

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Saturday, 8th December 2018** at **11.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor Raj Kumar Vice Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Dr. Ameer Sultana
3. Dr. Amit Joshi
4. Professor Anita Kaushal
5. Shri Ashok Goyal
6. Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi
7. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
8. Professor Keshav Malhotra
9. Professor Navdeep Goyal
10. Shri Prabhjit Singh
11. Professor Ronki Ram
12. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
13. Shri Sanjay Tandon
14. Dr. Satish Kumar
15. Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha
16. Professor Karamjeet Singh Registrar ... (Secretary)

Dr. Subhash Sharma, DPI (Colleges), Punjab and Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh, could not attend the meeting.

At the very outset, the Vice Chancellor, while conveying good morning, said that he welcomes all the members to the meeting on his behalf and also on behalf of the Panjab University family.

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

Condolence Resolution

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

- i) Shri Chaman Lal, Superintendent, Establishment Branch on 27.11.2018;
- ii) Shri Ghanshyam Dass, retired Deputy Registrar and father-in-law of Dr. Gurmeet Singh, Fellow on 30.11.2018;
- iii) Smt. Krishna Dhawan mother of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, UBS on 4.12.2018;
- iv) Shri Ram Sharan Saxena father of Professor Sudhir Kumar Saxena, DES on 04.12.2018; and
- v) Shri Amar Chand father of Dr. Kirti Vardhan, Department of Evening Studies.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Shri Chaman Lal, Shri Ghanshyam Dass, Smt. Krishna Dhawan, Shri Ram Sharan Saxena and Shri Amar Chand, and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that-
 - (i) Panjab University has been ranked as the best University of the country and 3rd among best institutions of India, according to the US News and World Report Rankings, 2019. Apart from this, Department of Physics has been ranked No.1 in India. The Vice Chancellor conveyed his congratulations to all faculty members, especially the Department of Physics.
 - (ii) On the basis of mock interview conducted for a batch of 17 students at the IAS Study Centre for final interview, 10 students have been selected in PCS Judicial;
 - (iii) Mr. Sunil Arora, IAS (Retd.), an alumnus of Panjab University has been appointed as Chief Election Commissioner of India. This is really a great achievement of this premier University.
 - (iv) Professor Nishtha Jaswal, Department of Laws, has been appointed as Vice Chancellor of Himachal Pradesh National Law University at Shimla. This is once again a great achievement of our fraternity.
 - (v) Hon'ble Shri Vijay Sampla ji, Union Minister of State for Social Justice and Empowerment visited the Panjab University on 04.12.2018 in connection with the celebrations of World Disability Day and assured financial help of his Ministry for various projects relating to providing facilities for specially privileged and disabled persons. We have submitted a project of Rs.24 crores containing different aspects relating to persons with disability. Hon'ble Shri Vijay Sampla Ji has, in principle, agreed to sanction this project.
 - (vi) Bhai Gobind Singh ji Longowal, Hon'ble President, Shiromani Gurudwara Parbhandak Committee visited the Panjab University on 06.12.2018 and released a grant of Rs.5 lac for the seminar;
 - (vii) Shri Satyadeo Narain Arya ji, Hon'ble Governor, Haryana, visited the Panjab University on 06.12.2018 and released a grant of Rs.5 lac for Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Centre. Shri Satyadeo Narain Arya Ji has assured him that if any event/activity is conducted in Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Centre/Chair, more grant could be given.
 - (viii) Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, former Union Minister and Fellow of Panjab University, has contributed second instalment of Rs.2 lac to the Panjab University Voluntary Contribution Fund as his contribution for 2018.
 - (ix) Professor Jagdeep Kaur, Department of Biotechnology, Dr. Ranvir Singh, National Centre for Human Genome Studies & Research of Panjab University and Dr. Pushpender Kumar Sharma, Department of Biotechnology, Sri Guru Granth Sahib World University, Fatehgarh

Sahib, have been granted India patent for inventing a lipase, a kind of protein, which can work even at temperature as high as 60° along with enhanced catalytic power for use in industry;

- (x) The research project for the development of 5G based UAV Augmented Intelligent Monitoring and Surveillance System prepared by Prof. Harish Kumar and other members of UIET has been accepted by the Ministry of Electronics & IT for which a grant of Rs.2.24 Crores has been sanctioned. This group has prepared a very ambitious plan with an outlay of Rs.252 crores for the establishment of Advanced Centre for Cyber Security and Artificial Intelligence. This would be an added advantage and the Hon'ble Home Minister has assured that he would look into this matter. This Centre would be one and only one in this particular region.
- (xi) Dr. Sangeeta Pilkhwal Sah, Associate Professor, UIPS has been elected as a Member of the prestigious National Academy of Medical Sciences (NAMS);
- (xii) Professor Preeti Mahajan, Chairperson, Department of Library and Information Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh has been honoured with Indian Association of Teachers of Library and Information Science (IATLIS)-Prof. S. P. Narang Research Promotion Award-2018'.

2. I was out of India for a very special and a specific task. During my visit to Italy from 27th November to 2nd December 2018, I particularly visited Italy and different places. I have been able to get the following things in favour of Panjab University:-

- (i) I was keynote speaker in International conference organised by Pegaso University, UET (Scoula Universteria Per il Turismo) & ITHC on "Global Trends and Innovations in tourism" and they will be sending a letter of intent to our university. It is a great achievement. It is the only vibrating University in the region which is promoting the online courses. With the help of certain senior Professors of the University as well as the Fellows, our focus is to promote the online courses so that there must be much more visibility in the domain and the financial strength of the University can be enhanced and strengthened once again.
- (ii) I had meeting with President of Regional Sicilian Assembly Hon. Gianfranco Micciche and with Educational Advisor to Govt. of Italy Hon. Prof. Roberto Lagalla. During the meeting various opportunities were explored for mutual cooperation between Panjab University and Govt. of Sicily.

In Italy, there are different Mayors as in the States. There is one such fellow who is called President and I met him. I am really very happy in telling you that those people are very proactive and very eager to have collaboration with Panjab University. They know many things better than us about the Panjab University and about the areas where we have the strength. They want to have collaboration with us, particularly, in the areas of Physics, English, Biotechnology, Tourism and Engineering. I am going to formulate some groups of Professors and Fellows who would visit that Country and they will undertake a very specific task for both the countries.

- (iii) I have been honored by Mayor of Cefalu; Rosario Lapunzina; and the account of my visit has been entered in historic book of Cefalu city. Cefalu is a State and for a particular domain there is a Mayor which is considered to be a very prestigious position. They have kept a historic book from the year 1600, the dignitaries such as Presidents or Vice

Presidents, who come to visit the place, mark their signatures in that book. I am very happy to communicate you that my signatures have also been recorded in that book with date, which is a great achievement in the name of Panjab University.

- (iv) During my visit with Prof. Calogero Di Carlo, Head Pegaso University, we had discussions w.r.t. online courses as Pegaso University is a leader in online programs. We have got the Letter of Intent for this and with the help of the Hon^{ble} members of the Syndicate, Senate and University fraternity, would definitely take it further.
- (v) We had discussion regarding research collaboration between University of Palermo & PU. Palermo is a very prestigious, old and very big University. In my meeting with Professor Fabio Mazzola, Vice Rector areas for mutual cooperation were explored and they will be sending a detailed proposal. They are very curious for mutual cooperation in the areas of Mathematics, English and Physics.
- (vi) I visited Duca Di Salaparuta, a private wine making group in Sicily and they have expressed to have interaction with our Biotechnology and UIHMT department. Wine Industry is one of the reputed industries in Italy. They got my visit arranged to the Wine factory where 100 years old wine is kept. The President of that group intended for having collaboration in the areas of biotechnology and tourism department.

These are some other things, which I would like to communicate to this August House for their information that the University now has moved and time has come to revamp the entire system enable it to accelerate so that they could achieve much in a shorter period of time.

The Vice Chancellor said that as suggested by the members in the earlier meeting, the action taken reports of the previous Syndicate meetings dated 27.08.2018, 23.09.2018 and 14.10.2018 are before them. They are requested to have a look and suggest as to what is required to be done. He further said that besides 2-3 other news, there is a news that Panjab University has been short-listed for Institute of Eminence tag, a scheme of the UGC.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra thanked the Vice Chancellor for resolving the issue of Ph.D. increments, to which the Vice Chancellor said that it is due to their good wishes. It is a very big achievement and it happened with the grace of God. Now about one hundred Assistant Professors, who were deprived of the increments, would get it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that CAS promotions are also held up and they requested the Vice Chancellor to get these promotion cases cleared at the earliest.

It was decided that Letter F.No.28-9/2018 (PS/Misc) dated 7th December, 2018 (Appendix-I) received from Professor Rajnish Jain, Secretary, UGC be adopted.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had received a letter, which would be brought to the Syndicate for consideration and adoption. The Vice Chancellor said that there is another good news relating to the teachers and Principals of affiliated Colleges. He has got a good signal and he would be visiting certain affiliated Colleges and would about 20-25 Colleges, which would be given a grant of Rs.1.5 crores. Apart from this, these colleges would get another Rs.1 crore as Recurring Grant. This is a very ambitious plan of the Central Government about which the Hon^{ble} Minister has told him. He would constitute a Committee with the help of them where the Principals of affiliated College

would be given representation. They would select about 20 Colleges in a phased manner within a week and prepare a proposal for grant of Rs.1.5 crores (one-time grant) and Rs.1 crore as Recurring Grant. He would personally go and get it sanctioned.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired as to for what activities this grant would be sanctioned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not yet fully aware about the scheme. He has only been told by the Minister about the plan which is meant for the Colleges. He would also like to tell that nowadays the Government is not giving funds for the development of infrastructure. However, this is the only scheme under which the selected Colleges would be given a grant of Rs.1.5 crore for development of infrastructure and Rs.1 crore as Recurring Grant out of which they could appoint and pay salaries, etc. to the teachers and non-teaching staff.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there are certain Colleges, which had surplus funds, but there are Colleges in the rural areas, especially the Girls Colleges, which really needed the funds for development.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would not do anything as he believed in participation of each and everyone. He would constitute a Committee comprising Fellows, Professors and Principals. The Committee would select the Colleges and get prepare their project, which would be recommended to the Government. They would try to cover all the 192 affiliated Colleges under this Scheme. Since 2019 is the Election Year, they should get it done at the earliest. He has visited certain Colleges, which are doing very well.

Shri Prabhjit Singh enquired as to what did he (Vice Chancellor) mean by the 'Election Year'.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that 'Election Year', mean that they would get the grant quickly and if there is any delay, the grant might also get delayed owing to 'Model Code of Conduct'.

Dr. Satish Kumar suggested that the process should be completed within a stipulated period, so that it does not get delayed owing to imposition of 'Model Code of Conduct'.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter relating to grant of status of Institute of Eminence under which a grant of Rs.50 crore was recommended by the RUSA, could not materialize. Now, he has been able to put the things on the track with their good wishes. Now, he is hopeful that they would get the grant. He added that he never differentiate between the University and its affiliated Colleges. In fact, he would take all the 192 affiliate Colleges along. As such, there should not an iota of doubt that he only talks about the University. In the RUSA grant, there is a huge component of Colleges.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that in Delhi, after getting the report, it was found that there were certain Colleges, which did not have Principals, and the Secretary, MHRD, convened a meeting of the Managements just to ensure that the vacant positions are filed up, only then they would be considered for RUSA grant. He apprehended that the situation which happened in Delhi should not be repeated here.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Court has fixed the next hearing, and he is sure that they would get the issue resolved at the earliest.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that the Research Promotion Cell was created by the Syndicate and Senate. He enquired whether the Director Research has been removed with the direction of the Syndicate. Was it resolved in the Syndicate meeting? Even if Dean Research was to be appointed, the Dean Research also had certain specific

rules/regulations for appointment and functions. He thought that it might not have been brought to his knowledge. Secondly, there is resentment amongst the faculty members of the University. Thirdly, when the position of Dean Research was created, it was an *ad hoc* arrangement. Thereafter, the Research Promotion Cell was created after doing some homework. Certain authorities and powers were given to the Director, Research Promotion Cell. If they brought in Dean Research again, there might be legal problem, and then that powers/authorities should also have been given to Dean Research only then the working of the University could be smoothened. Hence, there is a need to constitute a Committee to look into this issue. Moreover, even if the Dean Research is to be appointed, the appointment should be on the basis of seniority. He felt that if they have to shift to the old system of Dean Research, it should be done on the basis of seniority as earlier it was being done by the Syndicate and that too on the basis of seniority. The person, who is senior-most Professor after the Dean of University Instruction, should be appointed as Dean Research. He pleaded that the person, who is senior-most Professor after the Dean of University Instruction, should be appointed as Dean Research.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice-Chancellor is doing very good work.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever he has been able to do, that has been done with the cooperation of Hon'ble members.

Continuing, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that had the Vice-Chancellor been not positive and helpful, it would not have been possible. As he was a part, he knew how the Vice-Chancellor has been able to get the issue of grant of Ph.D. increments done. When everything is being done in a proper way, why should they do one such thing which creates resentment amongst the faculty members?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had come here with a clear mind and heart. Here neither he had any friend nor any foe. He had come here for the welfare of Panjab University and from the day one he is trying to take it to newer heights. In fact, in Italy different persons told him about certain Professors of English, Mathematics and Physics of this University, with whom they wanted to coordinate. Secondly, he believed in two things – (i) he takes along all; and (ii) he could not move slow. It is up to them to assess whether they treat it his quality or a shortcoming. He always believed in countdown. He has to do a lot of things in his three years' tenure and he is trying to do something for all. For research, on their recommendation, he could review it for thousand times. His initial statement was also on research and innovation. Research is at his heart and he would take care of their feelings. Whenever they give suggestions, irrespective of good or bad, he reacts immediately. He agreed with the opinion of Professor Goyal and they have to rethink and act accordingly. As such, the Hon'ble members should give their suggestion as to what is to be done. It does not matter whether they appoint Dean Research on the basis of seniority or otherwise as his only concern is that the work should not suffer. Some of them should sit together and find a way out, but the work should not stop. Whatever orders have been passed by him, could be reversed on their feelings/observations/recommendations. It should not come to their minds that he is interested in appointing a particular person, and his only concern is that the work should go on.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that whosoever have been appointed are their respected faculty members and they are good teachers. Whatever traditions are there, should be followed and the persons should be appointed on seniority basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would constitute a Committee to look into the entire issue and see as to how the best could be achieved.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that whatever is provided in the University Calendar regarding Dean Research, the same should be followed. He believed that the authority of the Syndicate is not above Calendar.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that so far as University Calendar is concerned, the position of Dean Research did not exist anywhere. The Research Promotion Cell was created under the decision of the Senate as also the Dean Research. Now, since the Syndicate unanimously decided to go back to the Dean Research, and when they go back to the Dean Research, the practice/traditions of Dean Research are clear and one of the traditions is that the Dean Research is appointed on the basis of seniority. Owing to this, the matter is being hotly debated in the Campus that the Dean Research should have been appointed on the basis of seniority and the people feel that everything is being done in a good manner and the Vice-Chancellor is really doing good things. He, therefore, pleaded that the Dean Research should be appointed on the basis of seniority and the second senior-most person should be appointed as Dean Research.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee would be constituted to examine the whole issue and make recommendation as to what is to be done and on what basis.

Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that, in fact, he was anticipating, whatever has been raised by Professor Navdeep Goyal, perhaps it comes in the Vice-Chancellor's statement, but it did not happen so. He was expecting so because when the charge of Dean was given, it was in the Vice-Chancellor's statement. Perhaps, the Dean Research might also be in the Vice-Chancellor's statement. Anyhow, the issue has been raised by Professor Navdeep Goyal. PUTA's elections are held and across the groups all wanted that the Dean Research should be appointed on the basis of seniority. He, therefore, proposed that keeping in view their feelings as well as of the Syndicate, the Dean Research should be appointed on the basis of seniority. So far as his (Vice-Chancellor) speed is concerned, they fully agreed that the working should be done speedily and there should not be any delay. However, whether it is Dean Research or any other Officer of the University, if the Vice-Chancellor feels that he/she is not doing the job properly, the matter should be brought to the Syndicate. It is the last meeting of the present Syndicate. If the Vice-Chancellor is facing any difficulty, the matter should be placed before the new Syndicate even because the matter which falls within the purview of the Syndicate, the same should be get resolved/sorted out by the Syndicate itself so that the members of the Governing body observe that their involvement is there. They respect his (Vice-Chancellor) feelings that he likes to get the work done at a high speed. Secondly, so far as the Action Taken Report provided to them is concerned, he would like to point out that whatever decision was taken by the Syndicate, the same is not there. Perhaps, it is not there because it was not part of the consideration. They welcomed his (Vice-Chancellor) orders relating to giving charge of Dean, College Development Council (DCDC) to Professor Sanjay Kaushik, but those orders were to be revised, and the same is not in the Action Taken Report. If the orders have been revised, they should be informed and a copy of the same be provided to them.

It was informed that the Action Taken Report provided to the Hon'ble members is not about the decisions taken by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 18th November 2018. In fact, the Action Taken Report related to the earlier meetings of the Syndicate, i.e., dated 27th August 2018, 23rd September 2018 and 14th October 2018.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if the orders have been revised, they should be informed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has got some input from some of the Hon'ble members and on the basis of that, he would revise the orders under consideration.

To this, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that, in fact, it was resolved by the Syndicate to revise the orders and there was nothing about the input. Input was required only, if

the matter was not discussed in the Syndicate. When the matter was resolved in the Syndicate, there is no question of any input.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if any input has been given by certain persons, and Shri Prabhjit Singh intervened to say, 'No', nobody, whosoever has given the input to the Vice-Chancellor, is not above the Syndicate – whether they are Fellows, Professors or anybody else.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi observed that even the Syndicate members could not give any input outside the meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is an input in the resolved part itself.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan pointed out that the meeting was allowed to continue only when the issue was resolved. Even the Vice-Chancellor had said that he has get the appreciation letter issued, but the same was not shown to them. Ultimately, it was resolved that a part of the said orders would be withdrawn and revised orders issued, but the same has not happened.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is in process.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that, in fact, the next day the orders should have been revised.

Professor Keshav Malhotra, endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Dr. R.K. Mahajan, said that, to boost the morale, the Vice-Chancellor should have revised the orders immediately after the meeting.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that with the revision of orders not only the morale was to be boosted, but it would have also encouraged the official(s).

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that instead of revising the orders, the Vice-Chancellor has constituted a Committee to oversee the functioning of the officer, which has never ever happened.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that there is no mention of any Committee in the Vice Chancellor's Statement. When Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they had read it in the newspapers that a Committee has been appointed to oversee the functioning of Controller of Examinations, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Vice-Chancellor has not informed them about this in his statement.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they welcome the statement of the Vice Chancellor that he likes to take all along and they also support him on this, but the news which have appeared in the newspapers during the last few days give the impression that everything is not good in the University. It has appeared in the Press that there is an office of Controller of Examinations and a Committee has been constituted to oversee the functioning of that office. It has also appeared in the Press that the Wardens are not doing their work properly and a Committee has been constituted to oversee them. If it is so, they should sit together to sort out the issues, but none should feel that his working is being surveillance because it gives a wrong impression. If the work/burden of the Officer(s) is to be reduced, they are with him (Vice-Chancellor). Similarly, if an Officer is not working properly, he (Vice-Chancellor) could call him and ask him to explain as to why the problem is there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is listening because the Hon'ble members have raised a very important issue. There should be no doubt at all because he is of the firm opinion that unnecessarily neither any doubt nor any confusion should be created.

At the stage, the Vice-Chancellor requested the Officers and officials, who were present in the meeting, to go and wait outside.

