seats as mentioned in Handbook of Information.
2. Availability and utilization of laboratory charges collected from students as part of fees were discussed and it was decided to enhance laboratory charge to Rs. 1000 p.m. from the current charges of Rs. 120 p.m. (from Indian students) and to enhance development fund to 400 $/semester instead of current of 200$ from the NRI students from the academic year 2018-2019 and also be made part of the budget of the Centre for Medical Physics.

3. Weightages for Common Entrance Test (PG) and the qualifying degree are discussed and decided that the B.Sc. marks will contribute weightage of 40% & Common

Entrance Test (PG) will contribute weightage of 60% towards admission merit for the M.Sc. in Medical Physics first year.

4. The members of Syndicate decided that one post of tutor cum RSO be created in the University.

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 17)

I-13. That –

(i) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), between University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Panjab University, Chandigarh and Semi-Conductor Laboratory, Department of Space, Government of India, Sector-72, S.A.S. Nagar, Punjab be executed; and

(ii) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), between Sophisticated Analytical Instrumentation Facility (SAIF) Panjab University, Chandigarh and Department of Science & Technology (DST), Govt. of India, New Delhi, be executed.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 7)

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

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 25)

(iv) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), between Panjab University, Chandigarh, and Self Employed Women's Association, Bharat Concerning Cooperation Towards Women's Empowerment, be executed.

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 39)

(v) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), executed between Nottingham Trent University and Panjab University, Chandigarh, to explore future collaboration between Nottingham Business School of Nottingham Trent University and University Business School of Panjab University.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 22)

(vi) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), executed between Punjab Heritage and Tourism Promotion Board (PHTPB), Chandigarh and Panjab University, Chandigarh to establish cooperation between PHTPB and P.U. through University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management (UIHTM) for long term partnership in knowledge sharing and activities for

development and management of tourism in the State of Punjab, be ratified.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 23)

(vii) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), executed between Panjab University, Chandigarh and VAV Life Sciences Pvt. Ltd., 51/B Mittal Court, 224 Nariman Point, Mumbai, Maharashtra for collaboration for enhancing the availability of highly qualified manpower in the area of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Biotechnology, Engineering and Management, within the country, be ratified.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 24)

I-14. That Technology Transfer Agreement between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Unique Biotech Ltd. (UBL), Plot No. 2, Phase-2, S.P. Biotech Park, Shameerpet, Hyderabad, Telengana, as recommended by the Research Promotion Cell Committee dated 30.10.2017 (Item No. 7), be approved.

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 24)

I-15. That as recommended by the Academic and Administrative Committee of the Department of Public Administrative, Dr. Jagmohan Singh Raju, IAS Additional Chief Secretary, Government of Tamilnadu, be appointed as Visiting Professor in the Department of Public Administration.

(Syndicate dated 19.12.2017 Para 44)

I-16. That –

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

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

case which has already been referred to them under the statutory provisions of the above Act."

(b) Syndicate further noted from MHRD letter No. F.2-5/2015-U-II) dated September 18, 2015 that the 'Employer' and the 'Disciplinary Authority' are to be treated as one and the same. This also stood affirmed by the DoPT guidelines. Disciplinary Authority of the Vice-Chancellor is the Chancellor, who is also the Chairman of the Senate, the appointing authority of the complainant Professor. Thus the PUCASH report ought to go directly to the Chancellor.

II The Syndicate expressed serious concern that a sitting member of the Senate wrote a letter dated 5.9.2017 in dual capacity as President, PUTA, in which she has made unfounded and unacceptable allegations against an officer attached to the Chancellor, PU and the Registrar, PU. The Syndicate found it objectionable that the facts have been distorted mischievously and with mala fide intention to mislead the Chancellor. The Syndicate condemned the false allegations made by a sitting member of Senate against the senior officers, who were discharging their duty towards PU. In particular, the Registrar, PU had no role in the execution of just duties by officers in the Chancellor's office. The Syndicate also observed that complainant did not forward her input to Chancellor's office following PU rules.