After lengthy discussion, it was –

RESOLVED to constitute a Committee consisting of Professor Navdeep Goyal, Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Sanjay Tandon and Dr. Amit Joshi, Secretary to the Vice Chancellor, Convener, – (i) to frame guidelines for the office of Dean Research in consultation with the Vice Chancellor; and (ii) to view contents of Committee constituted for facilitating and assisting the examination system.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Mr. Sunil Arora, IAS (Retd.), an alumnus of Panjab University, on his having been appointed as Chief Election Commissioner of India;
 - (ii) Professor Nishtha Jaswal, Department of Laws, on her having been appointed Vice Chancellor of Himachal Pradesh National Law University at Shimla;
 - ii) Professor Jagdeep Kaur, Department of Biotechnology, Dr. Ranvir Singh, National Centre for Human Genome Studies & Research of Panjab University and Dr. Pushpender Kumar Sharma, Department of Biotechnology, Sri Guru Granth Sahib World University, Fatehgarh Sahib, on having been granted India Patent for inventing a Lipase;
 - iii) Dr. Sangeeta Pilkhwal Sah, Associate Professor, UIPS, on her having been elected as a Member of the prestigious National Academy of Medical Sciences (NAMS); and
 - iv) Professor Preeti Mahajan, Chairperson, Department of Library and Information Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on her having been honoured with 'Indian Association of Teachers of Library and Information Science (IATLIS)-Prof. S. P. Narang Research Promotion Award-2018'.
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. Nos. (1-(i), (ii), (iii), (v), (vi), (vii), (viii), (ix), (x)), and (2-(i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), & (vi)), be noted.
3. thanks of the Syndicate be conveyed to Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal for releasing the second instalment of Rs.2 lacs to the Panjab University Voluntary Contribution Fund as his contribution for the year 2018.
4. the Action Taken Report(s) on the decisions of the Syndicate meetings dated 27.08.2018, 23.09.2018 and 14.10.2018, as per **Appendix-II**, be noted.

2. Item 2 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

- 2.** To appoint the following Committees for the period noted against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Committee	Enabling Regulations on the subject	Tenure of the Committee
1.	Revising Committee	Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 at page 32, P.U. Calendar, Volume- II, 2007	Calendar year 2019, i.e., 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019
2.	Regulations Committee	Regulation 23.1 at page 33, P.U. Calendar, Volume- I, 2007	Calendar year 2019, i.e., 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019

- NOTE:**
1. Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 for composition of Revising Committee along with present members of the Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2018 enclosed.
 2. Regulation 23.1 for composition of Regulation Committee along with present members of the Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2018 enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in fact, this Item should have been placed before the Syndicate in its January 2019 meeting as it is the prerogative of the new Syndicate.

When it was pointed out that last year, the item pertaining to appointment of these Committees was placed before the Syndicate in its December meeting, Ashok Goyal said that, at that time also, it was suggested that, in future, the Item should be placed before the Syndicate in its January meeting.

RESOLVED: That, for the time being, the consideration of the Item be deferred with the observation that, in future, the Item be placed before the Syndicate in its January meeting.

3. Item 3 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

- 3.** To appoint Vice-Chairperson of P.U. Extension Library Advisory Committee, Ludhiana, for a term of two Calendar years, i.e. 1.1.2019 to 31.12.2020, as per Rule 1 (ii) at page 36 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

- NOTE:** 1. Rule 1 (ii) *ibid* reads as under:

“The Committee shall consist of:

- (i) xxx xxx xxx
- (ii) Vice-Chairman: To be appointed by the Panjab University Syndicate out of the Principals of Local Degree Colleges for a term not exceeding two Calendar year

2. Professor (Mrs.) Mohinder Kaur Grewal, Principal, Govt. College for Women, Ludhiana was appointed as the Vice-Chairperson of the Advisory Committee for the term 01.01.2017 to 31.12.2018, by the

Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (47 R (ii)) (**Appendix-III**) and her term would come to end on 31.12.2018.

3. An office note containing the list of the Principals of Local Degree Colleges Ludhiana enclosed (**Appendix-III**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that Principal Inderjit Kaur, Ramgarhia Girls College, Milerganj, Ludhiana, should be appointed Vice-Chairperson of P.U. Extension Library Advisory Committee, Ludhiana.

RESOLVED: That Principal Inderjit Kaur, Ramgarhia Girls College, Milerganj, Ludhiana, be appointed Vice-Chairperson of P.U. Extension Library Advisory Committee, Ludhiana, for a term of two Calendar years, i.e., 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2020, as per Rule 1 (ii) at page 36 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

- 4.** Considered minutes dated 28.09.2018 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding proposal for appointment of outside adjunct faculty (as per UGC Guidelines) at the University Teaching Departments. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.5.2018 (Para 11) has resolved that minutes dated 13.03.2018 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding proposal for appointment of Adjunct Faculty at the University Teaching Departments that the regular faculty be appointed as Adjunct Faculty from the respective Department that needs services of the faculty members, as per Appendix, be approved.

On a query made by Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that among others he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) and Professor J.K. Goswami were the members of the Committee, the recommendations of which are being considered now. In fact, there are certain guidelines of the UGC for Empanelment of Adjust faculty, and they have incorporated certain changes in the UGC guidelines, e.g., in the Selection Criteria the upper limit of period of empanelment has been reduced from 3 years to **1 year**, Head of the Institution has been replaced with **the Vice-Chancellor**, Dean (Academic/Research) with **Dean of University Instruction**, One External Expert (nominated by the head of the Institution) with by **the Vice-Chancellor**, Registrar/Vice-Chancellor/ Bursar or equivalent person (Convener) with **Dean of the concerned Faculty**, competent authority with **Syndicate**. Further, the last few lines mentioned in bold at page have been added.

It was clarified that the Adjunct faculty is to be appointed under Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Skill Development Scheme. As per the Scheme, persons from Industry, Police Administration, etc. are to be appointed as Adjunct faculty to teach the newly introduced skill development courses, and the persons so appointed are called Adjunct faculty. Persons so appointed could deliver maximum of four lectures at the payment of Rs.1,000/- per day. However, they could be paid a maximum of Rs.80,000/- per month and this is only for the outside experts. In the Syndicate meeting dated 26th May 2018, it had been decided that the regular faculty of Panjab University could also be appointed as Adjunct faculty, which is wrong as the regular faculty of the University could not be engaged for this purpose. So far as regular faculty of the University is concerned, it is already there that they could be engaged as guest faculty at a payment of Rs.1,000/- per lecture. Anyhow, the item placed before the Syndicate really meant for the Adjunct faculty, which is for the outside experts. After receiving the UGC guidelines, the Vice-Chancellor has appointed a Committee, which has incorporated necessary changes in the UGC guidelines.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to what is difference between Adjunct and guest faculty.

It was clarified that the guest faculty could be paid Rs.1,000/- per lecture but not more than Rs.25,000/- per month. However, for Adjunct faculty the maximum limit is Rs.80,000/- per month at Rs.1,000/- per lecture and maximum four lectures could be delivered in a day. The person appointed as Adjunct faculty has to be given TA, DA, and accommodation for staying for a week. So far as guest faculty is concerned, guest faculty is not for specialized courses. UGC has said that the Adjunct faculty is to be appointed to teach newly introduced specialized courses under Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Skill Development Scheme. For example, Dev Samaj College for Women has introduced a very good subject, viz. Beauty & Cosmetology for which they would appoint Adjunct faculty from the Industry where the experts are available.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired then why the guest faculty is appointed.

It was clarified that the guest faculty is appointed to teach the regular courses wherever the regular teachers are not available to teach the course(s).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should be informed as to which such a course is being offered at the University Campus.

It was informed that the services of such experts from the industry are required at University Business School, Dr. Harbansh Singh Judge Dental Institute and University Institute of Engineering & Technology.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it meant, till date they had not appointed any Adjunct faculty from the industry neither at UBS nor UIET, and they have no interaction with the people from the industry. On the one side, they are being informed that the Government has introduced Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Skill Development Scheme, and on the other side, that they are inviting people from the Industry at UBS, Dental Institute & UIET, where the regular courses are being offered. Indirectly, it meant that by using the Government Policy (Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Skill Development Scheme) for specialized courses, they wanted to bring in faculty for regular Department/courses. When they invite some guest, the System already existed in the University for paying him/her the honorarium as well as TA/DA. It meant, they are starting something new in the name of Skill Development courses to be used for regular Departments, whereas it is not for regular Departments. A plea is being given that Dev Samaj College has introduced a very good course under this Scheme. Item relates to the University Campus.

It was pointed out that certain specialized courses have to be introduced in the affiliated Colleges under this scheme.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the turn of affiliated Colleges would come, they would discuss the issue. At the moment, they are talking only about the University Teaching Departments. He drew the attention of the House that the Item before them is 'Proposal for appointment of outside adjunct faculty at the University Teaching Departments'. Let them not mix it up with the affiliated Colleges, and as and when the turn of the Colleges come, they would discuss the issue. Now, if the requirement is there, why it is not mentioned "only for the specialized courses and not for regular courses already being offered in the University Teaching Departments".

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one of the problems is that the guidelines of the UGC have not been appended with the Item, and everything is clarified in the guidelines. As such, what Shri Ashok Goyal is saying is absolutely correct. Therefore, the consideration of the Item should be deferred and placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting along with the relevant papers, including UGC guidelines.

When the Vice-Chancellor enquired, during the intervening period, would there be any disadvantage, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they would not be any kind of disadvantage. The Vice-Chancellor said that his only concern is that there should not be any disadvantage, especially when there is acute shortage of faculty at the University Campus.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that December is already going on and after appending all the related documents, including UGC guidelines, the item should be placed before the Syndicate in its January 2019 meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then the Item should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting after making it comprehensive. He added that when they appoint somebody as Adjunct faculty, then the course to be taught is highly specialized.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it seems to him a good thing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though it is a good thing, they must specify as to what kinds of exigencies are there, where they wanted to appoint Adjunct faculty.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the members to meet him as he wishes to promote this and with this, experts from different fields would come to the University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is not that the people of high calibre. In fact, the workload is not there, but they invite/appoint people to oblige them. Therefore, to stop its misuse is absolutely necessary.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Committee would be requested to revisit it in a comprehensive way.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that Professor Keshav Malhotra should also be appointed a member of the Committee.

RESOLVED: That, for the time being, the consideration of the Item be deferred, and at the same time, the matter be referred to the same Committee to revisit the matter and make comprehensive recommendations. Professor Keshav Malhotra be also made a member of the afore-said Committee.

Arising out of the above, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Departments falling under the Faculty of Arts and Languages are facing problem as they did not find teachers to teach specialized courses. However, retired teachers from the Colleges are available, and they should be allowed to be invited as guest faculty to teach such specialized courses on a payment of Rs.25,000/- p.m.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now the issue arises whether the Committee would deal with the University alone or the Colleges also.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that what he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) is saying is that there are certain courses, which are offered at the University campus, but the teachers are not available to teach these courses. He (Professor Keshav Malhotra) is suggesting that the teachers retired from the Colleges should be allowed to be invited as guest faculty to teach such specialized courses and they be allowed to be paid maximum of Rs.25,000/- p.m. This decision was taken, but the fate of that decision is not known.

Dr. Amit Joshi and Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that if there is a vacancy in the University Teaching Department, all should be made eligible to teach such courses not only the retired ones.

It was agreed to, in case there is any requirement of guest faculty to teach course in the University Teaching Departments, retired teachers of affiliated Colleges of Panjab University may be invited as guest faculty on payment basis up to the maximum of Rs.25,000/- p.m. as per UGC rules of guest faculty.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi suggested that it should not be approved as such, but a regular item should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that though the regular teachers are available within the Campus for appointment as guest faculty, they are not entitled for payment/honorarium. As such, the working teachers, including from the affiliated Colleges, would not get any payment. Hence, none would like to work without payment. Payment could only be made to the retired teachers.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi reiterated that this should not be approved like this; rather, an regular item be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Professor Anita Kaushal pointed out that in the Colleges, the guest faculty is engaged on Rs.500/- per lecture, whereas in the University the payment is Rs.1,000/- per lecture.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this issue should also be taken care of by the Committee referred to in Item C-4, and a person from the affiliated Colleges should be made a member of the above-said Committee.

This was agreed to and it was also resolved that Professor Anita Kaushal be also made a member of said Committee.

5. Considered minutes (Item No.7, 9, 10, 18 and 23) dated 04.10.2018 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Executive Committee, PUSC.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 04.10.2018 (relating to Items 7, 9, 10, 18 and 23), as per **Appendix**, be approved.

6. Considered the co-education status of National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, as forwarded by the affiliation Committee dated 07.09.2018. Information contained in office note containing brief history of the case was also taken into consideration.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that, last year, the Affiliation Committee took this decision and he would like to inform them as to why this decision was taken. Before that, it was discussed in the Syndicate meeting several times that there is a large number of Colleges, which are called non-attending Colleges. Non-attending meant, the Colleges admit students in thousands, but no student attended classes and they are allowed to appear in the University examinations. Complaint was coming that the Colleges, which were working honestly, candidates do not take admission there as they preferred to take admission in the non-attending Colleges. Actually, this was the phrase being used. When the report of the Affiliation Committee relating to this College came, it was mentioned that the attendance in this College is very low, whereas the College was granted the status of Coeducation just a year before. At that time, they took few decisions because majority of the Fellows were giving details about certain Colleges, including that these are non-attending Colleges. It is on record that 11-Persons, including late Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, have submitted a list of such Colleges in the office of the Vice-Chancellor as well as in the office of Dean, College Development Council. Thereafter, they decided that they would make a surprise visit to 2-3 Colleges out of that list. It was also decided that they would neither inform the concerned Officers/officials of the University regarding the surprise visit(s) so that information does not leak nor claim TA/DA from anywhere. They (he - Professor Navdeep Goyal,

Principal I.S. Sandhu and Principal Late S. Hardiljit Singh Gosal) made a surprise visit of an affiliated College (CGM College, VPO Mohallan, Tehsil Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib). When they entered the College, the College persons were astonished to see them suddenly in the College and they also tried to lock the backside gate. Principal I.S. Sandhu immediately opened the gate and found that there were only school children. They asked them to show the identity cards of the students of the College, but they could not do so. Then they went to the upper floor where the furniture, which they had, was that of the school. Ultimately, they came to the conclusion as if a school is functioning from that building. Thereafter, they went to the adjoining building where they found 3-4 classes comprising of 8-10 students but the total number of students was 32, whereas that year the College had admitted 500 students and a year before they had admitted 1700 students. The building in which the classes were being taken had neither the doors nor the windows, and without doors and windows, the examination centre could not be created/granted. Ultimately, they prepared the report and submitted in the University, which was placed before the Syndicate. It was a remote area College and they discussed the issue in detail, and finally it was decided that the College be not disaffiliated though it deserved disaffiliation. It was a decision of the Syndicate, obviously it was taken by them collectively and it was also decided that the examination centre of the College for boys be abandoned because the major problem was of the boys. Similarly, this decision relating to National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, was also taken owing to this reason that there the boys virtually do not attend classes and the College should be converted from coeducation to Girls College only. Of course, they wanted that the College should improve upon itself and work within the norms. If the College(s) work within the norms, the University Syndicate (Governing Body) and the Senate does not have any problem. Now, if they had the report that the College has improved upon itself, working within the norms and properly, they could consider it. Perhaps, a Committee had also inspected this College a few months before, if the report is good, then it's okay; otherwise, they must deliberate on it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the Committee had visited the College, who among the members of the present Syndicate, had visited the said College.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he had gone to the College. In fact, he, Professor Keshav Malhotra and Dr. Dalip Kumar were the members of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Prabhjit Singh to put the facts before the House.

Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that the issue before them was to grant the status of Coeducation College to National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka. The management had opened the Girls College about 7-8 years ago. Through backdoor entry, now the College had started admitting boys, and the College has also obtained No Objection Certificate (NOC) from the Punjab Government. The former Vice-Chancellor has granted the status of Coeducation College to this College (National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka), in anticipation of approval of Syndicate and Senate, and the item had come for information, which was noted. Thereafter, a Committee, comprising Principal R.S. Jhanji (Chairman), Professor Keshav Malhotra and he himself, visited this College. He had a recording of about two minutes in which the Chairman of the Managing Committee has confessed that 60% of the students come to them. If they wished, the recording could be played.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Shri Prabhjit Singh to play the recording, and the same was actually played. When the Vice-Chancellor asked as to who is the Principal of the College, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that no Principal is there for the last about 8 years.

Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that they had gone to the College for conducting an enquiry. The reason as to why they were sent to conduct the enquiry is that whosoever

teacher ask for salary, the College Management dismissed him/her. Since two teachers were dismissed and two were placed under suspension, the Vice-Chancellor had sent them for conducting the enquiry. The purpose of the enquiry was as to why the teachers have been dismissed/placed under suspension. He (Vice-Chancellor) would be shocked and in fact, every member of the Syndicate would be shocked to know that about 12-14 teachers are working in the College. The College is functioning for the last 8-10 years and all the teachers have been working on a consolidated pay of Rs.21,600/- per month. No Principal is there for the last about 8 years. All the non-attending students have been admitted in the College. Fortunately, the item has been placed before them. Had the item been placed in the next meeting of the Syndicate, perhaps, he would have not been able to explain the facts in detail because he is a member of the present Syndicate only. What to talk of coeducational College, this College is not fit to function even as a Girls College. The College is totally professional, professional means that just wanted to earn more and more money. College is neither giving maternity leave to the female teachers nor giving any Provident Fund. They are talking about the implementation of recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission, but he is doubtful that the College has implemented even the recommendations of 3rd Pay Commission. If there is a deficiency in a good College, the same should be given a chance to improve upon. They should not allow a College to function, which is being run by certain thieves. In the year 2014 also, the Inspection Committee(s) had visited this College, and the Committee(s) had pointed out that the College has not appointed the Principal. Since they are getting the job done without the Principal, why should they spend on him/her and why not save the funds? They have the habit of getting their job done from the University on one pretext or the other. Sometimes they threaten and sometimes get the approval from the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of Syndicate and Senate. In fact, this College is entirely a non-attending College. On a query made by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, Shri Prabhjit Singh informed that the lady, whose voice was there in the recording, is the Librarian. The Committee has got the recording done and submitted the recording in a CD to the office. The Cameraman was hired on the expenses of the University, got recording made and submitted the same in the University office. He himself had gone to the Dean, College Development Council (Professor Sanjay Kaushik) and informed him that they have submitted report along with the CD as a proof. He has requested him (Dean, College Development Council) to make it sure that the report is placed before the Syndicate, but he is sorry to point out that so far the report has not been placed before them. In fact, this item should have been placed before the Syndicate along with that report so that all the members know as to what this College is doing. The Management of the College has confessed before the Committee (Principal R.S. Jhanji, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Dr. Dalip Kumar and he himself (Shri Prabhjit Singh) in front of camera that more than 60% non-attending students come to the College. If they still wanted to permit the College, he could not do anything.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now nothing is left to say about the College. In fact, this is a very serious issue.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that there are seven such Colleges and only one College should not be targeted. One of such Colleges is at Muhar. How could the children of Ganganagar come in Muhar College? In fact, 600 children of Ganganagar have been admitted in Muhar College. Even CGM College, Mohlan also falls in this category. Similarly, Satyam College has not so far.....

Shri Prabhjit Singh intervened and said that it is true, Muhar College should also be disaffiliated. He suggested that the request of this College (National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka) should be rejected and, thereafter served a show-cause notice for disaffiliation. A Committee should be sent to the seven Colleges, which are being pointed out by Dr. R.K. Mahajan for verifying the position so that all the members are made aware of their deeds.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan pointed out that though Satyam College is functioning for the last 8-10 years, 100% deficiencies existed there. This time Satyam College was not given affiliation by the University, and it is surprising.....

Shri Prabhjit Singh intervened to say that one thing he forgot to tell that the lady is asking the student to come to the College on Friday and Saturday urgently. She is compelling the student to come is because information had leaked from the University, a surprise visit/inspection would be made by a University Committee either on Friday or Saturday.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that that was why, they made a surprise visit to a College, and the information about that was not disclosed to none of the official.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they had decided that affiliation to Satyam College be not granted for 1st year class(es) because if they dug out the reports relating to that College of the last 5 years, they would find 100% deficiencies, but the College Management did not have any fear. They stopped the affiliation of this College on 29th September, and the College issued the advertisement on 1st October. The College does not fulfil any condition for affiliation, a meeting of the Affiliation Committee was scheduled for 1st on urgent basis, but it was given to the College on 30th the College through the DUI. Who has done this, should be checked. They had, in fact, denied affiliation because the College used to appoint teachers only for one and half years, and thereafter, dismiss them and this process has been continuing for the last five years.

Dr. Amit Joshi stated that these cases had come to the Affiliation Committee and to say how it has happened and that these are wrong, is not proper. As pointed out by Shri Prabhjit Singh, the problems might in the College as he (Dr. Amit Joshi) has not gone to the College to see this. Whatever Shri Prabhjit Singh has said is true, but so far as Affiliation Committee is concerned, the report of the Committee, which had visited the College for grant of affiliation for 2018-19, was absolutely okay, and on the basis of that report, the Affiliation Committee took the decision. However, whatever has been pointed out by Shri Prabhjit Singh it is true and whatever action is required on the basis of that, they must initiate the same. But this action as well as action in the case of Satyam College, which is pointed out by Dr. R.K. Mahajan, the case of Satyam College is crystal clear because the College had issued the advertisement and made requisite appointments. However, if no candidate appears in the interview against a particular post, what could the College do? At that time, he himself (Dr. Amit Joshi) and Shri Ashok Goyal had prepared a data about this of many such Colleges. They had done the exercise about this of almost all the Colleges individually. They had made a lot of efforts in the Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Ashok Goyal, which had members including Dr. Ameer Sultana and Professor Anita Kaushal, and they did not do any such case in the Committee. Do they expect that any such case could get through under the Chairmanship of Shri Ashok Goyal? He would say this with hundred per cent surety because he (Shri Ashok Goyal) sees everything minutely. He only did not agree that the affiliation to this College has been given undeservedly.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan intervened to say that affiliation was given to the College without any prerogative.

Continuing, Dr. Amit Joshi stated that, in fact, affiliation has been granted after seeing everything in depth. So far as Satyam College is concerned, Shri Ashok Goyal had not come to attend the meeting on that day. However, he had talked to him (Shri Ashok Goyal) and informed that he has seen the file of the College (Satyam College) and he could say with guarantee even today that even if anyone of them go through the file, he/she could not say that the College does not deserve affiliation.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that he was also a member of the Inspection Committee so far as these two Colleges (National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, and Satyam College). The inspection on the basis of the National College for

Girls, Chowarianwali was granted affiliation, he was a member of that Inspection Committee. The Affiliation Committee usually does its duty on the basis of Inspection Committee report. In fact, they scrutinize the report of the Inspection Committee and make recommendations accordingly. The examinations were going on when this time the Inspection Committee visited the College. So Shri Prabhjit Singh might be right, but when they visited the College. The Committee comprised of Principal Nisha Bhargawa (Chairperson), Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, he himself and it was a big Committee of probably 11-persons. Paper-wise, the Committee found everything in order though they had also reported the issue of salary. Certain things do not come under the purview of the Affiliation Committee. Paper-wise, everything was in order. However, so far as attendance of students is concerned, they could not verify the same because at that time the examinations were going on. As such, the Affiliation Committee has performed its job rightly. So far as Satyam College is concerned, its case was rejected on the basis of Inspection Committee report. The Surprise Committee had also visited the College on the basis of Inspection Committee report. The attendance of the students and the teachers was not provided to the Committee, which visited Satyam College, and the same was very dangerous. The report of the Inspection Committee is available at page 34. On the basis of this, i.e., neither they have the attendance of students nor the teachers, the case of the College was rejected by them. Teachers were called only when their presence was required. In fact, this was a big drawback of Satyam College. Anyhow, the College has been granted affiliation by one of the higher authority and they did not raise finger to authority, but they are not blaming him (Vice-Chancellor) for that decision. However, the Vice-Chancellor must have gone through the report of the Inspection Committee, which is very degrading because neither the attendance of students nor teachers is there.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he had an opportunity to talk to the Chairman of the Managing Committee and his reply was what could they do as the teachers appointed by them get settled/appointed on regular basis in the Schools?

Professor Ronki Ram said that there is two issues – (i) the Committee which has visited the College; and (ii) information given by Shri Prabhjit Singh. Though both the issues are interconnected with each other, are not in the item, which has come to them for consideration. The papers related to the item are available from page 31 to 38. The constitution of the Committee is available at page 31. In fact, it is very good Committee, under the Chairmanship of Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Parvinder Singh (Dean, College Development Council), Principal (Dr.) Surinder Singh Sangha (Fellow), Dr. Ameer Sultana (Fellow), Dr. R.K. Mahajan (Syndic & Fellow), Dr. Amit Joshi (Syndic & Fellow), and Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu (Syndic & Fellow). After the visit of this Committee, the Affiliation Committee, which visited the College, comprised of Dr. R.K. Mahajan (Syndic & Fellow), Professor Anita Kaushal (Syndic & Fellow), Dr. Amit Joshi (Syndic & Fellow), Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu (Syndic & Fellow), and Dr. Subhash Sharma (Syndic & Fellow). The report of the Committee says that the courses demanded by them should be granted to the College for the session 2018-19. So far as status of coeducation to the College is concerned, it could not be given as the same is not under their purview, and the Committee has written that the request of the College for grant of coeducation status be placed before the Syndicate. Moreover the final resolve part of the Committee also says that affiliation be given to the College, and the same has been granted. Now, the item before them is whether the status of coeducation is to be granted to the College or not. What Shri Prabhjit Singh is saying is a separate case, which could be looked into. Keeping in view his (Shri Prabhjit Singh) viewpoints, they could take further necessary action in the matter. However, the students should not be put to disadvantage.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that so far as grant of coeducation status is concerned, it is always granted by the Government.

Shri Prabhjit Singh intervened to say that the decision of the Government is not binding on the University.

Continuing, Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the University has asked the College to first obtain NOC from the Government, and only thereafter, they would grant the status of coeducation to the College. Only thereafter, the Management has changed the name of the College. According to him, the University had granted the status of coeducation to the College. However, last year the same was withdrawn and only the examinations of the students (Boys) got conducted.

Shri Prabhjit Singh remarked that even after listening to the recording, which itself proves everything, he is saying that everything is in order, then only God could save them.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan reiterated that they should not target a particular College; rather, their stress should be on all the eleven Colleges.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is saying that all such Colleges should be inspected again.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi remarked that should they leave the College, which has been proved to be wrong.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they did not grant the status of coeducation until the Government issued the NOC to the College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that so far as affiliation is concerned, the Chancellor's Office is getting the updation on the issue. Since it is very-very serious, he would not be taken lightly under any circumstances. It should be brought again after putting in rigorous efforts and making it a comprehensive one.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to make his observations without offending anyone. One of the members has referred to page 35 and Shri Prabhjit Singh has pointed very-very pertinent shortcomings. What is the reply to this that the Syndicate had sent a Special Committee to inspect the College, but why the report of the Committee has not been brought to the Syndicate? Until the reply to this is given, what would they discuss? The Committee had taken along a Cameraman and submitted the report along with the recording. Why the report has not been placed before the Syndicate? Secondly, they should have a look at page 35 and see the members, who have attended the meeting. He would like to inform them that this meeting had never been convened. He requested that the notice issued for the meeting should be shown to him. In fact, this meeting was never convened.

When Dr. R.K. Mahajan intervened to say that even the notice for the meeting of 1st is not available, whereas the same was unofficial meeting, the Vice-Chancellor said that he would not allow this. When a member is speaking, he should be allowed to complete his statement. In fact, it is a very-very bad practice. He is ready to listen to all and is not running away from here. The meeting is for all and they should not look at the watch. Everybody has several assignments, and someone has some priorities, he could send a request letter to him (Vice-Chancellor) stating that he/she would not be able to attend the meeting. All the Hon'ble members are working somewhere and he (Vice-Chancellor) has also to go somewhere. The meeting should not be made a joke. When Dr. R.K. Mahajan again started speaking, the Vice-Chancellor said that nobody is asking anything from him (Dr. R.K. Mahajan).

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it meant that the meeting, which was held on 1st, had been held in a wrong manner, and it also meant that they had got the licence that they could hold the meeting at any time and decide whatever they wished. He drew the attention of the House to page 35, i.e., the Proceedings of the meeting of the Affiliation Committee dated 5th October 2018, which had been confirmed by a person, who was not even present in the meeting. The one, who is not even present in

the meeting, is confirming the minutes. Moreover, the minutes had been signed by two members only, whereas there were 11 members of the Committee. The recommendation is that the matter should be placed before the Syndicate, and the Vice Chancellor in his wisdom also ordered that the matter be placed before the Syndicate. He just wanted to know from the Vice-Chancellor and also from the House that the item, which has been placed before them for consideration, is an item of the last meeting of the Affiliation Committee where even the quorum was not complete, and they have already allowed it. Now, what are they supposed to do? The report, which was submitted by the Committee, has not been brought to the Syndicate, and the issue, which has been placed before them for consideration, has already been decided. He has also come to know that the Affiliation Committee has also granted the Examination Centre. What are they doing? Dr. Amit Joshi has pointed out that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) was the Chairman of the Committee and such an item could not escape from him. He has no hesitation in accepting that they had done a proper scrutiny and to give message to certain Colleges, they did not grant affiliation to them, but subsequently, in his absence, that very Affiliation Committee granted affiliation to those Colleges again. He does not think that the case of grant of affiliation of even a single College is pending now. In a case of a Government College situated in Chandigarh, it was unanimously decided that the College, which has not even applied for affiliation, which has not even been inspected, had admitted the students, and he has been given to understand that in the last meeting of the Affiliation Committee, what decision has been taken, he was enquiring from the Dean, College Development Council, in the morning as to what is the status of the students, who have been admitted by the College.

The Vice-Chancellor said, that meant, everything has been done, but information has not been disclosed to anyone. Is this the system, which is prevailing in the University?

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the system has not changed with the change of Dean, College Development Council. The Affiliation Committee has recommended that these students be shifted to such and such Colleges. Would they be treated as students of the College, where they have been shifted? Earlier also, they had shifted the students in this manner, but the Colleges, who had committed the mistake, were imposed the fine to the tune of Rs.5/- lacs. However, in this case, no fine has been imposed, but the students have been shifted and the students would take the examination there. The students have been shifted to the Colleges without seeing their infrastructure, and better to this was to let the students remain that College where the teachers were available. The only mistake of the College was that it did not apply for affiliation. Only camouflaging has been done that they have not done what the College was demanding/expecting. If it is not making mockery of the University, then what is it? Moreover, the Colleges say that the Affiliation Committee is more power than the Syndicate, i.e., over and above the Syndicate. The decisions taken by the Syndicate have been changed by the Affiliation Committee. So far as the issue of this College is concerned, the Affiliation Committee has said that last year, when the Affiliation Committee changed the status of this College from coeducation to Girls College, it was based on some input given by the Committee, which had visited the College. Now, it is not within the purview of the Affiliation Committee simply because the College has demanded the status of coeducation. There it was told that last year also, the College had not accepted the decision of the Committee and boys had appeared in the examination from that College. This year, it has been approved that the returns of boys be accepted. He admires Dr. R.K. Mahajan for taking a stand as to why only one College is being targeted. If there are 7 or 11 such Colleges, all should be punished, but it did not mean that till then the case of this College be kept pending. Simultaneously, action should also be taken on those 7 or 11 Colleges. However, since the case of this College is *fait accompli*, they could not do anything today as the returns of the students have been accepted and they are appearing in the examinations. Whatever decision they take, it has no relevance, but the Syndicate should not regularize that it is already, even after listening to the recording played by Shri Prabhjit Singh. The report of the Committee should be placed before the Syndicate and in the meantime, the remaining

Colleges should be got inspected by sending Surprise Committee(s) and it should be ensured that information about the visit of Surprise Committee(s) should not be given to anybody even to the officials concerned.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they should not make fun of themselves. If they had permitted the Government College, it would be in the best interest of everybody that the students should be allowed to continue in Government College, Sector 46, Chandigarh, irrespective of wherever they are appearing in the examination. However, fine should be imposed on the College. At the same time, a decision should be taken that no concession would be given to anyone under any circumstances. The stand of the Government was right that when they could give this benefit to DAV Management by sending Inspection Committees a number of times, why it is not being given to them. Two-two persons sitting in the meetings of the Affiliation Committee, have taken all such decisions. If they look at the notice of the meeting, they would be surprised to know that the notice has been issued in the evening that the meeting of the Affiliation Committee would be held tomorrow in the morning. He did not wake up so early that he is able to attend the meeting in the University at 11.00 a.m. and within few minutes decisions on such crucial issues, especially when Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha and Madam had sent in writing that the meeting should not be called on such a short notice. Even then, they are making mockery of the system. He said that when the Affiliation Committee would be made next time.

The Vice-Chancellor intervened to say that there is no need to appoint an Affiliation Committee. Let them resolve that there should not be any Affiliation Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no need to resolve that there is no need for appointing an Affiliation Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the Affiliation Committee was appointed by the Syndicate, it is necessary to resolve today because next time when it would be changed, the next Syndicate should know it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is saying that there is no such regulation that the Affiliation Committee is to be constituted. Therefore, after this, they might not constitute any Affiliation Committee, and this Committee be disbanded.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that since people are paid for this, it is necessary to disband this Committee.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the item which has come to the Syndicate remained as such. The Affiliation Committee has recommended that the issue of grant of status of coeducation to the College be placed before the Syndicate, and the Syndicate should reject the request of the College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they think it proper, he is intending that instead of rejecting it straightaway, the whole issue should be examined comprehensively.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Item would come again to the Syndicate along with the report of the Committee.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the request of the College for grant of coeducation status should be rejected. So far as Girls College is concerned, affiliation has already been granted.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the same is done, but what would they do to the College.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan pointed out that the Government has issued NOC to the College and they had given the status of coeducation to the College.

To this, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the recommendation of the Government is not binding on them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Item should be brought to the Syndicate again after making it more comprehensive.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now they have come to the conclusion that the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) should be asked to explain as to how and under whose instructions this meeting of the Affiliation Committee has been convened, and how the minutes of the meeting has been confirmed/got confirmed from a person, who has not even attended the meeting. And a note has been put up to the Vice-Chancellor that the minutes of the Affiliation Committee signed by the Chairman of the Committee are enclosed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the comments of other officials, who are involved in/associated with the matter, should also be obtained.

Shri Prabhjit Singh suggested that the explanation received from the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) and others should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that though Dr. Amit Joshi was present there, he did not sign the minutes.

Dr. Amit Joshi clarified that, at that time, the Affiliation Committee took the decision that the matter should be placed before the Syndicate, but not that the affiliation should be granted to the College, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, and there is a lot of difference between the two. One is that the status of coeducation is granted, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, and he was of the firm view that this should not be the case, and the matter should be placed before the Syndicate. The Affiliation Committee has not got any such power.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that Dr. Amit Joshi has informed that the issue was to be placed before the Syndicate, and in this regard he would like to inform them that the issue is of dates back, i.e., the month of September. Though three meetings of the Syndicate (held in the months of September, October and November) have gone, the file of this College remained standstill and did not move forward. It should be enquired as to by whom and why it was kept pending for such a long period. In view of this the Committee members have no alternative, but to take the decision that the students be allowed to appear in the examinations, which were approaching fast, and the remaining issue(s) would be taken care of later on.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Affiliation Committee does not have power to grant affiliation/extension of affiliation to a College, in anticipation of approval of Syndicate, though the Vice-Chancellor has, but not for grant of status of coeducation to the College.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that Dr. Amit Joshi has not signed, it is a separate issue, but when the meeting of the Affiliation Committee was held, they three (Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu, Dr. R.K. Mahajan, Dr. Amit Joshi) as well as Deputy Registrar (Colleges) spoke to Dr. Satish Kumar Ji. So far as Shri Ashok Goyal is concerned, he had gone to Meghalaya.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that it meant they knew that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) had gone to Meghalaya.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu and Dr. R.K. Mahajan jointly said that they came to know this only in the meeting of the Affiliation Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the members to see the condition, and that meant, the Dean, College Development Council, was also not within the station, and the meeting was called in his absence.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it should also be enquired as to why the meeting was convened on 1st in which affiliation was given to a College, where they had made a surprise visit.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that regarding the issue of Govt. College, Sector 46, Chandigarh, since the second semester is commencing, an Inspection Committee be sent to the College and the students be brought back to the College. However, a penalty be imposed on the College, for which the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu and Dr. R.K. Mahajan jointly said that then the case of Satyam College should also be considered

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi suggested that, to be fair to everyone, the item should be brought again to the Syndicate with complete details.

Shri Prabhjit Singh suggested that so far as explanation of Deputy Registrar (Colleges) is concerned, the same should be placed before the Syndicate.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the explanation of the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) and the concerned officials be also obtained regarding the meetings of the Affiliation Committee held on 1st wherein affiliation was granted to Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur along with the meeting held on 5th and why Satyam College has been granted affiliation without the recommendation of Affiliation Committee. Thereafter, everything would be crystal clear and it would also be known as to who is at fault.

RESOLVED: That -

1. for the time being, the case for grant co-education status to National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, be deferred and the same be placed before the Syndicate along with the Enquiry Report and other comprehensive details;
2. the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) be asked to explain as to how the meetings of Affiliation Committee were convened on 1.10.2018 and 5.10.2018 without issuing any notice and how the minutes have been got confirmed from a person who was not present in the meeting and comments from all other concerned officials be also obtained and placed before the Syndicate; and
3. In the light of the discussion, it be enquired as to how the Examination Centre was granted to Satyam Girls College, Village & Post, Office Sayadwala, Fazilka on 30th November when the Committee was to visit that College on 1st December.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That, so far as shifting of students from a Government College, Sector-46, Chandigarh, to another College is concerned, since now 2nd semester is commencing, the students be brought back to the College and an Inspection Committee be sent to the College. However, a penalty be imposed on the College, for which the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate.

7.

Considered following recommendations of the Committee dated 15.11.2018 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 14.10.2018 (Para 4) with regard to review the decision of the Syndicate meeting dated

28.05.2017 (Para 22), for cancellation of Ph.D. registration of Ms. Anuradha Jaidka, a Research Scholar, Department of Sociology:

- (i) that the Syndicate may review and revise its decision regarding the cancellation of Ph.D. registration of the candidate.
- (ii) that a suitable Committee be constituted to interact with the candidate to settle the case.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2018 (Para 15) considered representation dated 20.07.2018 of Ms. Anuradha Jaidka, #289, Milk Colony Dhanas, Sector-14 West, Chandigarh-160014 forwarded by Under Secretary, Vice-President's Secretariat vide No. VPS-15/2/R/PU/2018 dated 02.08.2018 regarding complaint against Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Ex-Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh for creating circumstances under section 3(2) the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace Act 2013 to favour the accused (xxxxxx xxxxxx) and it was resolved that a separate item may be brought to the next meeting of the Syndicate in regard of reviewing of the decision already taken by the Syndicate vide para no. 22 of meeting 28.05.2017 regarding the cancellation Ph.D. registration of Ms. Anuradha Jaidka.

Accordingly, an item No. C-4 was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 14.10.2018 to review the decision of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2018 (Para 22) and it was resolved that the Vice Chancellor be authorised to form a Committee with a clear and explicit term of reference to review the decision taken by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 28.05.2017 (Para 22) regarding cancellation of her Ph.D. Registration.

It was clarified that Item 7 related to Ms. Anuradha Jaidka, a candidate for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Arts (in the subject of Sociology), whose registration was cancelled. Thereafter, the Syndicate in its last meeting authorized the Vice-Chancellor to form a Committee and make recommendation(s).

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi intervened to say that they knew the Item. He said that last time, he also spoke on the issue a lot and there was much up and down on the issue. In fact, they wanted a comprehensive solution to the problem. The girl had made certain allegations, which of course, were supposed to go to the Chancellor, including whether a hostile atmosphere was created or not. Another thing was that she had filed a complaint, which was found to be false, and the case has several aspects. They (Syndics) had suggested that a Committee should be formed, which should look into the issue from all angles/aspects and make a comprehensive report, but the same has not happened.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that so far as he remembers this Committee was not constituted for the purpose on which the report had come. In fact, the Syndicate was of the unanimous view that though there is no such provision for cancellation of Ph.D. registration of a candidate, the Ph.D. registration was cancelled. It was also said that the candidate has approached the Court, and whatever be the decision of the Court, the same would be followed. However, some of the members were of the view that they should do this. Ultimately, they were able to arrive at a consensus that this be settled, and for settling the issue unofficially, the Vice-Chancellor was authorized to take the services of any member of the Syndicate or otherwise. Madam had pointed out that if

they had done this as the Syndicate was of the opinion to do this, at that time it was pointed out that if they do this, that issue would stand as it is. Then it was suggested that comprehensive efforts be made to settle the issue. However, those things have been brought to the Syndicate, which the Syndicate already knows. Hence, there was no need of this input that there is no such provision to cancel the Ph.D. registration of a candidate on non-academic reasons, whereas the Syndicate had constituted the Committee for other purpose. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to see the implementations seriously, e.g., there is no member of the Syndicate in this Committee, and the Committee is saying that the Syndicate is requested to review its decision as there is no provision for cancellation of Ph.D. registration of a candidate, as if they (Syndicate) do not know it. Therefore, they should try to settle the issue in accordance with the discussions held in the last meeting of the Syndicate, and until then the matter should be kept pending. In the meantime, if some direction(s) come from the Court, then they could not do anything.