III A Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor D.V.S. Jain, Fellow, PU, Professor Emeritus and INSA Hony. Scientist and comprising other Senate members Sardar Tarlochan Singh, Ex-MP, Professor Pam Rajput, Professor Emeritus, Ambassador I.S. Chadha, IFS (Retd.) and Shri V.K. Sibal, IAS (Retd.) and Senior Advocate is constituted to look into the issues arising out of the letter under consideration so that such occurrences as created by the action of the complainant (Senate member and Professor, PU) do not recur in future. Syndicate noted with concern that complainant's act has compromised the image of the University and its Governing Bodies.

NOTE: The recommendations of the above committee have been placed before the Syndicate meeting dated 30.03.2018.

(Syndicate dated 07.10.2017 Para 2)

I-17. That the penalty of Rs.1 lac imposed upon the Affiliated Colleges, who have failed to submit their application for grant of temporary

extension of affiliation for the session 2017-18, as recommended by the affiliation Committee (for the year 2017-18) in its meeting dated 07.08.2017 and 31.08.2017, be waived off.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 13)

I-18. That the donation of Rs.30,00,000/- made by Mrs. Kamini Pahuja, USA, be accepted for institution of an Endowment to be named as 'Gargi Scholarship' for female students pursuing B.Sc. (Hons.) and M.Sc. (Hons.) in the Department of Mathematics, P.U. The investment of Rs. 30,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year and the interest so accrued there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 1044497814. The scholarship will be awarded to two female students of each class of B.Sc. (Hons.) 1st year, 2nd year and 3rd year and two female students of each class of M.Sc. (HS) 1st year and 2nd year on receipt of the interest from the amount, on the following terms and conditions:

a) The Scholarship to be named as 'Gargi Scholarship'.

b) The Scholarship will be awarded to two female students of each class of B.Sc. (Hons.) 1st year, 2nd year and 3rd year @ Rs. 1500 p.m. for 10 months and two female students of each class of M.Sc. (HS) 1st year and 2nd year @ Rs. 2000/- p.m. for 10 months.

c) Out of these 2 scholarship at each level will be merit based and other will be merit-cum-need based. Merit will be calculated on the odd semester result of that effective year and a viva-voce examination in the ratio 60:40.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 27)

I-19. That an additional sum of Rs.1,00,000/- donated by Shri Radha Krishan Sethi S/o Shri Kanshi Ram, H.No. 362, Sector-9, Panchkula, be accepted for purchase of books and payment of Scholarship etc. to the poor & needy students out of "Students Aid Fund Account" and Income Tax Exemption Certificate duly signed by the Registrar, P.U. Chandigarh be provided to the donor to avail income tax benefits for the session 2017-18.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 28)

I-20. That the donation of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Professor S.K. Sharma, Former Director, PGI, Chandigarh # 302, Sector-21, Panchkula be accepted for institution of an Endowment in the memory of his son "Late Dr. Rahul Sharma Gold Medal". The investment of Rs. 1,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year and the interest so accrued there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 1044497814. The scholarship will be awarded to a student who secures first position in oral surgery in the final year examination in Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental

Services and Hospital every year on receipt of the interest from the amount, on the following terms and conditions:

a) The Scholarship to be named as 'Dr. Rahul Sharma Gold Medal'.

b) Gold Medal to be awarded to a student who secures first position in oral surgery in the final year examination in Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Services and Hospital every year during the Panjab University Convocation.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 29)

I-21. That –

(i) minutes dated 10.12.2017 of the Committee, constituted for the effective utilization of Rs.10 lakhs donated by Dr. Kewal K. Tewari, to increase the corpus of "Professor DVS Jain Merit Scholarship Endowment, be approved.