RESOLVED: That efforts be made to settle the issue in accordance with the discussions held in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 14.10.2018, and until then the matter be kept pending.

- 8.** Considered if, Hoshiarpur Professional and Vocational College, Adamwal, Hoshiarpur, be disaffiliated w.e.f. the session 2018-19 and two FDR's amounting to Rs.32,50,000/- (Rs.20,00,000 + Rs.12,50,000/-), be returned to the College as per resolution dated 08.09.2018 (**Appendix-V**) of President/Chairman, Governing Body, Hoshiarpur Professional and Vocational College, Adamwal, Hoshiarpur. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-V**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 13.5 at page 161 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 reproduced as under:

“the discontinuation in respect of each integrated course of study/subject for which it is affiliated shall be in stages as under:

- (i) In the first year, admissions to Part I classes will be discontinued and admissions to Part II/III will continue;
- (ii) In the 2nd year, admission to Part II classes will discontinue and class for Part III, if any, will continue;
- (iii) In the 3rd year, there may be no admission.

Explanation: The students concerned who have already taken up the course/subject shall be allowed to complete the course/ subject concerned. This will not, however, cover the failure in a class.”

- 2. Request dated 17.09.2018 of the Chairman, HPV Degree College, Hoshiarpur, along with resolution dated 08.02.2017 enclosed (**Appendix-V**).
- 3. The President, Hoshiarpur Professional and Vocational College, Adamwal, Hoshiarpur, was informed vide letter dated 01.11.2018 (**Appendix-V**) that there is no mention in the resolution dated 08.02.2017 that the college be disaffiliated from the University.

It was informed that the request of Chairman, Governing Body of Hoshiarpur Professional and Vocational College, Adamwal, Hoshiarpur, was received on

1st November for disaffiliation from Panjab University. They have to stick to Regulation 13.5 at page 161 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, which has been quoted above. As per the Regulation, the College Management could close the College only in a phased manner, i.e., in the first year, admissions to Part I classes; in the second year, admissions to Part II classes; and in the third year, admissions to Part III classes, and thereafter, the endowment fund amounting to Rs.32.5 lac (Rs.20 lac + Rs.12.5 lac) could be refunded to the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to who would monitor this process.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that Dean, College Development Council and Finance & Development Officer would monitor the whole process. Though they have been informed about the procedure to be followed, he would like to add that when the College would not make admissions to first to 1st Year classes, then 2nd Year classes and so on, how would the teachers get the salaries? In fact, when the College would not make admissions to 1st Year classes, the students of 2nd and 3rd Years would automatically leave the College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has been told that practically no teacher in there in this College.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, this provision is there in the Regulation because the College could say to the existing students that they would not give admission to the students in 2nd and 3rd years. However, if somebody confirms that the College does not have any student in 2nd and 3rd years, then of course, they could consider the request of the College for refund of endowment.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Dean, College Development Council to see that if the College does not have teachers, it should be got ensured from the Principal that the existing students would be imparted education in any manner. It is the responsibility of the Principal that the students must not suffer. The time-table should also be obtained from the Principal of the College.

RESOLVED: That the request of Chairman, Governing Body of Hoshiarpur Professional and Vocational College, Adamwal, Hoshiarpur, for disaffiliation of the College w.e.f. the session 2018-19, be accepted with the condition that the closer of the courses shall be as per Regulation 13.5 at page 161 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 and the Chairman should also confirm that the students admitted in the College do not suffer. The Dean, College Development Council, be asked to oversee the whole process and obtain the time-table from the Principal.

9.

Considered the report (**Appendix-VI**) submitted by the Committee, visited the Department of Higher and Technical Education, Government of Meghalaya to verify the validity of the degrees issued by the CMJ University of Meghalaya, pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 30.3/21.4/29.4.2018 (**Appendix-VI**) and make recommendation.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.7.2013 (Para 46) (**Appendix-VI**) resolved that the degree/s awarded by C.M.J. University Shillong (Meghalaya), irrespective of year of award of degree, which are placed or are to be placed before the Registrar or Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate after 12.06.2013, be **not** granted equivalence.

Accordingly, a letter No. ST 12473-772 dated 14.8.2013 was issued to the Colleges and the Teaching Departments of the University.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.3.2017 (Para 7)

(Appendix-VI) resolved that the degree/s awarded by C.M.J University Shillong (Meghalaya) be recognized till the session 2015-2016. Pursuant to this letter No. ST 12155-454 dated 11.7.2018 **(Appendix-VI)** was issued.

3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 10.12.2017 (Para 37) **(Appendix-VI)** considered if letter No. ST 12473-772 dated 14.8.2013 and letter No. ST 12155-454 dated 11.7.2018 be implemented pursuant to discussion held in Senate meeting dated 10.09.2017 and it was resolved that the degree of the students who have applied any job or applied/admitted any course in the University and its affiliated College issued by the CJM University Shillong (Meghalaya) be got verified by writing to the said University.
4. A copy of the Senate decision dated 17.2.2018 (Para III) relating to evaluate issue of validity of degree issued by the C.M.J. University is enclosed **(Appendix-VI)**. A copy of letter No. ST 4167 dated 16.4.2018 sent to Deputy Director Education Department (C) Punjab is also enclosed **(Appendix-VI)**.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this case was discussed in the Syndicate and Senate many a times. Ultimately, three people went to Shillong. In fact, he would say that the things which were verbal earlier, have now come in written form from the Meghalaya Government.

At this point of time, the Vice Chancellor said that he has got a document just yesterday, which he had sent to them and requested to see to it.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are two-three things which he would like to discuss. Firstly, CMJ is a private University. The Governor of Meghalaya has ordered that since there are some problems, the University should be dissolved. The State Government has given a show-cause notice for dissolution and also for the invalidation of degrees. Thereafter, they went to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court directed the State Government to listen to CMJ authorities properly. As regards the degrees, the Supreme Court said that the degrees be got examined by giving a notice to the University. The State Government listened to them and perhaps passed a resolution for dissolution of the University, against which the University went to Meghalaya High Court. The Meghalaya High Court stayed the notice where two things, i.e., dissolution and invalidation of degrees were written. The stay is still continuing. On the other hand, the Supreme Court had asked the State Government of Meghalaya to look into the case. The State Government verified the degrees of those involved in the case and declared their degrees invalid. But if they talk about the UGC Act, it says that if there is a University recognised by the UGC, the degrees issued by it would be valid. On the one hand, there is a direction from the Supreme Court that the Government should see to it and on the other hand, the High Court has stayed the original order. So, to his mind, looking at the overall scene, he cannot comprehend it. He was of the opinion that they should get this case legally examined keeping in view the whole scenario. If they talk of many other Universities existing in the country, these are in a very bad position. He further informed that in different cases, the degrees of CMJ have been declared valid as well as invalid. He pointed out that there is a case in the Punjab & Haryana High Court where a degree of CMJ has been declared valid, which has been declared invalid by the Meghalaya Government. There is one more case in Madras High Court relating to Ph.D. degree and that has been declared valid. He informed that there is another such case of CMJ University. The person is NET qualified and appointed in DAV College. Since the person is NET qualified, the degree of CMJ University was not important from the employment point of view, but the UT

administration has given him all the increments on the basis of Ph.D. degree of CMJ University. So, there are lot of things where the degrees have been declared valid. He has no knowledge if somewhere the degrees have been declared invalid. He would like to say one thing more that this case was discussed many a times in the Syndicate and on the basis of those decisions, the Vice Chancellor took some decision. So, those were not the decisions of the Vice Chancellor alone. Now they are discussing this matter, but they are not legal persons. However, the Judges have also declared these degrees valid. So, if they say that someone has did this or that, that part is wrong. Finally, he would say that they should see the overall scenario of the case.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked the Vice Chancellor that before listening to Shri Ashok Goyal, could they listen to the University Official (Controller of Examinations), who had gone to the Meghalaya Government?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he takes a strong objection to it as he is also a University official. Shri Goyal stated that the Syndicate and the Senate had taken a decision that it should be got verified that, as per the directions of the Supreme Court, what decision has been taken by the Government of Meghalaya. The Senate decided that the Controller of Examinations would visit the Education Department of Government of Meghalaya, but instead of accepting the decision of the Senate, the then Vice Chancellor ordered, "no need to go". But this order of the Vice Chancellor was not placed before the Syndicate. On the statement of Professor Navdeep Goyal, Shri Ashok Goyal said that this was decision taken by the Vice Chancellor himself.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that all the orders, including sending them to Meghalaya, were issued by the then Vice Chancellor. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he was talking about the validation of degree.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that all the decisions were taken by the then Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not go into these things whether the decisions were taken by him alone or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the House should be made aware as to what is the actual position because they have written in the report that it is for the reasons best known to the then Vice Chancellor. All decisions have been taken by him unilaterally, not only unilaterally, but by overruling the decisions taken by the Syndicate and Senate. So to say, that they are all party to it, is not. It was for the first time, the case of approval of these teachers was brought to the Syndicate in January 2015. At that time, it was questioned that when the Vice Chancellor is the authority to approve these cases, why this has been brought to the Syndicate. Let the Vice Chancellor take decision at his own level. The Vice Chancellor made two statements – (i) they would take an affidavit from those candidates that their degrees have not been cancelled; and (ii) it would be verified whether it is in accordance with UGC, and in regular mode etc.etc. In the end while concluding, the Vice Chancellor had said that they would take an affidavit, the affidavit, which he stated in the earlier lines and it would be verified. Now the office, instead of including that line, that his degree has never been cancelled. The fact which was supposed to be verified, not by way of an affidavit, but by of information from UGC or from PTU or DST, whatever was discussed. All these things were put in the affidavit and the actual line for which the affidavit was taken, was omitted. The Vice Chancellor on his own in October, 2015 approved these appointments by taking legal opinion where neither the University nor the candidate nor anybody else ever revealed that their degrees had already been cancelled and the decision was conveyed to them in July 2014 itself by speed post. The Government of Meghalaya has provided to them all the copies of the receipts of the speed post, the address, the decisions, they have given to them everything. The Committee had not done anything at its own. The terms of reference and whatever the direction of the Syndicate was that this three-member Committee would visit Government of Meghalaya to verify the status of degrees, so they have done

that only. The only thing is that they could persuade the government officials to get these papers signed, which are in hundreds, in original by Joint Secretary of Government of Meghalaya. He must appreciate that they were very cooperative. The government officials said that the problem is known everywhere. He asked them if the problem is known to everyone, then why they have not put it on the website that these are the degrees which have been cancelled. They told that none of the degrees awarded by the CMJ University has been declared valid by Government of Meghalaya as per the directions of the Supreme Court. Now to say whatever the Act or regulation say, but to his knowledge, as a lay man, nothing is beyond Supreme Court. Now it is for the Supreme Court to see whether they have delivered the judgement as per the Act, whether Supreme Court could do it or not. If one feels that the Supreme Court has done something, which was not within its powers, why nobody challenged it. When the degrees were declared invalid by the Government of India under the directions of Supreme Court in 2014 itself, why till the end of 2018 that decision has not been challenged by somebody? Instead of that, in spite repeated requests, they are not still ready to say that their degree has been cancelled and they have received a letter in this regard. Sometimes, they say that their address had changed and sometimes they say that this was not their address. For all these things, they have to request the officials of Government of Meghalaya to provide a copy of the receipt where they had sent the letters, which is made a part of annexure. They did not bring the decision only, but also the representations made by the candidates, attendance record of the candidates who met the Government officials and appeared personally. They brought the record of observation by the Committee, recommendation of the Committee and also the record of the final order which was passed on 31st March, 2014, declaring the degrees invalid. There were two directions – one was about the degrees of the students and another was about the dissolution of the University. As far as the degrees of the students are concerned, the aggrieved party was the students. As far as the dissolution of the University was concerned, the aggrieved party was the CMJ Foundation. The other part of the dissolution was to be taken up by the Assembly of Meghalaya State. So, after giving them the notices, the Assembly of Meghalaya passed the order that the University stands dissolved. The decision of dissolution by the Government of Meghalaya was challenged by the CMJ Foundation in the High Court again. But, the decision of invalidating the degrees, whereby the candidates were affected adversely, has not been challenged in any Court of law till date and three years period in 2017 had already passed which was the limitation period for filing any appeal or writ petition. As on today, rightly or wrongly, the status of the degree which was required to be known by visiting Shillong is that their degrees are invalid. He raised this issue in 2015 and then he raised it time and again in Syndicate and Senate also. When he questioned as to why the affidavit has not been taken and the degrees have not been cancelled, one of the two candidates, in October 2017 gave the affidavit that his/her degree has never been cancelled and an affidavit which comes into existence on 13th October, but the covering letter is of 12th October where it is written “that I enclosed herewith an affidavit filed by so and so that my degree has never been cancelled” by the concerned Principal. He is writing about that thing on 12th which came into existence on 13th. So, is that candidate not guilty of playing fraud with the University? Even if it was wrongly conveyed to her that her degree was invalidated, under what circumstances she can give the affidavit that her degree was never cancelled. The second candidate, which, of course, he came to know, visited the University yesterday also and probably have submitted some papers to his (Vice Chancellor) office, which he expected, if at all, he (Vice Chancellor) wanted to give it today, should have been circulated to the members of the Syndicate yesterday itself. They are nothing to do with those papers. The same papers which have circulated, not only once, but a number of times as all those documents are very much contained in the files of the University which is nothing but legal opinion given thrice by the Advocate, Legal Retainer of the University and also various judgements of the High Court and Supreme Court. So, his simple query is, can any order of Supreme Court be stayed by the High Court, at least he had not known. A decision of the Supreme Court has not been stayed by the High Court, has that been the case, then those affected by the Supreme Court decision would have benefited by the stay order granted by the High Court. What he is saying is that it is fresh cause of

action. Nobody can say that Supreme Court decision is against him and the High Court decision is in his favour. At least, he does not know any jurisprudence by way of which High Court can prevail upon the Supreme Court. On being asked by the Vice Chancellor if his version has concluded, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a very-very serious issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is true that it is a very-very serious issue, but the issue is how should they summarise it?

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should summarise this that either they should be reject this report, that this report is not acceptable, it is as per the mandate of the University/Syndicate that the Committee went only to verify the status of these degrees from Government of Meghalaya. The Government of Meghalaya says that these degrees are invalid.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it meant, it is accepted.

The Vice Chancellor asked Shri Ashok Goyal if his version is over to which he said that he has only given the input what he (Vice Chancellor) has wanted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Committee was given a task to verify the degree. He has already said that earlier they were saying these things verbally, but now they have brought these things in writing. The Government of Meghalaya has declared these degrees invalid. The Meghalaya Government can declare these degrees invalid on Supreme Court direction, it is correct. What they would say about the Act. Even after that order of the Supreme Court, there are so many orders of the different High Courts where they have declared the degrees of CMJ University valid.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that he wants to bring to the notice of the Vice Chancellor that in 2015 itself, a case was filed by a student in the Punjab & Haryana High Court seeking admission in Panjab University on the basis of the degree which he has obtained from the CMJ University. The University had declined that admission saying that they do not recognise any degree of CMJ University. He went to the High Court and the petitioner alleged there that University on the one hand has allowed some people to work as Assistant Professors based on the degrees of the same University and on the other hand, he is being denied even admission in a course. The University filed an affidavit in the High Court that it is wrong to say that they have made any appointment on the basis of degree of CMJ University. It is also wrong to say that they have approved any appointment and the writ petition of that candidate had been dismissed by the Punjab & Haryana High Court which was a State case Vs Panjab University. So, as far as, the cases which Professor Navdeep is referring, he also knows that it is not only the cases which are only in favour of CMJ University, there are cases which are against CMMJ University in the same High Court by the same Judge, same Bench and he (Shri Ashok Goyal) knows those cases also. But those cases are that these people have obtained the degrees from a University which is situated outside Punjab. Those cases are against Punjab Government. It was purely on that issue that they have said that they cannot discriminate whether the degrees obtained from one State or the other, this cannot be the criteria to deny the job. The one case, he is referring to, it is not about the validity of degree. One of his fellow's fellow, meaning thereby, one of the Senate members, who is a practicing Advocate, if she comes here or in the Senate, he or she would say, these degrees are valid. The practicing Advocate telephoned him, who was opposing the CMJ degrees in the High Court, asked him about the judgement which he had read in the Senate. She asked to send that judgement to her. He asked her, why she needs that judgement? She told that she would take the same in the Court. He asked, it is strange that she is taking different stands in the Court and the University. She said, "you were right, but you could understand". He, within five minutes sent all the citations and they won that case. That was proved in the High Court what he is saying, Professor Navdeep is not telling that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has not stated that the degrees are valid rather he is saying to examine it.

Shri Ashok Goyal further said that the decision of the Syndicate dated 29th April, 2018, was that they should go to Meghalaya Government and check the validity of degrees, which they did and said that the degrees are not valid. What decision is to be taken now?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Government of Meghalaya took the decision on 31.3.2014 to declare the degrees invalid. Thereafter, the High Court stayed this decision of the State Government. So, the operational part was stayed by the High Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that he should be shown a copy of the stay order of the High Court.

Shri Prabhjit Singh clarified that the part relating invalidation of degrees has not been challenged, only the dissolution part has been challenged.

Dr. Amit Joshi said if the University is dissolved, who would give the degrees. Did they mean to say that the University should run, but it should not award the degrees?

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that three members including he himself visited Shillong. If there was a stay, the University cannot declare the degrees invalid.

Dr. Amit Joshi said, suppose there are two parties, one is State and the other is University. The case is running in the Court. Suppose the Committee goes to the State. When the State has already filed a case against the University, how the State could give in writing that the degree is valid. The State which has gone to the Court against the University, how it could admit that the degree is right. The State has filed an affidavit to the effect that the University is wrong. The question is, what the Court says. State would never give this thing in writing that their degrees are valid. The Panjab University could send any number of letters to the MHRD saying that theirs is a Central University, but would they agree to it. Nobody would give in writing about it, everybody would just give them lip-sympathy. The Meghalaya Government and University have conflict of interest. The University in question has approached the Court against the orders of the State Government. As they are saying that it is regarding dissolution of the University, what type of dissolution? He asked, whether the University existed as on today, Professor Navdeep Goyal replied in affirmative. Is it recognised? If it is recognised, for what the dissolution is being done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has heard that the University has A⁺ NAAC Grade.

Dr. Amit Joshi said if all these things are there, then what type of dissolution is there? The question is that as on today, the University is giving degrees and have A NAAC grade, the University is at the same place. Secondly, the judgement regarding stay order is of 4.9.2017. He has to search it out and he would give a copy of it.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked if the copy of that order is available with him at the moment.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is another case of Mr. Jaswant Singh where the High Court has recognised his M.Lib. degree and gave him the job.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that the Court has not recognised the degree, instead the Court has said that they cannot deny job to a person if he has done the degree from outside the State. That is a different issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they have taken legal opinion also in this case which is in their favour. When they have taken the legal opinion from the Senior Advocate, why they had to send a Committee?

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it was decision of the Senate.

Dr. Amit Joshi said, then technically, how the Syndicate can review the decision of the Senate. In the meeting it was said that only one person would go.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they he just taken along with them the other persons.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just want to read the resolve part of the Syndicate meeting of 29th April on Appendix-VIII, page 57, this is the decision of this Syndicate only where all those, who are sitting here, are the members. The unanimous decision is “the information contained in Items I-(i) to I-(ix) on the agenda be noted and a Committee consisting of Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Prabhjit Singh and Controller of Examinations be requested to visit the Department of Higher and Technical Education, Government of Meghalaya to verify the validity of degrees in question. They could have gone much beyond also. They know so many things beyond this, but since the mandate was only to verify the validity of degrees from Government of Meghalaya, they had done that. Now they say, why it has been done and that is what the then Vice Chancellor was saying that, no need of verifying the validity. There is no need to visit Shillong, in spite of Senate decision. If they have followed the diktat of the Syndicate and the report which is given by the Government of Meghalaya as required, if it is not to liking of some people, they say why this decision was taken. It means if it is according to them, it is okay, otherwise it is not right. The decision which the Syndicate has taken, can the Syndicate go out of that decision? Can they say that if the Meghalaya Government has declared the degrees invalid, what they can do?

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said the letter where it has been written that the degrees are invalid, he is going to read the observations which given by the government. In Annexure-1 of the Report, it has been written that “transfer certificate from Dravidian University to CMJ University not available till date. Course work done at Jorabat Campus. Thesis submission certificate dated 08.05.12. Certified that candidate has met all requirements needed for award of Ph.D., even though viva was held at a later date”. These are recommendations/observations of the University. He questioned, could it be written even after these recommendations?

Shri Prabhjit Singh said, yes, it could be written.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan requested that they should once read it before taking the decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, ‘yes’ it could be written, if the order is defective.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they are not here to defend or oppose something. This case has come to the Syndicate and they are taking a very comprehensive view of that. In this case they are not supporting or opposing any individual. This case has come to the Syndicate and the Senate. When any item comes to the Syndicate and Senate regarding appointment at a College or in the University, there is a set procedure for it. So, that procedure of appointment made for the colleges, where the degrees are checked, the affiliations are seen and taken into consideration and all the points which come from the colleges to University are routed through the University. How the Vice Chancellor would come to know that the item which is coming through Dean College Development Council, is under some sort of duress or these are true, as a Vice Chancellor, one has to bear it. So, the question is, whether this case has totally neglected the different procedures to be followed for a proper appointment. This case would not end here only. Thereafter, a Committee was made. Everybody has given his

own version. Three persons, Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Prabhjit Singh and Controller of Examinations went to Government of Meghalaya. This report would go to the Court also. Apart from the other legal action, the report says that the degrees are invalid. The first fifteen pages of the report mention about the whole case. It means the Syndicate has given whole data to the Committee. The Committee went to Shillong and after having information from the Government of Meghalaya, told here that the degrees are invalid. When the case would go to the Court, it would be asked what was the intent of the Committee. This matter is not only limited to Syndicate, there are many other institutions such as Supreme Court, High Court etc. So, want to say that they might not do anything new and go ahead on it. They have full respect for the three members. Before going ahead on the issue they should think on it very cautiously.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) is a new to the University, the Syndicate members have also come in 2016, but this issue is continuing since 2013. Shri Malhi used to say that they bring the old cases about which they do not know anything. It was only to make everybody aware as to what is the background of this case so that everybody could easily understand the case. Only two cases had been approved in this University. Why those cases of CMJ which had been submitted prior to these cases are not approved and why those cases which have been submitted after this, have not been approved. What is the reply with them? He is simply saying that they have not passed aspersions on anyone. But the reference which they are giving regarding legal opinion, in that legal opinion it has been written that as per Supreme Court order, Government of Meghalaya was directed to pass order in the absence of any adverse order passed by the Government of Meghalaya, it will not be possible to treat these degrees as valid. Now, that Legal Retainer has not been told till date that these degrees have already been declared invalid. Instead of that, a reply of RTI application someone who is neither connected with Panjab University nor with any candidate, the application was filed from Roorkee by somebody, in reply to that it has been said that they have not declared any degree invalid, however, the visitor has cancelled. That reply was sent by the University, which has nothing to do with the University. Thereafter, legal opinion was sought and said that it is very clear in the RTI, and that was why it was not done. Why these two candidates who have given themselves in writing to the University that they have represented their case in the Supreme Court and so they should be given provisional approval till that time. Why the University did not ask from the till today as to what is the outcome of that case. Neither the University asked them, nor they told anything to the University. What does it mean? Neither the University is interested in knowing nor they are interested in telling because the University also knows what is what, and they also know what is what. Are they trying to send the signal that those who are able to manipulate the degrees of places like CMJ University, they the appointments here and the students who have passed Ph.D. from Panjab University, they are starving on the roads. Out of these two candidates, he (Vice Chancellor) is also a man of management, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) all of them are very educated people, except him, they are Ph.Ds. Referring to the two students in question, he said that these two shining stars, both of them has got Ph.D. degrees in less than two years' time from there – one candidate has got it in one year and eight months and the other in one year and one month after registration. He has not mentioned this in the report as he did not want to go into it. They talk of academic excellence but here they support such things. He has no objection, let this Syndicate reject this report, he has no problem.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should accept the report. Is it a fake report, which they are denying to accept?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, the statement should have been started that report accepted and thereafter they should have given the other suggestion. He asked Professor Navdeep Goyal, is he challenging the findings of the report?

Professor Navdeep goyal said that he is not challenging the report.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the report is based on facts and if someone challenges this report in the High Court, he would defend his report as it is given under his signatures.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said, can a student enrolled in Panjab University for Ph.D., do Ph.D. from Punjabi University simultaneously. It looks very nice when they read something. It has been written by the students that 'transfer certificate from Dravidian University to CMJ University not available till date. He informed that she was enrolled in Andhra Pradesh.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they are having this certificate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if the certificate is available with them, then why they have not given. When Dr. R.K. Mahajan intervened, Shri Prabhjit Singh asked, is he having that certificate, if not, they why he is saying so. They went to shilling and worked there for ten hours together, even without taking water, only then they were able to collect these documents. A person of the PCS rank has given them these documents under his signatures.

The Vice Chancellor said that he appreciates it.

Continuing, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he has nothing personal in it, everything is based on facts.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was such a place, the officer who was helping them said that he is sorry that he cannot not even serve them water.

The Vice Chancellor said, let they should conclude it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they should accept the report and let the office act according to that, that is all.

Dr. Amit Joshi while referring to page 10, point No. 7 of the report, said that it says the State Government without issuing any direction for correcting the mis-management and mal-administration, proceeded to pass an order dated 31.3.2014 for dissolution of the CMJ University with immediate effect. So, it is right what Shri Prabhjit Singh has said, but he would not go into these details. He said that he would like to draw the attention of the members to page 12, point number 21 which states as under:

"21 In the circumstances, it is considered appropriate and hence directed that –

- (a) It shall be required of the respondent-University to specifically notify the students that this appeal has been admitted for consideration and ultimately, the admissions in, and award of degrees by, the respondent-University shall remain subject to the final judgement to be passed in this appeal...."

Continuing, he said that here it is written about the degree only and there is no mention of the dissolution of the University. He again referred to page 13, Point No. 9 which states as under:

"9. The aforementioned interim order passed in the writ appeal was challenged by the CMJ University before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The University was granted interim protection at the first instance. Thereafter, the SLP was disposed of vide order dated 13.08.2018, whereby the matter was transferred to the Hon'ble Gauhati High Court and the stay granted in favour of the University was extended till then."

Dr. Amit Joshi asked now what has left to discuss.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has shortened half the report to half as it would become difficult to read, he could have given every basic law. Dr. Amit Joshi has read Para 21 (a) wherein he read "this appeal has been admitted for consideration and ultimately, the admissions in, and award of degrees by, the respondent-University shall remain subject to the final judgement to be passed in this appeal." He said that this is for those students who were admitted to the University after the stay was granted on dissolution. Thereafter, those in whose cases the order was already passed by 31st March, 2014 as per judgement of the Supreme Court, they are not these. They said that the students who are pursuing now, their admissions and degrees will be subject to the outcome and they will also be subject to the same process of hearing as was directed by the Supreme Court, meaning thereby that they do not know what would be the decision of the University. In the meantime, the students who are studying, they are studying on their own risk and responsibility. That is why they say that the contesting respondent shall ensure that all the students are notified within two weeks from today. It means, it has to be told to them that it is their (students) responsibility only. They may or may not study. But what has been said by Dr. Amit Joshi has nothing to do with those students whose degrees have already been invalidated up to 31st March 2014.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor to tell something about the notification where it has been written that they would notify to the students within two week, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been written in the order itself at page 12 of the report. However, he would provide a copy of the notification.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should not be on the hearsay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is quoting from the order and nothing has been written by himself.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the University has sent them to verify the validity of degrees, which they did, so they should either accept or reject the report. However, he said that the report should be accepted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the said order is of 16th July, 2015 and the same is available in the University file. Now the question comes, the matter went to the Supreme Court. The latest position is that the decision of the decision of the State dissolving the University was challenged in the Gauhati High Court. The Gauhati High Court gave some order against that order an SLP was filed in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court on technical grounds said that it is only an interim order passed by the single judge. They should have gone in LPA, there and then only, against the interim order why they have gone to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court said that they should go back. When they wanted to send it to the Gauhati High Court, it was found that there were only two judges. For LPA two Judges are required. The total number of Judges were two and one of those, who was Advocate General of Meghalaya was elevated, in the meantime, as a Judge, was representing this case, obviously, he also could not be here. Keeping in mind, this difficulty, instead of transferring it from Meghalaya to Gauhati High Court and the terms of reference, the contents of the appeal, the contents of SLP, the contents of writ petition do not talk anything about the validity of degrees. Now it is the Court who took into consideration that if the University is allowed to continue during the pendency of the case and tomorrow adverse decision is passed against the University, what will happen to the students who will be taking admission in the meantime. So, it was only to protect their interest that they will be taking admission at their own risk and responsibility and their degrees will also be subject to this. He informed that degrees were cancelled even after 29.03.2014.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that as far as the Supreme Court is concerned, it has never rejected the degrees. The Supreme Court referred the case back to the State.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is one thing more which must be in the knowledge of the Vice Chancellor. Out of the seven cases, one case is that of Mr. Vinod Kumar. In July, 2013, the Syndicate took a decision that the degrees of CMJ University are not to be entertained for appointment or for admission anywhere. But in March, 2017, on the representation of one Mr. Vinod Kumar, without processing it through any office, with the recommendation of Professor Navdeep Goyal and Ms. Anu Chatrath, the Vice Chancellor constituted a Committee by including these two people. The Committee authorised the Chairperson, Department of Law and Dean, Law Faculty and the Committee said that the Supreme Court and the Syndicate have taken the illegal decision. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) thought as to who is this such a powerful man. It was Sunday on 1st January, 2017 and he was in the Syndicate upto 31st December, 2016 and this representation was received on 2nd January, 2017. On this representation, a Committee was constituted and it was decided in March 2017 that the decision of July 2013 has become redundant. He, then found that this man is first cousin of the one of the candidates who has been appointed at DAV College, Sector-10. This case also came to the University. His degree was also cancelled on 29th March by that University and this person is representing and saying that great injustice has been done to them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra reiterated his request to accept the report of the Committee.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the Meghalaya Government has already declared these degrees invalid. The CMJ University went to the Court against the government. The Meghalaya Government has already said that the degrees are invalid, so there should not be any objection if the report of the Committee is accepted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever has been stated by Professor Ronki Ram and Shri Ashok Goyal, but in the conclusion at page 17 of the report, it has been written that "(i) The issue of degrees awarded by the CMJ University has already attained finality, in terms of the order dated 13.09.2013 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in No. 19617 of 2013, (ii) The only limited relief to the degree holders was that they may submit a representation to the State Government, who may take a sympathetic view of the same".

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the part relating to Government of Meghalaya is alright. When the Meghalaya Government has invalidated the degrees and if it was in their knowledge, they should have challenged it to which Shri Ashok Goyal said, had he been at their place, he would have challenged it. They have mentioned all the things in the report and the report is well drafted. But, he opined that before accepting the report, it should be got legally examined.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at the end of the report, they themselves have written that action be initiated in accordance with law.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is not so simple. If they accept the report and the case regarding dissolution of the University goes in favour of the CMJ University, what would they in that case. What is fault of that candidate?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that once his degree has been declared invalid, it is finished.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they cannot say this thing, it would be decided by the Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to clarify only to satisfy Dr. Amit Joshi. He is right in saying that the Government has taken the action of dissolving the University and that the government is fighting in the Court against the University taking a stand that this is a fraud University. Obviously, the State Government which was

taking a stand against the University, how they could expect a positive order from the government, that is what his question is. The Supreme Court, going out of the way, nobody other than Justice G.S. Singhvi, who is known throughout the world as a Judge, said that they may be given an opportunity of representing and they be granted personal hearing and a sympathetic view may be taken. The question which is being posed to them that the government which has filed the case against the University, what they could expect from it, this question needs to be posed to the Supreme Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that in view of the history of the case, it is not so simple. As they are telling that they have mentioned about 25% of the people and he (Vice Chancellor) thinks there may be many more. So, he thinks, what is the harm in taking the legal opinion as is being said by Professor Navdeep Goyal to which Dr. Amit Joshi asked as to how many times they took legal opinion on this.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they did a lot of discussion on the issue. There is already a contention between the State Government and the University. The State Government has already said that the degrees of CMJ University are invalid, but the University says that it has already gone to the Supreme Court. Shri Ashok Goyal went to the State Government which said that the degrees have already been declared invalid. So, the case is still standing at the same place. Since as per the CMJ University, the case is in the Court, what decision they have to take in the matter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the CMJ University has gone to the Court in connection with the dissolution issue. But the overall facts and the last legal opinion which the University sought in the case, till that time it was not clear whether the State Government had declared the degrees invalid. Now, since all the documents have been received, they should take the legal opinion again.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is an issue between the State Government and the CMJ University. The then Vice Chancellor sent a team of three persons including two respected Fellow to verify the validity of degrees. They did a very fine job. The issue of their University is academic and enquiring fact, so he thinks there is no harm if they take a legal opinion on it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said, there cannot be any harm in it. But he wanted to know on which issue the legal opinion would be sought.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a very exhaustive report. They would seek legal opinion on the issue that whatever data has been submitted by the Enquiry Officer, would they not face any problem at a later stage if the report is accepted. The Vice Chancellor reiterated, what is the harm in seeking legal opinion.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, would they obtain the legal opinion on the point whether they should accept the report or not? The Vice Chancellor has said that he would seek legal opinion on the point if they would face any problem as he is going to accept the report. It means, he would like to ask whether he should submit the report or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not so, he is accepting the report, but he would like to seek legal opinion on the procedural lapse.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, that is why, they have mentioned, 'in accordance with the law' and they have not proposed as to what are the steps in accordance with law. After accepting this report, the action be taken after consulting. When they would consult, the Advocate may say that the degrees which has been declared invalid by the Government is wrong as the litigation is pending, so this order of invalidity is not sustainable. Once he says that, what would they do? The other thing he may say that, 'yes' as on date, the status is that the degrees are invalid, and this decision has not been challenged and it has attained finality, so they should proceed in this way. The

candidate in question would go to the Court, challenge this report, challenge the action of the University, then the Court would take its view. Whatever order is passed by them, it is okay.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not only accepting the report, but he would start taking some action on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that, that action should not be such by which the position of the University is maligned.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that if they take legal opinion on that aspect, what is the harm in it to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should definitely take legal opinion on that. That is why they have written, in accordance with the law.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Registrar to read out the resolved part prepared on the basis of the discussion which took place. The resolved part reads as: The report is accepted and any action to be taken by the University against the candidates, on the basis of the report, shall be taken after taking legal opinion.

Dr. Amit Joshi while not agreeing to it said that the order dated 4.9.2017 regarding dissolution of the University, it is actually the order of 31st March by which the degrees have been declared invalid. He requested not to confuse the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal while clarifying the position said that two orders were passed on 31st of March – one was about declaring the degrees invalid which has been passed by the Joint Secretary, Government of Meghalaya and the other order passed on 31st March is about the dissolution, not by the Joint Secretary, but the Assembly. Why he is saying so is because the order of 31st March regarding dissolution was challenged.

Professor Navdeep Goyal asked whether there are two orders.

Dr. Amit Joshi; however, said that it is not mentioned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is mentioned in this report also, but he (Dr. Amit Joshi) has not read it. Only Section 48 of the Act is mentioned. In Section 48, it is mentioned while dissolving the University, they have to follow these steps. They say, those steps have not been followed and that is why the stay is there.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that degrees are the integral part of the University. University is made to confer degrees on the students. If a University stands tenable, how they reject the degrees awarded by that University.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this whole information is being leaked from the office and requested that it should be kept strictly confidential. The legal opinion be not taken from those Advocates who have already given it, either it was negative or positive. He suggested that the legal opinion be taken from some other Advocates.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan asked, can the government declare the degree of a private University invalid at its own level?

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that, the Supreme Court had asked to check the degrees, which they did.

Professor Navdeep Goyal also said that the degrees have been checked.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that the report should be accepted after obtaining the legal opinion.

Endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Amit Joshi, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the matter is placed before the Syndicate again after obtaining the legal opinion, what is the harm in it?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is saying that the report of the Committee should be accepted, but action should be taken after obtaining the legal opinion.

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

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested the members to stop discussion now as enough discussion has already taken place on the issue.

RESOLVED: That the report dated 29.11.2018 of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate dated 30.3.2018, 23/29.4.2018 to visit the office of the Government of Meghalaya, Shillong and to verify the validation of Ph.D. degrees awarded by the CMJ University to various candidates, **be accepted**. However, before taking action against the college teachers, whose appointment has been approved by the University, legal opinion be obtained.

- 10.** Considered minutes dated 30.11.2018 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to representation of Ms. Kanupriya, President, PUCSC, regarding guidelines/Rules for condonation of shortage of attendance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should approve the condonation of shortage of attendance as requested by Ms. Kanupriya in her representation as one time exception, but for future the rules already existing would apply. On being asked by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, Professor Navdeep Goyal while briefing about the case said that officiating Vice Chancellor formed a Committee.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he is not asking about the Committees, rather he wanted to know the reason for condonation.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they received representation from the students in this regard. Various types of condonation have been given in the rules. Again on being asked the reason by Shri Malhi, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the attendance of the students was short.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi intervened to say, why it was short, why they were not attending the classes? The students are here to attend the classes.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the students besides other things, they also take part in extra-curricular activities.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi wanted to know those extra-curricular activities. If the reason is genuine, then they would condone the shortage of attendance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the students are asking for additional lectures, where the DSW has given them certificate for participating in extra-curricular activities, whereas in the rules they have mentioned that everything would be covered under 10% condonation.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said, then why they do not pass the students without appearing in the examination.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he does not agree with condonation of lectures beyond 10% as it is a question of academic excellence. The students have to study and if they do not want to attend classes, let them go home. The condonation cannot be beyond 10% of the attendance.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they cannot go beyond what is written in the Hand Book of Information. In the case relating to the Hostels, they say that they cannot go out of the Hand Book of Information, but in this case they are doing so.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they are setting a very bad precedent. They are obliging everyone.

The Vice Chancellor said that all of them are part of the system and everybody should be responsible.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per his knowledge, the examination has already started.

The Vice Chancellor so far the students have appeared in 2-3 papers.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that by this way, they have already granted the condonation.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should punish those who have allowed the students to appear in the papers.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he does not agree to it which was also endorsed by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi. It means the wrong has been done by someone, and want to get it approved from the Syndicate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi reiterated that whosoever has done it, he should be punished.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it has not happened for the first time that this should not be treated as precedent, they used to do it in the past also.

Professor Ronki Ram said that there are about 18000 students in the University and a good number of students in the affiliated colleges. The University has administration has to maintain peace. The students are young blood, they contested election on these issues and promised the students to get condonation of 10%, but at the same time there are certain rules in this regard. They also want that the students should strictly follow these rules. There could be only 2-3 students who run their politics on such issues. As such, due to one or two students, they cannot unnecessary vitiate the atmosphere of the University during examination days.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should not accept it due to unruly activities.

Continuing, Professor Ronki Ram said that it is not such, there is a mechanism for condonation of lectures.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi intervened to say that he could understand that he (Professor Ronki Ram) wants to avoid any untoward situation.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they have received a representation from the students and they want to resolve this issue immediately.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said, it means they want to oblige some persons.

Professor Ronki Ram said that in order to ease the situation, they should resolve it amicably to maintain peace in the campus.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that since the introduction of semester system, when the students take part in inter-zonal youth festivals, it takes away 20-25

days of the students. Now the inter-university youth festivals is going to be held on 27th i.e. immediately after the examination. So, 10% lecture condonation for cultural activities and sports are very less. The condonation of 10% lectures is genuine, as such these should be granted. The students who take part in zonal festival have to spend 30-35 days. Due to semester system, more days are spent than the number of lectures for which the condonation is allowed.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the students come to study here and not to attend cultural activities.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that it is a part and parcel of their studies.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said then they should make a rule that the students would study only for ten days and would play for the rest of the time. Why do not they change the rules?

Shri Surinder Singh Sangha said, is it a bad thing if twenty students out of the one thousand take part in games.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said they could pass it to grant additional lectures to which Shri Malhi said then it is alright.

Shri Surinder Singh Sangha said that they are not talking about all the students, rather they are talking only of those who take part in such activities.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked as to how many students take part from their colleges in the Olympics.