(ii) The proposal submitted by Professor R.K. Kohli, for instituting an annual award namely Shiv Nath Rai Kohli Memorial Mid-Career Best Scientist Award be accepted and thanks be conveyed to Professor R.K. Kohli.

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 21)

I-22. That permanent affiliation to Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce and Management, village, Jhande, P.O. Tharike, Distt. Ludhiana, be granted.

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 33)

I-23. That Report dated 27.11.2017 of the Committee constituted to find facts, errors and irregularities in examination pointed out by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Fellow be accepted.

NOTE: (i) Dr. K.P.S. Shante, who has himself admitted his fault for breaching the sanctity of the examination system, be debarred from undertaking any assignment of the University for future.

(ii) The Syndicate expressed its concern over such incidents and to plug the loopholes, the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to form a Committee to suggest necessary steps so that such incidents ought not occur in future; and

(iii) The appointment of Centre Superintendent in Khalsa College, Mahilpur which was alleged to be against the rules be examined by the Standing Committee along with the complaint by the Standing Committee along with the complaint made by Dr. Amit Joshi, Dr. Inderpal Sidhu be urged to participate in the

meeting of Standing Committee so that the Committee can submit the final report to the Vice-Chancellor.

(Syndicate dated 19.12.2017 Para 40)

I-24. That –

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

(ii) Dean College Development Council/Vice-Chancellor will allocate required funds for conducting workshops for implementation of CBCS of Education College to Dean, Education.

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 34)

I-25. That minutes dated 24.10.2017 of the committee, to finalize the contents of the format of Ph.D. certificate issued to the students for Ph.D. Programme after July, 2009, be approved with the changes in Annexures-I & II (attached) and the same would form part of the proceedings.

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 7)

I-26. That the minutes dated 04.10.2017 regarding eligibility criteria/admission process for admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. programme, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 11)

I-27. That the facilities to the transgender students community in the Panjab University, as contained in the proposal dated 07.11.2017 pursuant to the minutes of the Committee dated 07.09.2017 met under the Chairmanship of Additional Deputy Commissioner, Chandigarh Administrative, be accepted.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 35)

I-28. That as per the request of Principal Dr. N.R. Sharma dated 24.08.2017, P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai be named as "Saheed Udham Singh P.U. Constituent College", Guru Har Sahai.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 14)

I-29. To note and ratify the orders of the Vice-Chancellor that the pass percentage from 50% to 40% to SC/ST students for M.Phil./Ph.D. Entrance test, 2017, be reduced for this year only, to enable SC candidates to get their paper II checked.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 39(i))

I-30. To note a request dated 02.09.2017 received through e-mail of Dr. Jatinder Kaur, Principal, Guru Nanak College, Moga.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 39(ii))

I-31. That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the following concessions to wards of Kashmiri Migrants for admission to various courses in Education Institutions for the academic session 2017-2018:

(i) Relaxation in cut-off percentage upto 10% subjects to minimum eligibility requirement.

(ii) Increase in intake capacity upto 5% course-wise.

(iii) Reservation of at least one seat in merit quota in technical/professional institutions.

(iv) Waiving Off domicile requirements.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 38(iv))

I-32. That the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Committee dated 04.09.2017, has approved corrigendum fee-fund structure to be followed by the Degree Colleges affiliated to Panjab University for the session 2017-18 along with the mandatory conditions as intimated earlier vide letter No. 85015-85185 dated 22.05.2017.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 42(iv)

I-33. To note the message dated 09.11.2017 received from Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu, Vice President of India & Chancellor, P.U. regarding greetings to the Vice-Chancellor, faculty, staff and students for the New Year.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 42(ix)

I-34. As per authorization given by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9), the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Affiliation Committee dated 23.10.2017 has not granted the temporary extension of affiliation for BHMS course-1st year (50 seats) for the session 2017-18, running at Homeopathic Medical College and Hospital, Sector-26, Chandigarh, which supersedes the earlier letter No. 6681-6700 dated 29.06.2017 vide which the College was granted the temporary extension of affiliation for the said course, pursuant to the order of CCH letter No. F.No. 17014/26/2013/EP (H) dated 31.08.2017 and no admission of the students will be allowed to be made by the College for the session 2017-18.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 42(xi)