Shri Surinder Singh Sangha said the participation in sports and other cultural activities has reduced to 5% only.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that attendance in class is even compulsory in Europe and America and people used to win Olympic medals there, but no condonation of lectures is granted there also.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that as per the P.U. Calendar 10% lecture condonation is granted by the Board of Control, 10% by the D.S.W. and now the students has demanded condonation of 10 lectures (not 10%). She opined that there would be very less cases and as such they should give authorisation to the Vice Chancellor on behalf of the Syndicate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if one student used to attend all the lectures but the other do not attend, then what is the use of attending the lectures if both are to be treated equal.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that the students who take part in sports activities, actually they did get admission only on the basis sport quota.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that when he was studying in St. Stephen Colleges, if he missed even two lectures in the college, then he has to stand before the Dean's office and he used to be shivering. The Dean used to shout at him for missing two lectures. That was the education system.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that they did not grant condonation of lectures to the students till the time they bring the certificate of their participation from the Directorate of Sports in the sports activities.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that in India there is no problem in getting any type of certificate.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that this is necessary in order to ensure the participation of the students in the sports and cultural activities.

Dr. Amit Joshi enquired as to what are the UGC guidelines in this regard to which it was informed that there are no such guidelines.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that whatever is written in the Hand Book of Information, they cannot go beyond that. If somebody ask the University under RTI as to under what rule they have granted this condonation, what would be the reply of the University.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said they should maintain academic excellence and requested not to spoil it. They should not even allow it for one time. It cannot be said that one time murder is allowed. This is not a proper way of condonation of lectures.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that if this University is at number one, it is because of students.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is not associated with this item and he is also not getting his dissent recorded. But he would like to know, why they are considering this item when they are not legally competent to consider it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, let them assume for a minute that they do not pass this item, what would happen then because what they are demanding, it has already been given. Whatever has been happened, that has been happened. In most of the cases, only this happens and there remains nothing with them. Though the item is brought for consideration just by name, but it should have been for ratification or information. Shri Malhi ji is saying to take action, but the minutes have been approved by the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the Vice Chancellor may not be knowing about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said the meeting was officially convened by the officiating Vice Chancellor and it was presided over by him where DSW and some syndics are its member.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if they go on doing like this, it would make a mockery of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, let them should accept the facts. Everything has been done under pressure and when they did not bear that pressure, they did it. They should accept that whatever they did, it was done even after knowing everything. He asked Shri Malhi that when he was in Police, he must be knowing about it that such things had to be done under pressure of the agitations.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it is not an agitation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whenever any agitation takes place, the DSPs used to say, what the teachers are doing, they should resolve the issue with the students and they should be relieved of this problem.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should not bow to the pressure. If they have to think in this way, then do it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh suggested that this issue could be referred back to the Committee for reconsideration as per the Hand Book of Information and placed before the next Syndicate for consideration. They are not rejecting the item.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what is the ground for referring it back to the Committee.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that when there is no permissible category for condonation, why it is being granted in the first place.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they could refer it back to the Committee saying that the Syndicate discussed this matter. Since the decision of the Committee is contrary to the Hand Book of Information, it is being sent back to them for reconsideration. It would give them a signal not to do this in the next year.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should just ask the Committee under what rules they have done it. On being said by Dr. Amit Joshi that the students have already appeared in the paper, Shri Malhi said that they do not have any information to this effect.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee has clearly written that it has been given as per the Hand Book of Information and thereafter they have said the 10% is given by the Board of Control.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor about the 10 lectures, Dr. Ameer Sultana said that is regarding condonation of lectures by the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested the Vice Chancellor not to do like this since it would become a continuous process and he (Vice Chancellor) would be a difficulty. They should not approve it and send it back so as to put pressure on the students. It would be seen later on if any problem arises and then they would do it.

Shri Ashok Goyal read out recommendation No. 3 of the minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 30.11.2018 which states, "that a student will not be required to take prior permission of the Chairperson of the concerned department for participation in various activities".

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in large number of departments, generally, Board of Control accepts that even if the permission has not been taken, it is deemed to have been taken. However, the problem may be in one or two department.

Shri Ashok Goyal said the rules have been made to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has got framed these rules. Shri Ashok Goyal said that now they are themselves breaking the rules made by them. The need for prior permission arose because it was being used as a stepping stone. The students used to bring a certificate from the D.S.W. for getting condonation for the shortage of lectures. Then another thing started i.e. blood donation. There is a shop from where they could get certificate for blood donation. One day he went to the Department of Evening Studies where a good number of students were having blood donation certificate. The said certificate was issued to them on the same pro forma. He told them that all these certificates are fake. Then he called one student, who informed him that there is a shop from where the Certificate for blood donation could be procured. Since lectures for donating blood are given, the shopkeeper has increased the rate exorbitantly.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that what they do is, the student, who donates the blood, they get the roll of the student noted, thereafter the roll of the number of the said student comes from there, and after verifying the roll number of the students, they condoned the lectures without asking the student concerned. Now, they do not ask for the Certificate for donating blood.

It was said that now they could conclude that the Item is referred back to the Committee with a request to give recommendations as per UGC rules/Handbook of Information.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what would the Committee do?

To this, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it is the headache of the Committee.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that they have to justify that because they are giving 10 lectures over and above. However, a condition should be imposed and they would themselves inform them that despite all this, if a student fails fulfil the attendance requirement, an undertaking could be obtained stating that the student must ensure complete attendance in the following semester. Such students are only 2% to 4% and not more than that. For such students, the condition of completion of attendance requirement in the following semester and submission of assignment(s), etc. could be imposed.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Syndicate must be informed as to how many students are there, who have shortage of attendance of lectures, of which class & department they are, and who is the Chairperson of the Department concerned.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi suggested that the issue should be placed before them with full details.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is right, the item should be brought again to the Syndicate with full details.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the students, who are on strike, their issue should also be got resolved.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that 10% of the lectures are condoned by the Board of Control and 10% by the Vice-Chancellor. In addition to this, there is a shortage of lectures of students owing to genuine reasons, i.e., agriculture, illness, etc. Even in her Department, there is a transgender, to which she had referred to earlier also, had to go for sowing of paddy. After returning from there, she had to undergo a serious surgery, and she has not been able to attend the classes for the last about one month. Later on, her case would also come to the Syndicate. The students, who had undergone for surgery in the PGI, could be taken as if they are telling a lie. This type of students is very less and their cases should be considered sympathetically, and if need be, a nominal fine could be imposed on them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are guided/instructed by the rules and regulations of MHRD and UGC. On the one hand, there is a various types of violations and on the other hand, they themselves are creating different categories for condonation of shortage of lectures.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations dated 30.11.2018 of the Committee with regard to representation of Ms. Kanupriya, President, PUCSC, regarding guidelines/rules for condonation of shortage of attendance be referred back to the Committee with the directions that full details regarding the number of students, class and department, asking for such condonation, be also provided.

At this stage, Professor Keshav Malhotra reiterated that the students, who are on strike, their issue should also be got resolved.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu suggested that a Committee comprising teachers of the University Campus should be formed to resolve the issue of students, who are sitting on strike.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this issue would be taken up later on.

- 11.** Considered minutes dated 18.06.2018 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Committee to prepare a summary status report to enquire into the quality of Construction over the last 16 years of the expansion of the Panjab University along with comments dated 5.07.2018 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Executive Engineer, P.U. Construction Office in respect of the report published in Newspaper, Chandigarh Tribune dated 2.7.2018 regarding quality of construction at Campus, pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 23.09.2018 (**Appendix-VII**).

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.02.2017 (Para 12) (**Appendix-VII**) had constituted a Committee to enquire into the quality of construction over the last 16 years of the expansion of the Panjab University and submit its report within a period of six months.
 2. The Status report of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate was placed before the Syndicate dated 10/19.12.2017 (Para 12) (**Appendix-VII**) and it was resolved that a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Jarnail Singh, comprising of Dr. Dalip Kumar, Dr. Subhash Sharma and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma be constituted to prepare a summary status report to be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.
 3. The comments dated 5.7.2018 of the Executive Engineer, P.U. were placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2018 as item No. C-23 and it was resolved that item No. C-23 be deferred to be clubbed with item C-34 of the Syndicate meeting agenda of 7.7.2018 along with Report of the Committee already constituted and the same be placed before the Syndicate in one of its next meetings.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Amit Joshi said that they could accept the report.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that they had made a comment that this is a maintenance issue, but how could they accept this comment because the construction of the building is completed and the building becomes bad within a year. He had seen this particularly in the case of International Hostel as seepage is there from day one and so far they have not been able to find any solution to the problem.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the fungus has spread in the entire hostel. However, so far as the issue pointed out by Professor Navdeep Goyal is concerned, the comments of XEN should not be part of it, and who has sought his comments. It is a Committee of the Syndics and before placing the report of the Committee to the Syndicate, comments of the XEN have been sought. Shri Ashok Goyal ji had pointed out this in the previous meeting of the Syndicate also, and perhaps, the same has been appended with. In fact, Shri Ashok Goyal had suggested that the item should be to discuss the minutes of the Committee, but instead of discussing the minutes of the Committee, they are discussing the comments of the XEN, which were sought on the basis of the report appeared in the newspaper(s).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they (XEN office) is talking about the stone, but if they see the stone fixed in the old buildings, the same has not get effected even after so many year (more than 60 years). Why the stone fixed in the new buildings in leaving the walls?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they should remove the comments of the XEN from the Item and the report of the Committee is acceptable to them, and thereafter, they should proceed as per Law.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the XEN Office has been given the responsibility of scrutinising the bills of the Contractor after the completion of the building, because the XEN is the one, who would ensure quality. The University had given the contract to the Contractor and the XEN Office has got the job done. Why could not the XEN Office ensure that the work of the Contractor is of good quality? Could they not even do this?

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that, first of all, their XEN Office does not do any work. Even if the XEN Office does some work, it is very less. Majority of the work they get done from the outside agencies. The major job of the XEN Office is to frame terms and conditions of the contract and award the contract in accordance with recommendation of the Tender Committee. In the Tender Committee itself a suggestion had come, which is not implemented as yet, though the same had been recorded and approved. In fact, the suggestion was that there is a shortage of supervision on the part of the XEN Office owing to which the problems are being faced, whereas the main job of the XEN Office is to supervise. Along with the supervision, it was also approved by the Tender Committee that a person from the user Department/Office should also be associated for the purpose of supervision because he/she also knows about the requirements. When they get constructed their own home, they checked the work of the Contractor from time to time even though they are not technical persons and the technical work is checked by the technical persons. However, some things are checked by them. He does not feel that this part has been implemented so far, even though it is absolutely necessary. Why it is not being implemented, is not understandable. He reiterated that a person from the user Department/Office should be associated for supervision of the work of the Contractor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he agrees with the suggestion of Professor Navdeep Goyal that the involvement of the Chairperson is absolutely necessary.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that, that is why, he is surprised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in a couple of Departments Professors were there. He added that he was a Director there and a grant of Rs.6.5 crore came there, and he got constructed a building. Mostly, the Professors do not have anything to do in this regard. The building was a faulty one because the technical person just comes and approves the same. After getting the building constructed, he had been able to save a sum of Rs.1.25 crore. After consulting a senior Professor, he had constituted a Committee. In fact, the person of the user Department is assigned the job of supervising the work being done by the Contractor to ensure that the ratio of cement, sand, etc. is maintained. When they construct their own House, they knew the ratio between cement and sand, which is very general. With this, he had been able to save Rs.1.25 crore, with which he got constructed a temporary structure at the 3rd floor of the two storey building.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that the report should be accepted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed that once a Contractor (Electricity) came to his Department, and he asked him for the copy of the contract, gaze, etc. though he was not much aware of the specifications. The material is fitted in the building and they did not face any problem about the material till date. He reiterated that though he was not aware of the specifications, the Contractor got scared.

Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that at the moment, he is not talking about the acceptance or rejection of the report. In fact, he is not able to understand as to what the Item is. He pointed out that in Note 1 under the Item, it has been written "The

Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.02.2017 (Para 12) had constituted a Committee to enquire into the quality of construction over the last 16 years of the expansion of the Panjab University and submit its report within a period of six months". Then in Note 2, it is written "The Status report of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate was placed before the Syndicate dated 10/19.12.2017 (Para 12) and it was resolved that a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Jarnail Singh, comprising of Dr. Dalip Kumar, Dr. Subhash Sharma and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma be constituted to prepare a summary status report to be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting". In the status report, nowhere it has been mentioned as to when the construction of building concerned was started and when completed, and the same is about all the buildings. Whether the building was completed in the year 1947, 1955, 2005 has not been mentioned anywhere. How could he as member of the Syndicate know about that? According to him, the first part of the status report should be as to when the tenders for a particular building were invited, construction stated and when the same was completed, so that they are able to know whether the repair was required. As told by Professor Navdeep Goyal, if the buildings are only about a year old, then it is a very serious issue, and if the buildings are 16 years or 25 years old, the issue is entirely different.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to say that the Committee was constituted for the buildings, which were constructed during the last eight years.

Continuing, Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that the report is about the buildings, which have been constructed during the last sixteen years. How many times the earthquake has taken place during the last sixteen years? He has no problem if they wanted to accept the report. They did not know as to when the building was constructed and the work relating to maintenance is to be done by the staff for which they have to spend money. Once he had made a phone call to XEN and asked him that the material for white-washing a house in the campus has not been supplied by his office, and the reply of the XEN was that they did not have funds. The Vice-Chancellor should try to know as to what is happening. Even the persons, who go to the houses in Campus, did not take along even the lime (chuna).

Dr. Amit Joshi intervened to say that these buildings have been constructed on the basis of tenders. An exhaustive report on this had come on 19.12.2017. Since that exhaustive report was a bulky one, it was suggested that the summary of the report should be brought. The building, which had been constructed during the last 16 years, had big cracks. The building of International Hostel is in such a condition that it might collapse one day. If they visit the International Hostel, they would come out with sickness. In fact, the building of International Hostel is bad from the first year itself. The whole Senate was of the view that a Committee should be appointed. Bricks were broken and several other reactions took place. As the bricks are falling from the roof of the building of Department of Biotechnology every day, anybody could die any day. If they remain in that Department, and brick do not fall, they would not discuss the issue any more. After all, they constituted a Committee of Senate and certain members of the Committee visited the sites and did their job meticulously, including clicking of pictures of the faulty/cracked buildings, etc. Everything has been recorded, but still they are raising certain ifs and buts. Even if they suppose that an earthquake of 10 intensity had taken place and certain cracks occurred, but how the fungus, seepage, etc. is there. There is a suggestion to appoint a supervisor from the user building, but the job of supervising is of the XEN Office; otherwise, for what they are paid? Though the entire construction is faulty, still they are not willing to take action just because of certain technicalities. They always remained stuck in the technicalities. If the Syndicate or the Senate did not take action, then who would? A big photographic evidence is before them on basis of which they could take the action, and if not, they could tell the people, who visited those buildings, that they have rejected their report.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should accept the report. According to him, the only shortcoming in the report is

Dr. Amit Joshi intervened to say that every member worked meticulously.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that so far as falling of tiles is concerned, he would like to inform them that he had gone somewhere outside the Campus, and he saw there that the tiles were fixed with screws. He asked his friend as to why the screws have been applied to the tiles, and he (his friend) replied that this experiment, which they had done, has failed. In fact, this experiment was done so that they did not have to paint the walls again and again with which the maintenance cost escalates. The technical person asked him that if they challenge the basic structure, i.e., RCC, ratio between cement and sand, etc., then they would accept that the building/wall is faulty. In fact, their's this experiment has failed in the entire Chandigarh. The tiles/bricks are not falling in the buildings of Panjab University alone. Now, they have discontinued this practice in Chandigarh. So far as seepage in the buildings of University is concerned, he is hundred per cent sure that in Chandigarh, it is called dampness (*shora*), which even reaches first floor. When he shifted to the University accommodation, since he did not take the service of University's Construction Office, one of his friends, who is expert in paint, etc., came especially from Jalandhar and told him about the dampness. If he wanted to get the walls painted, he had to peeled off the plaster up to height of four feet. Thus, he get the walls peeled up the height of four feet and applied the chemical, because he had to apply very costly paint on the walls, he could not afford to do the same again and again. However, he become a bit miser and applied this formula only on the outer walls, thinking that the shora would not come out in the inner walls. As such, nobody could solve the problem of shora. The chemicals (Fixit), etc. have arrived just nowadays. Later on the Central Walls also got affected by the shora, and he has applied the same formula.

Referring to the point that several earthquakes had taken place, Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha pointed out that the buildings, which are about 60 years' old, did not get affected with the earthquakes, but the buildings, which have been constructed recently, got affected.

It was pointed out that certain members are suggesting that the Report of the Committee should be accepted. However, a clarification is required as to what action is to be taken because the Committee has itself recommended (Para 2) that "It is a matter of serious concern and the Committee recommends to the Syndicate that on the basis of the facts, the persons responsible for the lapses should be identified and responsibility should be fixed". Who is to fix the responsibility?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the responsibility was to be fixed by the Committee itself. The Committee should have done its full work.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Committee has done a good job. What the Committee could do, it has done. In fact, the formation of the Committee in itself is defective. The quality of construction of a building could not be inspected unless and until technical persons are involved. However, in this Committee, no technical person is there. The Committee has pointed out the defects, i.e., leakage, cracks, etc., and they could not do more than that. Now, if they have to fix the responsibility, the technical persons have to check as to why it is happening. Whether it is because of the defective material or defective workmanship or low quality of material? Unless and until it is done, they could not fix the responsibility. As such, the Committee has done a good job, but to carry forward the recommendations of the Committee, they would have to appoint a Committee comprising technical persons.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when they were discussing this issue yesterday, though they were not able to tell, an idea came to his mind as he had done some work relating to this at Banaras Hindu University, involvement of technical persons is required.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Technical Committee even tell them the ratio between the cement and sand, and the quality other material used in the building, even of the constructed/stationary building.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the minutes dated 18.6.2018 of the Committee constituted to prepare a summary status report to enquire into the quality of construction over the last 16 years of the expansion of the Panjab University, **be accepted;**
- (ii) the Vice Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Technical Committee to examine the issue to suggest guidelines for further constructions and also to identify as to where the fault lies, for fixing responsibility; and
- (iii) for future, one faculty member of the user department(s)/Office of that building might be associated to supervise the construction work.

12.

Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English & Cultural Studies, be appointed as Dean, Alumni Relations, for one year with effect from the date she joins as such, in place of Professor Anil Monga, pursuant to Regulation 1 at page 109, of P.U. Calendar Volume I.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 1, page 109 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 which reads as under:

“The Senate on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate may appoint a Dean of Alumni Relations, such appointment may be made for a year to year but the maximum period for which a person may hold this office shall not exceed five (consecutive) years”.

2. Dr. Anil Monga, Dean, Alumni Relations, (Professor, Centre for Police Administration), has submitted his resignation.

RESOLVED: That Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English & Cultural Studies, be appointed as Dean, Alumni Relations, for one year with effect from the date she joins as such, in place of Professor Anil Monga, pursuant to Regulation 1 at page 109, of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

13.

Considered minutes dated 29.11.2018 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the representation received from Ambedkar Students Association (ASA), Panjab University, Chandigarh, with regard to Syndicate decision to charge Examination fee and implementation of Post Matric Scholarship in Self Finance Courses in the Teaching Departments of Panjab University & its Regional Centres.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.11.2018 (Para 15) has considered the decision of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2016 (Para 98) with regard to the effective implementation of policies and programmes of GOI for SC/ST students, covered under Post Matric Scholarship (P.M.S.) schemes and resolved that the exemption of 25% of examination fee available to the SC/ST

students studying in normal courses be **not** extended to the SC/ST students studying in self-financing courses.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the members to go through Item 13 as it is a serious issue. When the issue was being discussed with Shri Vijay Sampla ji and he told him that they are releasing.

Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that the discussion which he (Vice-Chancellor) held with Shri Sampla ji related to post-matric scholarship, whereas this related to examination fee. However, he could understand that when the Syndicate had rejected this in the previous meeting, why this has again been placed before the Syndicate, and that too, just on the representation of someone. If it is rejected again by the Syndicate today, what is the guarantee that next time the same would be brought again to the Syndicate. When the Syndicate had rejected it in its previous meeting, why it has been brought again? Like this, how would they run the administration? According to him, it is very unfortunate and urged that the Item should be withdrawn.

It was clarified that whether it is admission fee or examination fee of the SC/ST students, it is 100% refunded by the Punjab Government. However, there are certain self-financing courses, wherein only one-time fee, including everything, is charged. At one point of time, they decided that the students would pay only 25% of the fee and the Punjab Government would refund the 25% of the fee students concerned and the remaining 75% to the University. As such, they are charging only 25% of the examination from the students, which is a small amount. Now, the students of the self-financing courses are saying that the 25% of the examination fee should be taken from them. But what they are doing is that 25% of the admission fee was being charged from the students and the remaining 75% was being taken from the Government. The students are asking the University to follow the same pattern so far as examination fee is concerned. Since the admission in the self-financing courses is very less, this should be approved.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as any concession is being given to the students belonging to scheduled castes category. For example, if the examination fee is Rs.2200/-, what amount is being charged from students belonging to scheduled castes category.