I-35. That recommendation (No.1) dated 02.02.2017 of the Advisory-cum-Review Committee for enhancement of the annual NSS fee of affiliated Colleges from Rs.5/- to Rs.10/- per student per year from the academic session 2018-19, be approved and efforts be made to get the grants released from the Government.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 15)

I-36. That the following Patent License Agreements between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Hitech Formulations Pvt. Ltd., Principal Offices at 213, Industrial Area, Phase-I, Chandigarh, be executed:

a) Indian Patent Application No. 2074/DEL/2014, titled, 'Nanostructured Lipidic-Polymeric Pharmaceutical Composition encapsulating Drugs';

b) US Patent Application No. US 14/371,338, titled, 'A Process for Preparing Solid Lipid Sustained Release Nanoparticles for Delivery of Vitamins' and

c) Indian Patent Application No. 79/DEL/2012, titled, 'Solid Nanolipidic Particulates of Vitamin D3 and Retinoic Acid (RA)'.

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 Para 22)

I-37 That –

(1) the pattern of re-employment of Principals recommended by the Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 (Para 32) be reverted to the earlier pattern;

(2) the Colleges which have given re-employment to Principals in view of the Syndicate decision dated 30.04.2017 (Para 32) be asked to issue fresh advertisement for filling up the posts of the Principals within 30 days and the process for appointment of the Principals be completed by 15th June, 2018;

(3) the advertisement should clearly mention that the incumbents would be paid full salary in the pay-scale.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 47)

I-38. That letter dated 07.02.2018 of Chairperson, Department of Life Long Learning and Extension, P.U. for increase in reservation for persons with disability from 3% to 5% pursuant to the directions given by Hon'ble Supreme Court conveyed by Deputy Director, Social Welfare Department Women and Child Development Chandigarh Administration vide letter dated 19.01.2018 received on 22.01.2018, be adopted.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 18)

I-39. That approval for the transfer of Dr. (Mrs.) Savita Uppal, Principal, from Swami Ganga Giri Janta Girls College, Raikot to Arya College, Ludhiana w.e.f. 01.08.2017, be granted.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 30)

I-40. Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9), the Committee in its various meetings, has granted temporary extension of affiliation to the following Colleges for certain courses/subjects for the session 2017-2018, as under:

Sr. No.	Date of the meeting of Committee	Name of the College	Name of the Courses/ subjects	Session for which the temporary extension of affiliation us granted
1.	23.10.2017	Baba Kundan Singh College, V.P.O. Muhar, Ferozpur, (Punjab)	(i) M.A. 1st Music (vocal) (ii) B.Com, 3rd Year (one unit), subject to fulfil all the condition (if any) imposed by the Inspection Committee by 15th December 2017.	2017-18
2.	23.10.2017	Govt. College (Girls), Jalalabad (w), Distt. Fazilka (Punjab)	(i) B.A. I, II & III (E.) Subject History, Political Science, Physical Education, Mathematics, Economics, Punjabi (C & E), English (C & E) (ii) B.Com. Course (one unit), subject to fulfil all the condition (if any) imposed by the Inspection Committee by 15th December 2017.	2017-18
3.	23.10.2017	Hoshiarpur Professional, and Vocational College, Adamwal Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.A.- I & II (English (G&E), Punjabi (G&E)., Political Science, Sociology, Physical Education, History, Economics, Mathematics and Computer Science (ii) B.Com. –I & II (one unit for each class) (iii) B.Sc. I & II (Agriculture) one unit (iv) B.Sc.-I (Non-Medical)	2017-18