To this, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they charge less examination fee from the students belonging to scheduled castes category. He enquired as to how much amount relating to fees of SC/ST categories is pending with the Punjab Government, and is it of one year only.

It was informed that more than Rs.10 crore is due from the Punjab Government and it is for the last more than 4-5 years.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that would they still continue giving the concession. In fact, this policy of the Government is for the private Colleges also, but all the private Colleges had discontinued it because they did not have funds to pay salary to the teachers. He is talking about those Colleges, where they are going for inspection. There is such a College in Machhiwara and certain other Girls Colleges. There are more than 50% of the students, who belonged to reserved categories, and they could not charge fee from them. Now, the teachers are agitating for payment of salary to them and Punjab Government had not given any money to them since 2015-16. From where would they pay salary to the teachers? Now, they are taking fees from all such students and requesting the Punjab Government to deposit the amount of fees to the students in their respective accounts directly. They should also adopt the same policy. In the case of University students, the Punjab Government should directly deposit the amount of fees paid by SC/ST students in their respective accounts directly. They only have to send the Aadhar and Accounts Numbers of the students to the Punjab Government. If they did not do this, how would they be able to pay the salaries to the staff in accordance

with the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission? They did not have any problem with the SC/ST students. In fact, they wanted that this benefit should be given to the SC/ST students, but not at the cost of students belonging to general categories, teachers and non-teaching staff. They did not want to face any problem relating to payment of salary and pension to the teachers and non-teaching staff.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Prabhjit Singh has made very good observation that though they are already unable to pay salaries to the staff, they should continue giving this benefit to SC/ST students.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they should be told as to for which years the amount of more than Rs.10 crore is pending with the Punjab Government. He is apprehending that this amount would continue to multiply and at one stage it would become Rs.20 crore or more. This amount would continue to increase because the fees and students are bound to increase. As such, the problem is going to be escalated.

Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that the Punjab Government gives just Rs.20 crore per year, but had forfeited more than Rs.10 crore in this manner.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the problem is – when they introduced the self-financing courses, they had introduced them in good spirit. Though a number of years have passed after the introduction of the self-financing courses, they did not increase their fees accordingly. In fact, the self-financing courses have become routine/general courses. To tide over the problem, they have to increase the fees of such courses as well as the fees of the NRI students. If they did this, they would not face any problem. According to him, they have not started the self-financing courses after doing proper homework; rather, they have already diluted the purpose of introducing the self-financing courses. In fact, the self-financing courses are eating their already generated income. Meaning thereby, they have to look into the matter in its entirety.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, the students belonging to SC/ST had staged a dharna, and the students are saying as to why discrimination is being meted to them and they have also informed the Minister about this. As such, a lot of things are there. He requested the members to look into the issue in that perspective. He has also been told that the amount involved is also not a big amount. The students are pleading that though this benefit is being given to the students studying in Colleges situated in Punjab, why the same not being given by the Panjab University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this benefit is being given in other Universities of Punjab, as such they could not say that they are being discriminated because in any case grant to other Universities of Punjab is to be given by the Punjab Government. Whether the other Universities of Punjab continue to function or closed down, is the responsibility of the Government, whereas there is no such position of Panjab University. How could they continue to wait for the money to be released by the Punjab Government? Majority of their grant comes from the Central Government. As such, they could not say that discrimination is being meted out to them. They might do whatever they wished, but should not expect anything from the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is why, he is concerned with this matter and the same has been placed before the Syndicate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the Punjab Government should clearly inform them the pending amount and the same should be released to the University at the earliest.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the fees of self-financing courses in respect of SC/ST students are also refunded by the Punjab Government.

It was informed that the Punjab Government was followed rigorously for the release of amount, which is pending with it. When the Hon'ble Minister had come, they had respected him. Thereafter, letter(s) has/have also been written to him and the matter is also being continuously followed, but owing to one reason or the other, the amount is not being released by them (Punjab Government).

Professor Ronki Ram said that, in fact, this amount would come to the Punjab Government from the Central Government.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that at the moment the financial position of the Punjab Government is that from January 2017, it has not released four instalments of Dearness Allowance neither to the employees nor pensioners, i.e., after the swearing in of present Congress Government. The condition of the Punjab Government is worse as even the reimbursement of medical bills of at least six months are pending in the Treasury as the Government does not have the funds. So far as the point raised by one of his friends that the money for payment of fees, etc. to the SC/ST students from the Central Government is concerned, the Central Government had given the money to the Punjab Government, but the Punjab Government has used the same for some other purposes. Only the matching grant was to be allocated by the Punjab Government, but it is not in a position to do so. The Punjab Government is now saying that the audit is going on. The members should know that there was much fee in certain courses, especially Engineering Courses, the private Engineering Colleges made fake admissions of SC students and the Managements claimed and received the entire money from the Punjab Government, whereas neither the students had taken admission nor they appeared in any examination. People made complaints and the issue was also raised in the Punjab Vidhan Sabha and Vidhan Sabha marked the case to the Vigilance Department. The Vigilance Department pointed out that the certain Colleges showed admission of certain students, but they did not appear in the examination. As such, those admissions are fake. In fact, crores of rupees are to be recovered from certain Colleges by the Punjab Government. Therefore, he does not think that this issue would be solved in the near future. The simple solution to the problem is that those students belonging to SC/ST categories, who wish to take this benefit, should obtain the same from the Punjab Government directly.

To this, Professor Ronki Ram said that students belonging to SC/ST categories might file a case against the University.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that no case has been filed by the students of Punjab Colleges.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha informed that the DPI (Colleges), Punjab, had received a phone call from the Chief Secretary, Punjab asking him to direct the concerned College(s) not to withhold the roll numbers of such students owing to non-payment of fees.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the roll numbers have been released because the same were withheld. Had the fees been taken from the students earlier, the question for withholding the roll numbers would not have arisen? He enquired whether they have started taking fees from the SC/ST of P.U. Constituent Colleges.

It was informed that until 2017-18, the Government had directed that the fees should not be charged from the SC/ST students as the same would be deposited in the University account by the Punjab Government directly. The Central Government had written a strict letter that from the session 2018-19, the Government would directly deposit the amount of fees of SC/ST students in their respective accounts, but not in the University account. In accordance with it, the Government was supposed to deposit the amount in the students' accounts directly. However, now they have issued revised instructions that though they would deposit the amount in the students' accounts directly, the University/College concerned would compel the students to pay the fees,

until the amount is not deposited in the students' account. On the basis of these instructions, they could not compel the students to pay the fees. The amount would go directly to the accounts of the students and the students would give an undertaking that as and when the amount is received by them from the Government, it would be paid to the University/College. However, until then the Certificates/Degrees are not to be released to them. Now, it is very difficult to implement these instructions of the Government.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the students would leave the University/College after a period of three years, and up to when they would retain the degrees. In fact, it is a political decision and it should have also been taken in respect of general category students. On the one hand, the Government did not want the students to pay fees and on the other hand, it is not releasing the amount to the respective Universities/Colleges.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that the Government is seeking recovering from those students, who have left the College/University after studying for two years.

Professor Ronki Ram said that since he is working on this area, and the students are also meeting him. The students have told him that the Government had issued instructions that the University/College should not charge any fees from the students, and the fee should be taken from them only after it is received by them from the Government. Government would notify that the money for such and such academic sessions have been sanctioned and paid to the students. The University/Colleges have also been told not to release the degrees to them until the amount is paid. When the degree would not be released to the student, he would definitely file a case. However, if the amount is deposited in the account of the student, he/she has to pay the same. As such, the University/College would not be at loss. The only thing is that the amount, which was supposed to be received today, would be received after two or more years.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that there is a famous case of Ludhiana College, which is also on the You-Tube. The Principal of the College had withheld the roll number of a student, and S. Simranjit Singh, MLA, went specially to Ludhiana from Chandigarh and get the roll number released to the student. Thus, it is a very serious problem. Could they ask the teachers to take salary after two and half years? The source of income of private Colleges is only the fees, which they are not allowing them to charge.

Professor Ronki Ram said that in DAV College, Hoshiarpur, a big problem had taken place and the certain persons from the University had to go there to solve the problem.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he had no problem even if the entire fee is not taken from the students, but from where the salary would be paid to the teachers. Is any of the teachers ready to take salary after two or more years?

Professor Ronki Ram said that if they did not implement the instructions/orders of the Government, they might face problem. The students might also file a case against the University in the SC/ST Commission, and they might be called to Delhi.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired as to from where the money would come.

On a query made Shri Ashok Goyal, it was informed that about Rs.15 lac to Rs.20 lac per semester is involved. The plea of the students is the case of the University regarding release of money is with the Punjab Government, and why should they suffer on this count. Now, the Syndicate should show its concern, and pass a Resolution that if the Punjab Government does not give them the money, it would be difficult for the University to continue with this scheme. With this, there would be pressure on the Government.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that right now they could Resolve that if the grant is given by the Punjab Government, they would reimburse the fees paid by the University to them.

Shri Prabhjit Singh suggested that it should be Resolved that as and when the Punjab Government release the pending amount to the University, which is due for the last few year, the University would give this benefit to the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are rigorously pursuing the Punjab Government for release of pending amount.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they might continue pursuing for years together, but the money would not come.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Punjab Government did not release grant to the University for several years and Professor R.C. Sobti, former Vice-Chancellor, run the University for six year, but the Government did not release the grant, and the same is still pending.

Professor Ronki Ram suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should write a letter to the Hon'ble Minister of State for Disability and Human Justice & Empowerment stating that the amount equivalent to 25% of fees, which they give concession/benefit to the SC/ST, should be given to the University directly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee would be formed and they would also try to take up the matter with the Hon'ble Minister.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Central Government would release the money only to the University directly, if such a decision is taken by the Parliament.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that they should request the Central Government that their amount relating to 25% concession in fees to the SC/ST students, should be released to the University directly instead of routing the same through the Punjab Government.

It was clarified that it is a Central sponsored scheme and had a set procedure.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should keep in mind that whatever the cost they have to bear, they could not afford to have confrontation with the State Government, and at the same time, they would be having confrontation with the students as well pleading that it is a matter with the students and the Government, and the University is not involved in it as it is the scheme of the Government. The Government, irrespective of any party, would say that the Panjab University, even though it is taking grant from it, instead of helping it, is harassing it just for Rs.50 lac. That was why, he had asked as to what amount is involved and what is pending with the Punjab Government, though the amount would increase every year.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they have to play a very balancing role so that their work is got done and at the same time, they also do not suffer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is on the job and hoped that with the grace of God, he would succeed. He would also like to inform them that during the year 2011-12, an agreement had been signed amongst the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, Punjab Government and the Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University stating that they should make the Panjab University a centrally funded University and provide them 90% of the grant and they would not demand Rs.32.87 crore, which they give them. This has been given in writing by the Panjab University itself. Recently, he had written a letter to His Excellency Governor of Punjab & Administrator, Union Territory, Chandigarh, and also met him and requested that

the Panjab University served the people of Union Territory of Chandigarh, and providing the services to the demography of the region, but the Union Territory is not giving anything in return to them. The Governor Sahib said how could it be possible, and they must be giving to the University something? He requested Governor Sahib to call the Advisor and the Advisor informed that they did not give anything to Panjab University. He had gone to the Governor with all the facts. He had requested the Governor to give one-time annual grant to the University either in the name of maintenance grant or development grant, and the Governor Sahib as well as all the Secretaries, who were present there, have agreed to his request, and he has quoted the figure of about Rs.52 crore. A same letter, he had got forwarded and he has also written a letter to the Chancellor. Soon he is also going to meet the Chancellor.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that though they should agree to extend this benefit to the SC/ST students as it is socially a good cause, they should word the Resolution in this way that they agreed to extend this benefit, provided the Punjab Government release the pending amount to the University and continue to pay it in future in regular manner.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the suggestion put forth by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi is accepted, they would face a big problem as it meant that they would discontinue with this scheme until the Punjab Government released the pending amount. What would they do when there would be agitation by the students?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired as to how the Budget of the University would be balanced.

Shri Prabhjit Singh enquired when the Government is not giving them the money, how its instructions/direction is binding on them.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the University has received a notice that they have not prepared the roster, but a number of appointments have been made during the last so many years. Until the roster is prepared, they could not make any new appointment. The Government is saying who the action be not initiated against them for not preparing the roster. Similar is the case of giving 25% fee concession to the students belonging to SC/ST categories.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that his only concern is that when the money is not coming from the Government, wherefrom they would meet the expenses.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that no reply has been given to the query made by Shri Prabhjit Singh that when this Item was rejected by the Syndicate in its earlier meeting, why the same has been placed before the Syndicate again.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when the students were agitating, he talked to the Dean Student Welfare and other Officers of the University, and ultimately they came to the conclusion that the issue should again be placed before the Syndicate, and even the students were also of the same view. The students had also given him the Memorandum in front of Shri Vijay Sampla ji, who had also asked him to take care of this and promised that he would look into the matter so far as the release of grant to the University is concerned.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations dated 29.11.2018 of the Committee (**Appendix-VIII**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the representation received from Ambedkar Students Association (ASA), Panjab University, Chandigarh, with regard to Syndicate decision to charge Examination fee and implementation of Post Matric Scholarship in Self Finance Courses in the Teaching Departments of Panjab University & its Regional Centres, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Punjab Government be requested to release the pending grant; otherwise, it would be difficult for the University to continue with the Scheme. At the same time, Professor Ronki Ram, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Finance and Development Officer would talk to both the Punjab and Central Governments Officers.

Consideration of following Item C-14 on the agenda was deferred:

14. To consider the reports dated 14.09.2018, 20.09.2018 and 13.10.2018 submitted by Committee in respect of the following Colleges:

1. S.D.P. College, Ludhiana
2. Devki Devi Jain Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana
3. Atam Valabh Jain College, Ludhiana

Item C-33 on the agenda of Syndicate dated 07.07.2018.

15. Considered minutes dated 31.05.2018 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to look into the representation submitted by Ms. Anuradha Sharma, EPABX Operator, Telecommunication Unit.

It was informed that Ms. Anuradha Sharma has worked from 22nd February 1996 to 14th November 2007 as daily wage Clerk and she has completed 3777 days. In the year 2006, a judgement was delivered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Uma Devi Vs. State of Karnataka, on the basis of which the services of certain person, who had completed 3650 days, working in the University on daily wage basis were regularized and the cut off date was 31st December 2010. She met the condition of 3650 days in the year 2007 and joined as EPBX Operator. They had also taken the legal opinion and in accordance with the legal opinion, she is entitled. Now, the Committee has recommended that if she is ready to give an affidavit that she would not claim regularization from the back date and would also not claim seniority in the Clerical cadre from the back date, she could be considered for appointment as Clerk on regular basis from the decision of the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That the services of Ms. Anuradha Sharma, EPABX Operator, be regularized as Clerk. Since Ms. Anuradha Sharma has worked as EPABX Operator w.e.f. 2007 onwards, she be appointed as Clerk on regular basis only from the date of approval of the Syndicate. In order not to disturb the seniority of already appointed Clerks, she be asked to give an affidavit that she would not claim regularization from the back date and also would not claim seniority in the Clerical cadre from the back date.

Arising out of the above, Professor Ronki Ram stated that there are certain persons in the University working on daily-wage/contract basis, who have completed the requisite 3650 days and they have worked continuously for 10 years. Earlier, the services of majority of such persons were regularized. However, the services of certain person, who fell short of 10-20 days, were not regularized. There are certain persons (very few in number), who had met the condition of 3650 days, but due to one reason or the other, did not get extension. As such, they were not in the job of the University, when the services of other such persons were regularized. Whereas the judgement of Supreme Court says that the services of those, who had served for 3650 days or more, be regularized. He meant to say is that there are 2-4 such cases, which fall in this category. One of such persons, is Mr. Jatinder Singh Chauhan. He urged the Vice Chancellor to bring his case also to the Syndicate for regularizing his services.

At this stage, it was pointed out that they have received a representation from Panjab University SC/ST/BC Employees Welfare Association regarding preparation of roster for non-teaching positions needed to be discussed and decided.

It was informed that the roster prepared by the office has to be approved by the Syndicate. On a query by Shri Ashok Goyal whether the roster has been prepared, the Registrar informed that it has been prepared.

Professor Navdeep Goyal asked if an item has come earlier regarding this to which the Registrar relied in the negative.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked if the roster has been prepared. If so, is he (Registrar) satisfied with it to which the Registrar said that it would be completed till tomorrow.

Shri Prabhjit Singh asked, is there any urgency in it?

The Vice Chancellor said that there is some court issue.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the roster belong to non-teaching staff. They are not going to make any recruitment, what is the urgency?

The Vice Chancellor said they should also listen to the practical difficult, they are facing. It has been alleged that the roster is being delayed unnecessarily. Secondly, if the roster is prepared, the internal issues relating to promotion would be solved immediately.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that there is no reservation in promotion in Panjab University.

Professor Ronki Ram said that reservation is there in promotion also.

Shri Prabhjit Singh again reiterated that there is no reservation in promotion. This was also endorsed by Professor Navdeep Goyal.

Professor Ronki Ram said that reservation is there when they appoint Associate Professors to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are talking about non-teaching staff.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to why they are in a hurry for preparation of the roster to which the Vice Chancellor said that he does not know about it. This could be brought in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that Professor Anil Kumar, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences was a member of the Roster Committee. He (Professor Ronki Ram) himself was a member of that Committee. There was a lot of pressure from the non-teaching staff. The Committee had put arduous efforts in that work.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would not like delay it unnecessarily as the roster is ready.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested to bring this in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said it would take a lot of time. Why 3-4 persons, out of them should sit and see to it. The Vice Chancellor said that they should not stop it and resolve it today itself.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he telling about the practical difficulty in it. The recruitment has not been done and the roster has to be prepared from bottom to top.

The Clerks were recruited long back and there is no recruitment since the last 10-15 years. They have regularised the persons as per seniority. Whosoever was eligible as per the seniority, he was regularised irrespective of the caste he/she belongs to. Now those persons are to be adjusted in the roster. So, it is not so easy practically.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, the Registrar says that they have prepared the roster.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that when they did not see the papers, how do they know about it?

The Vice Chancellor said, that is what he is saying. Three-four persons out of them should sit together and see to it.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi while agreeing to it said it is alright and they should do like this.

RESOLVED: That a Committee comprising following persons be constituted to look into the whole issue, including preparation of roster for non-teaching position, and make recommendations:

1. Shri Ashok Goyal
2. Professor Navdeep Goyal
3. Professor Ronki Ram
4. Shri Prabhjit Singh
5. Assistant Registrar (Estt.) ... (Convener)

At this stage, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there was an Item (No. 29) for consideration in the agenda of the Syndicate meeting 7th July 2018 relating to Master Seniority list of teachers. The list has been prepared, as per the UGC norms. The Establishment Branch had uploaded it on the University website inviting objections 2-3 times. Thereafter, the corrections as pointed out were incorporated. So, he does not think that now there could be any objection.

The Vice Chancellor said that what they are saying is right, but there are many other things related to it, so they should not do it in a hurry.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could bring this item in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are many items pending in the old agenda, some of which have already become redundant and some have already been taken up for consideration in different meetings. The items which are still pending, he thinks, should be consolidated and put in the current agenda. If the members allow, he would withdraw these items and place them before the Syndicate again after consolidating them; otherwise, it would not be possible to consolidate them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have to attach a note stating that the old items have been given new numbers.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi wanted to know whether these items would be placed before the new Syndicate or the current Syndicate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the only way is to first withdraw these items and then bring them in the new agenda.

This was agreed to.

16.

Information contained in **Items R-(i) to R-(xii)** was read out, viz. –

(i) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-employed Dr. Naresh Kumar Tejpal, Veterinary Officer (Retd.) in Central Animal House, on contract basis for 89 days (till the permission to fill the post from MHRD), on fixed emoluments i.e. half of the salary drawn (excluding HRA, CCA and other special allowances) rounded off to nearest lower 100 irrespective of the fact whether he has opted for pension or not, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty after office orders of the permission. His salary be met out the Budget Head 'General Administration-Sub Head-Temporary Establishment/ Contractual Services/Outsourcing'.