			(v) B.C.A. –I (one Unit), subject to the condition that the college shall deposit Endowment fund of Rs.25 lacs in two instalments i.e. Rs.12.50 lacs each. First instalment must be deposit by 15.12.2017 and second instalment should be deposit by March 2018.	
4.	23.10.2017	M.R. Govt. College, Fazilka (Punjab)	(i) B.A. Part I, II & III (Computer Science) (ii) B.C.A. Part I, II & III, subject to fulfil all the condition (if any) imposed by the Inspection Committee by 15th December 2017.	2017-18
5.	21.01.2017	SGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur, Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.C.A. I, II & III (one unit for each year) (ii) M.Sc.-I and II (IT)-40 seats (for each year) (iii) B.P.Ed. (1st and 2nd Year)- 50 seats(for each year) (iv) M.P.Ed. -1st Year (one unit), subject to the condition that the college shall appoint the faculty members as per recommendations of the Inspection committee by 15th December 2017.	2017-18
6.	22.12.2017	Post Graduate Govt. College, Sector -46, Chandigarh	(i) BBA -1st Unit (temporary affiliation) (ii) B.C.A. 2nd unit, The college is required to submit the copy of appointment/joining letter of resource persons for teaching BBA-1st unit and BCA 2nd unit classes.	2017-18
7.	22.12.2017	Saint Sahara College of Education Ferozpur Road Near Power Grid Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course (Two units 100 seats) Further, the principal of the college has been advised to submit the authentic proof regarding appointment of six Asstt. Professor on regular basis, immediately to enable the office to proceed further in	2017-18

			the matter.	
8.	22.12.2017	MBG Government College Pojewal, S.B.S Nagar (Punjab)	(i) B.A. Semester 1st, 3rd and 5th (Computer Science) M.A. I (Punjabi)	2017-18
9.	22.12.2017	Guru Nanak College, Moga	M.A. (Economics) I & II	2017-18
10.	22.12.2017	Khalsa College Gurdhiwala Hoshiarpur	Foundation Course in Human Rights Education (2-3 months) under UGC scheme of Human Rights Education	2017-18
11.	22.12.2017	Arjan Dass College, Dharmkot Moga	(i) B.C.A. I,II & III (40 Seats) (ii) PGDCA (40 Seats) The principal of the college has been advised to re-advertise 5 regular post, conduct the interview for the computer science faculty post immediately & full up the same and send the information to the University.	2017-18
12.	22.12.2017	S.D.P. College for Women, Ludhiana	Advance Diploma in Cosmetology	2017-18
13.	22.12.2017	Khalsa College, Gurhdiwala Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Sc.-II(Agriculture)-4 Year Course one Unit Further, the affiliation committee has desired that the Management of the College has appointed one regular teacher. The affiliation committee said that the appointment letter and joining report has been sent to the Panjab University and the vacant post be re-advertised.	2017-18
14.	22.12.2017	SGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur, Distt. Hoshiarpur	M.Sc. II (Mathematics) 20 additional seats i.e. 40 to 60 seats	2017-18
15.	22.12.2017	Baba Kundan Rural College of Education, Kulliawal, Jamalpur, Distt. Ludhiana	B.Ed. Course-1st & 2nd Year (02 unit) i.e. 100 seats The principal of the College has advised to re-advertise the vacant posts and compliance report be submitted within week's time.	2017-18

16.	22.12.2017	S.D. College for Women, Moga	B.A. I, II & III (Computer Science), Further the Principal of the college has been advised to purchase the books & fill up the vacant positions immediately and send the authentic proof of the same to this office.	2017-18
17.	22.12.2017	Mata Baljinder Kaur Kaler International College, Jala Road, Samadh Bhai (Moga)	(i) B.Com.-I, II & III (ii) B.Sc.- I, II & III (Agriculture) (iii) B.A.-I, II & III (English Compulsory and Elective), Punjabi Compulsory & Elective, Physical Education, Maths., Eco., Pol. Sci. Sociology and History. Further the principal of the college has been advised to re-advertise the vacant position and conduct the interview immediately and send the information to the University. Salary compliance report is also submitted to Panjab University.	2017-18
18.	22.12.2017	Khalsa College Gurdhiwala Hoshiarpur	Advance Diploma in Information and Communication Technology (Add on course)	2017-18
19.	22.12.2017	Bhai Nagahia Singh Memorial Girls College, Alamgir, Distt. Ludhiana (Pb)	B.A.I, II & III (English (C &E)), Punjabi (C &E), History, Political Science, Sociology, Phy. Education and Economics, B.Com. I, II & III (one unit), subject to the condition that the college will submit the balance amount of endowment fund and the college is also required to appoint the faculty members on regular basis as mentioned in the Inspection committee report for the session 2017-18 with intimation to the college branch.	2017-18

NOTE: A Committee comprising, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Parvinder Singh, DCDC, Professor Mukesh Arora, Principal H.S. Gosal, Principal Gurdip K. Sharma, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu, Dr. Dalip Kumar and D.R. Colleges (Convener) constituted by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9) to check the inspection report/s thoroughly and verify their compliance/s and take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, has granted/not granted affiliation/extension of affiliation to the above colleges.

Referring to Item I-15 regarding appointment of Visiting Professor, Professor Rajesh Gill said that she had asked the Vice-Chancellor earlier also to let her know if there is a budget provision for Visiting Professors in the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would find it out.

Professor Rajesh Gill referred to the letter of Dr. Jagmohan Singh Raju (last para page 174 of the agenda).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could discuss it later and it could be kept pending till then.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that till then the appointment might not be made.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the appointment has already been made. The person is saying that he needs no money.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the person is saying that he would charge the TA/DA for field visits all over India. She enquired whether there is any budget provision for Visiting Professors. There are so many Visiting Professors in the University and they are being paid Rs.40,000/- p.m.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as the Visiting Professors are not paid Rs.40,000/- p.m., it should not be said so.

Professor Rajesh Gill referred to Gen. K.J. Singh who has been appointed as Visiting Professor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would come back to this item later on. He clarified that Gen K.J. Singh is a very different Professor, Maharaja Ranjit Singh Chair Professor.

Referring to Item I-22, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Shri Naresh Gaur and Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that, it should be kept pending.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that until the report of the Committee is received, the permanent affiliation of the College be kept pending.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as and when the Committee submits report, the permanent affiliation could be reversed.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar, Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Naresh Gaur said that it should be kept pending.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if they discuss this issue, everything would be clear.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they stop the permanent affiliation, perhaps the Management would take corrective measures.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has been done by the Syndicate and the matter is for information.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the Syndicate had taken the decision and thereafter a lot of hue and cry was created there. The College is charging a fee of Rs.90,000/- from the students. They are talking of granting permanent affiliation whereas the teachers have been placed under suspension by the College.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that if they approve the item, it would send a wrong signal to the society.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the Committee has not gone there, neither conducted any query, then what they are proposing.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the permanent affiliation should be stopped.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the Committee to visit the College and come back. How he could stop a thing which has already been done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that for the information of the Vice-Chancellor, the permanent affiliation has to be granted by the Senate only.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, if this is to be done by the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how the Vice-Chancellor had done it and placing the matter for information as it has to be done by the Senate.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out the files are approved only after the officers of the University visit the Colleges as guests. He knows as to who are those officers and what kind of gifts they have taken from the College.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested Shri Harpreet Singh Dua to reveal those names.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the person, who is saying that it could not be stopped, had gone there. He further stated that as they are well aware that the College had not been granted permanent affiliation and whole case of the College was discussed in the Senate and it was pointed out that the College is not following the reservation policy either of Central Government or Punjab Government or University. He is having with him a prospectus of the College wherein a fee of Rs.25,000/- has been prescribed by the University but the College is charging a fee of Rs.60-70 thousand.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar pointed out that the College is even charging a fee of Rs.90,000/-.

Continuing, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the College is not granting the vacation to the teachers.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that a great injustice is being done to the teachers.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar pointed out that only 7 casual leaves are granted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that nothing would come out by pleading the case. It is the prerogative of the Senate to grant permanent affiliation or not. He wondered as to how the letter has been issued, that is why it has been brought for information. He enquired as to why the letter has been issued.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu and Shri Jagdeep Kumar requested that it should be kept pending.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, okay, he would look into it and it be kept pending.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the letter has already been issued, another letter be issued to keep it in abeyance and if it has not been issued, it should not be issued now till the matter is pending.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the letter has to be kept in abeyance.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that if the letter has not been issued, the same would not be issued.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar referred to **Item I-39**.

While referring to Item I-8, Professor J.K. Goswamy said that this item should be kept in abeyance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, yes, it is kept in abeyance.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma **while referring to Item I-23** said that a Committee was constituted by the Syndicate in relation to the last year examination. The report of that Committee was discussed in the Syndicate. He read out the resolved part (point (iii) of the Syndicate proceedings dated 19th December, 2017 which states as under:-

"(iii) the Syndicate expressed its concern over such incidents and to plug the loopholes, the Vice Chancellor be authorised to form a Committee to suggest necessary steps so that such incidents ought not occur in future."

Continuing, he said five months have passed and the next year's examinations have already started. He understands, unprecedented scandal occurred in the history of Panjab University. The person who was the culprit has already been penalised, though he was retired person. The Committee held seven meetings and gave its report stating as to what had happened in the examination. He did not want to open the whole issue enshrined in the report. But he would say that the decision which they have taken at that time, he would like to request the Vice Chancellor to form a Committee to discuss the issue in the light of the discussion that took place in this regard so that

such things may not happen in future. Another thing which has not happened ever in the history of the University that one of the official of the University, who was sent out of the meeting when the matter was being discussed, the Vice Chancellor told him about the things which were pointed out. But it is very unfortunate that keeping aside all the discussion of the Syndicate, the said officer stated that this is personal attack on him and he condemns it. It is very unfortunate that in the Syndicate, an officer whose role is just to assist the Vice Chancellor, condemns the whole minutes and discussion of the Syndicate. It is on record. He is disappointed that the Vice Chancellor, Chairman of the Syndicate, did not point out to withdraw those words as to how he (C.O.E.) could speak these words. Whatever was passed by the Syndicate, an individual has condemned it openly, it is in record. It is very painful that that the Committee held seven sitting, but the way that person has said, is a part of the proceedings. The name of any person had not been mentioned. He requested that this issue be looked into. All their officials are respectful, they do not have any individual grudge with anyone, but if an official condemns the minutes of the Syndicate and Senate, it would become a new history. The Cabinet meetings are held in the world, their officials also join the meetings and assist them, but they never condemn the minutes. So, this is very sad.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested to disclose the name of that officer.

At this stage, some discussion on other issues took place which has been made part of the general discussion.

RESOLVED: That –

(i) the information contained in **Sub-Items I-1 to I-7, I-9 to I-14, I-16 to I-21 and I-23 to I-38 & I-40 on the agenda**, be noted;

(ii) the information contained in **Sub-Item I-8, I-15 and I-39 on the agenda,** be kept pending;

(iii) the letter for grant of permanent affiliation to Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce and Management, Ludhiana **(Sub-Item I-22)**, be not issued, if already issued, another letter be issued to keep in abeyance the permanent affiliation already granted.

Professor Chaman Lal raised the objection for not giving him time to speak in spite of the fact that he had been requesting for a long time.

However, at this stage, the Vice Chancellor adjourned the meeting as he felt exhausted for the day.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, no, **Item I-15** has to be taken, it does not suit him (Vice Chancellor), so he does not take it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that **Item I-15** is still pending

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE CHANCELLOR