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed the following persons as Part-time Assistant Professor, P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours per week) for the session 2018-19, w.e.f. the date they start work for the session:-

1. Dr. Chander Shekhar Marwaha
2. Ms. Kanya Rani

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

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor has granted permission to Professor Nishtha Jaswal, Department of Law, P.U. Chandigarh to proceed on deputation w.e.f. 20.11.2018 (A.N.) till 31.01.2019 (i.e. date of her superannuation of 60 years) to join as Vice-Chancellor of H.P. National Law University, Shimla.

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has given the Current Duty Charge (C.D.C.) of the vacant post of Sub Divisional Engineer (S.D.E.) to Shri Rajpal Singh, Assistant Engineer (Civil), Construction Office, P.U. without any financial benefits, subject to the condition that the C.D.C. will automatically be treated as withdrawn as and when the vacant post of S.D.E. is filled-in, on regular basis in the Construction office.

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

(v) In accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. Neera Garg, Professor, Department of Botany, Panjab University on contract basis up to 12.11.2023 (i.e. the date of her attaining age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date she joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulation of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

NOTE: 1. Academically Active Report should be submitted by her after completion of every year of re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at

page 132 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2016 will be applicable.

2. The Senate decision dated 29.03.2015, item-8 (C-20) circulated vide No. 3947-4027/Estt.I dated 11.05.2015 is also applicable in the case of re-employment.
3. Rule 3.1 appearing at page 132 of P.U. Calendar, Vol. III, 2016 reads as under:

“The re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.

4. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Manisha Kaushal, Assistant Professor (Temporary CSE), University Institute of Engineering & Technology, w.e.f. 30.11.2018 (A.N.), under Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

NOTE: 1. Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, reads as under:

“The service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

2. Dr. Manisha Kaushal vide her request dated 31.10.2018 (**Appendix-XIII**) had written that she had been selected at Thapar Institute of Engineering & Technology, Mohali and also requested to accept her request as one month notice prior resignation.
3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XIII**).

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of following doctors as ‘Full-Time Medical Officer’ purely on temporary basis in B.G.J. Institute of Health, P.U. on fixed salary of 45,000/- p.m. initially for period of 89 days as per the recommendations of the Administrative Committee of B.G.J. Institute of Health dated 03.10.2018 (**Appendix-XIV**) and further extension be granted on their satisfactory service, with

the term & conditions notified vide advertisement No. 01/2018 dated 11.05.2018 (**Appendix-XIV**):

1. Dr. Kanwal Vilku
2. Dr. Brij Bihari Lala

- NOTE:**
1. Detail of the above Doctors is enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).
 2. Copy of the order dated 5.11.2018 is enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).
 3. A copy of office note dated 24.10.2018 is also enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

(viii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the revised Academic Calendar **as per Annexure-A & B (Appendix-XV)** for B.Ed./B.Ed. Yoga/B.Ed. (MR and LD) (Semester System) run by the Colleges of education affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh and M.Ed. (General) running in the Department of Education and Colleges of Education of Panjab University, Chandigarh for the session 2018-2019.

- NOTE:**
1. A copy of circular No. Misc./A-1/14845-15045 dated 04.06.2018 vide which the Academic Calendar was initially notified is enclosed (**Appendix-XV**).
 2. A copy of the circular No. Misc./A-1/18664-18864 dated 05.10.2018 is enclosed (**Appendix-XV**).
 3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XV**).

(ix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the recommendations of the Research Board in Business Management and Commerce dated 11.07.2018 and 25.09.2018 (**Appendix-**), to start Ph.D. Research Centre in Sectoral Areas at UIAMS, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for the session 2018-2019 with the following stipulations that:

- A.**
- a) There will be total of 10 seats for Ph.D. at UIAMS in the following sectoral areas.

i)	Banking & Insurance	:	03 Seats
ii)	Retail Management	:	02 Seats
iii)	Information Systems	:	02 Seats
	Infrastructural Management	:	02 Seats
iv)	For teachers (in any sectoral area)	:	01 Seat
 - b) For admission to Ph.D. at UIAMS in the session 2018-19, the UIAMS will consider the following candidates for admission to Ph.D. course work:
 - a) JRF/UGC NET qualified candidates/ teachers in PU or affiliated colleges, who have applied for admission in Ph.D. at UBS.
 - b) Candidates, who have cleared entrance test conducted by the University for admitting students in Ph.D. at UBS.

- c) After the admission process at UBS, the remaining candidates from above two lists of candidates shall be supplied by the Chairman UBS to Chairperson UIAMS.
- c) Admission for the session 2018-19 shall be made by the sub-committee to be constituted by the present research board out of the list of candidates supplied by the UBS to UIAMS.
- d) The same regulations for Ph.D. as applicable to UBS students shall be applicable to UIAMS students for the session 2018-19 only. In the next year, UIAMS will frame their separate regulations to be approved from appropriate bodies of Panjab University.

B. The Research Board in Business Management and Commerce dated 25.09.2018 discussed the modalities of Ph.D. admission in UIAMS, Panjab University, Chandigarh and resolved that:

1. Chairperson, University Business School to prepare the combined waiting list of all the candidates, who have completed the process for admission to Ph.D. program at University Business School in the areas of Accounting & Finance, Marketing, Human Resource Management and Strategic Management. The combined merit list be sent to the Dean for onward submission to Chairperson, UIAMS for admission in the Ph.D. programme strictly in the order of merit.
2. UIAMS shall display merit list of the candidates along with schedule of counselling on the notice board of UIAMS and also on the e-Notice Board of UIAMS/P.U.
3. The UIAMS shall call 25 top candidates from the Merit List for counselling and shall ensure that all 25 top candidates are informed by speed-post and e-mail about the date and time of Counselling along with the required documents/testimonial/ demand draft/NOC, if required with a clear-cut notice of at least 10-working days.
4. The Board authorized the following sub-committee to admit students in Ph.D. Course work at UIAMS on behalf of the Research Board:
 - a. Prof. Karamjeet Singh, Dean
 - b. Prof. Sanjay Kaushik
 - c. Prof. Sanjeev Sharma
 - d. Prof. Upasana Sethi
5. The admission to Ph.D. in different streams at UIAMS shall be as per the following procedure:

- a. Physical presence of the candidate is a must at the time of counselling.
 - b. On the day of Counselling, the candidate shall be given a choice to opt for any stream on the basis of her/his merit and after due verification of the documents, seats will be allocated to him.
 - c. Candidates have to deposit the requisite fee immediately at the time of counselling, otherwise seat shall be offered to the next candidate on the Merit List.
6. The counselling for admitting student in Ph.D. Course work shall be held at UIAMS on the date as decided by the Chairperson, UIAMS in consultation with the Dean, Faculty of Business Management and Commerce.

- NOTE:**
1. A copy of circular No.13906/GM dated 01.11.2018 is enclosed **(Appendix-XVI)**.
 2. An office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XVI)**.

(x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the following recommendations of the Research Board in Business Management and Commerce dated 13.04.2018 **(Appendix-XVII)** that:

1. Research Centre in commerce be allocated to GGSDS College, Sec- 32, Chandigarh.
2. Four seats in the area of commerce (One each in area of Accounting & Finance, Human Resource Management, Marketing Management and Strategic Management) be allotted to GGSDS College for Ph.D. students at the college.
3. To start with: admission, course work classes, examination and evaluation of these four students will be conducted by University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh. After successful completion of the course work and comprehensive viva-voce examination, these earmarked students will be allowed to choose supervisor from GGSDS College, Sector-32, Chandigarh and these students will conduct their doctoral research in the College Campus. Each student shall have one advisory committee consisting of two subject experts from university and the supervisor of the candidate.
4. The college is required to subscribe International and national reputed Journals worth Rs. 50,000/- per year.
5. The admission of four students specifically allocated to GGSDS College Sector- 32, Chandigarh shall be made by UBS alongwith the students admitted for Ph.D. in UBS.

6. The Ph.D. Course work classes for the four students allocated to GGSDS College, Sector-32, Chandigarh, shall be conducted in UBS for one year only and this arrangement will be reviewed next year. However, in future if any other college is also approved as Research Centre in Commerce and the total number of seats in Ph.D. in Commerce in college(s) in Chandigarh become more than 10 (Ten); then the Ph.D. Course work Classes shall be held at GGSDS College, Sector 32, Chandigarh.

NOTE: 1. A copy of circular No.14932-14038/GM dated 01.11.2018 is enclosed **(Appendix-XVII)**.

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

(xi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan, Sector-14 Panjab University, Chandigarh as Polling Both, for By-Election for one seat of Senate, including schedule **(Appendix-XVIII)**, from the Constituency of Heads of Affiliated Arts Colleges, to be held on 22.04.2019, for the remaining term of the Senate i.e. up to 31.10.2020.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 14.10.2018 (Para 8) has resolved that:

- (i) by-election, for one seat of Senate, from the Constituency of Heads of Affiliated Arts Colleges, fallen vacant on the demise of Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Principal, Govind National College, Narangwal, Ludhiana on 05.09.2018, be conducted for the remaining term of the Senate i.e. upto 31.10.2020.
- (ii) The Registrar is appointed as the Returning Officer for the purpose, under Regulation 10.1 of Panjab University Calendar Vol.-I, 2007.

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

(xii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the request dated 09.10.2018 **(Appendix-XIX)** of Ms. Anuradha Makhija, Deputy Registrar, UIET, P.U., for voluntary retirement w.e.f. 08.01.2019 (A.N) from the University service and has sanctioned the following retirement benefits:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016.

NOTE: 1. As per Regulation 17.5 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume 1, 2007, three month's notice period is required for

voluntary/premature retirement and she fulfils the said requirement.

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

Referring **Sub-Item R-(i)** relating to re-employment of Dr. Naresh Kumar Tejpal, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that normally there is a tradition in the University that re-employment is not given to the non-teaching staff. If at all such a re-employment is given, there would be resentment among the other employees. However, re-employment is given in extreme situation and that also on the recommendation of the Chairperson. He asked if any such recommendation has been received in his case.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has been told that without him, the Central Animal House would not function and it would become dead.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has been told that Dr. Naresh Kumar Tejpal is of no use for the Animal House. Though, he personally did not know anything about him, this could be done only if there is some recommendation from the In-charge of the Animal House.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that there is a statutory requirement for Central Animal House for the service of such a person, so they need his services. They have informed that they have written to the MHRD for appointing a person in his place immediately.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the item has come in such a way that in the first place they have written that the post be filled on contract basis for 89 days and in brackets it is written 'till the permission to fill the post from MHRD'. It gives the impression that if the permission is not received from MHRD, would they allow him to continue till death. He, therefore, said that if they have to approve it, they should approve it only for 3-4 month and after that he should not be allowed to continue. It might not happen that he would make it a basis for his further re-employment.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they have done it earlier in the case of a doctor in the Bhai Ghanaya Ji Health Centre.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is provision for extension in that case.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that though there is no provision, but he does not say that it should not be done at all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that does it mean that the Central Animal House could not work without this Veterinary Officer? He enquired as to when he got retired?

It was informed (by the Registrar) that he might have retired a month ago and he was appointed there after a gap of some days.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to how the Animal House was running during those days?

The Vice Chancellor said that he might be coming during those days also as is being done in the case of teachers whose appointment is approved later on.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it cannot happen that the Animal House cannot run without him. Does it mean that his retirement would be stopped on this account?

On a point raised by Shri Ashok Goyal that there is no provision of extension/re-employment in the Central Animal House as is prevalent in the Health Centre, Dr. Amit Joshi said that they should then make a provision for the Animal House also.

Shri Ashok Goyal informed that in the University, such things had been happening that the age of retirement of a certain class was enhanced to 65 years even without the knowledge of the Vice Chancellor and Syndicate, for which they were not empowered. They have been doing it and the Vice Chancellor has been bringing it in good faith. The mistake happening two/three times, now the people started saying that if it could be done for two/three times, why it could not be done now. The extensions for Drivers is also being given, they are being appointed on contract and also re-employed. Unfortunately, if some mishaps occurred, then it would be asked who has appointed them. There are some drivers who have given in writing that they have low vision and unable to drive car at night, but they are also giving him extension. No medical examination is done in such cases. He requested that the mandatory conditions about which they are mentioning, those should be shown to them so they can decide the things in a proper way.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that at this time, they might not approve it and it should be brought back again to the Syndicate with all the details. At that time after looking into the case, they could approve his salary from the date he has been working.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee consisting of Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Amit Joshi would be constituted to re-examine the case and the same would be placed before the Syndicate again.

Referring to **Sub-Item R-(ii)** relating to reappointment of Dr. Chander Shekhar Marwaha and Ms. Kanya Rani as Part-time Assistant Professors at P.U. SS Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Shri Prabhjit Singh asked that there is time-table attached with the item.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that these teachers would teach the classes 12 hour per week and the honorarium of Rs. 22800/- per month fixed is on the higher side.

After some discussion among themselves, the members were of the unanimous view that the information contained in Item **R-(ii)** should be ratified.

RESOLVED : That –

- (i) the information contained in **Item R-(ii) to R-(xii)**, be ratified.
- (ii) as regards **Item R-(i)**, a Committee consisting of Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Amit Joshi would be constituted to re-examine the case and the same would be placed before the Syndicate again.

17. Information contained in **Items I-(i) to I-(ii)** was read out and noted, i.e. –

(i) In pursuance of orders dated 17.10.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 26730 of 2018 (Dr. Alok Srivastava Vs Panjab University & Ors.) tagged with LPA 1505 of 2016, wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) was fixed for hearing on 12.11.2018, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (a) Dr. Alok Srivastava, Professor, Department of Chemistry, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.12.2018 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No. 26730 of 2018 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing on attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (b) he be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to him by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Ms. Saroj Bala Stenographer Department of Life Long Learning & Extension	10.06.1981	31.12.2018	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Dr. Naresh Kumar Tejpal Veterinary Officer Central Animal House	12.06.1990	31.10.2018	} Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
3.	Shri Sukhdev Singh Superintendent General Branch	25.11.1988	31.12.2018	

4.	Shri Amrik Singh Work Inspector (Designated as Charge man Grade-I) P.U. Construction Office	12.10.1985	30.11.2018	} Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
5.	Shri Bishamber Datt Senior Assistant Accounts-II (Fee Checking)	23.06.1983	31.12.2018	
6.	Ms. Santosh Kumari Peon D.S.W. Office	20.09.1985	30.11.2018	
7.	Shri Dharam Paul Cleaner Department of Laws	03.02.1977	31.12.2018	

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

General Discussion

1. Dr. Amit Joshi and Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said the Vice Chancellor did not invite their Principal for an informal meeting. The Vice Chancellor might not have done it intentionally, but it might have happened by default, to which the Vice Chancellor said that he used to meet the Principals by inviting them in groups. The Vice Chancellor asked the Dean, College Development Council, to arrange his meeting with 3-4 local Principals, including the Principal of SGGGS College, Sector 26, Chandigarh.
2. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu stated that when the issue of extension of age of retirement for Principal to 65 years was approved by the Syndicate, he had given his dissent. An interview for the post of Principal is being held in GGSDS College, Sector-32, Chandigarh, on 14th of this month. A panel has been given by the University. But the issue is that a letter has been issued that there would not be any recruitment in Chandigarh and Punjab Colleges. So the Director Higher Education (DHE), Chandigarh and D.P.I., Punjab are not giving any panel of experts for appointment of Principal. But the DHE office has not got any letter from the GGSDS College asking for panel for appointment of Principal. Two of their Fellows, i.e., Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta and Dr. K.K. Sharma are candidates for the post of Principal and both of them have talked to him. He requested that there should not be such an issue from which it should look that re-employment is to be given to someone else. If someone is not found suitable, that is a different thing. He further requested to look into the issue of DHE. It may not create problem for grant. The things should not be taken as granted for re-employment.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that as regards the issue of non-supply of panel, the letter issued by the Central Government has been issued in general, in reference to the roster system. There is need to see as to why the panels have been stopped. He clarified that the panels were stopped in view of the judgement of the Supreme Court with regard to reservation and the MHRD has done something else. The reservation policy does not apply on the Principal being a single cadre post in the Colleges, so it is wrong to stop the panel.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that as per the information provided to him by the President, Punjab & Chandigarh College Teachers Union, the DHE

office has not received any request from the College to provide panel. Both the Fellows are apprehending that since the outcome of the interview is already fixed, should they go to attend the interview? He requested to look into this matter so that such a question might not be raised in the Senate.

It was clarified that the letter sent by the government with regard to reservation, was for the Universities. They have also written to the MHRD that they are following these guidelines in letter and spirit. It is the duty of a University to provide panel and they have confirmed it from Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and some other Universities. The said letter was received in the month of July 2018 and the panels are being supplied since then, not only for the Principals but for appointment of teachers in the Colleges also, for which the University has also given its approval. So, to his mind, there is no issue in it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested the Registrar to once talk to the DHE to which the Registrar informed that he has already talked to him.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that he is not saying to talk to the DHE. The issue of giving the panel by the Dean, College Development Council, is alright. But what he would like to say is that two Fellows are appearing in this interview. All the Fellows who are from the Teachers' Constituency were against the re-employment of Principals up to the age of 65 years. He reiterated that they are apprehending that the appointment of Principal is already fixed, so it should be taken care of. This is the message which he would like to convey.

At this stage, Shri Prabhjit Singh again raised the issue of appointment of Principal at GGSD College, Sector-32, Chandigarh. He said it should not look as if they are pressurizing the Management of the College. The University has to give the panel, which it did. Now, it is for the management to see as to who is to be appointed and the University should not interfere in this matter. It is the prerogative of the Management and if they started interfering in this matter, the issue would become biased.

The Vice Chancellor said that though he is aware of the rules about reservation for the post of Principal, but he is not very much confirmed about the fact that whether the College Principals do come under the ambit of reservation.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that since it is a single post, there cannot be reservation.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was given to understand that the reservation could be implemented for the post of Principal in the Colleges situated in Punjab as per the total number of Principals.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it could be there in Government as well as in Grant-in-aid Colleges.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they are talking about the private Colleges and not of Government Colleges. How it could be implemented in the private Colleges as the post of Principal is a single cadre post.

3. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that he is raising the issue of paternity leave for the fifth time today in the zero hour. The Colleges Branch had to issue a letter regarding paternity leave to the affiliated Colleges. He does not know why the Colleges Branch is not taking any action and they did not even send the file to the new Dean, College Development Council, so far.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Dean, College Development Council, as to why this is not being done to which he (DCDC) informed that the file was put up to him and he has sent the file to form a Committee which would look into it. In the Syndicate Para, it was not written that it should be done; rather, it was written to take it to a Committee.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that it has already been implemented in the University and on that basis, he has requested to issue a letter to the Colleges also.

It was said (by the DCDC) that if the Committee recommends to issue the letter on the basis of the University, they will do it.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to bring a proposal in this regard within a week so that it could be placed before the Syndicate.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu reiterated that grant of paternity leave has already been implemented in the University and on the basis of that they are required to issue letter to the Colleges. He, therefore, requested the Vice Chancellor to get it done before the meeting of the Senate, i.e., 15th of December, 2018 so that information could be given to the Senate that the said letter has been issued.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the paternity leave is granted as per the Government of India rules to which Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu replied in affirmative.

Dr. Ameer Sultana informed that fifteen days paternity leave is already being granted in the University.

The Vice Chancellor also said that as per the government rules, fifteen days paternity leave is granted.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, is it written somewhere whether this would also be applicable to Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said, that is why, he is saying that they would make the proposal within a week and place it before the Syndicate.

Dr. Amit Joshi and Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that these are the guidelines of UGC. Dr. Amit Joshi said that Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu should be included in that Committee about which the Dean, College Development Council, has made a mention. If this is permissible as per the UGC guidelines, the Committee would see to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if there is any letter from the UGC in this regard, then it has to be done according to that letter, but if some new decision is to be taken by the University, then they have to consider the issue separately. If there are government guidelines, then they have to see the leave rules of the University and Colleges because the leave rules for University and Colleges are different. They could not say if some leave rules are applicable in the University, the same would be applicable to the Colleges also.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu requested that he should be included in that Committee so that he could place the relevant papers before the Committee.

This was agreed to.

4. Professor Ronki Ram raised the issue of staff for three Research Journals, which were merged. Earlier, there used to be two officials and one Peon in each Research Journal. After merger of Journals, the issue of staff was also resolved by a Committee, but the recommendations of the Committee have not been implemented. He said that all other issues have been solved, but the issue of staff is still stuck up at the implementation stage. He requested that one Multi-task person should be provided.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the multi-task person would be provided to them immediately and instructed the Registrar to do the needful.

Continuing, Professor Ronki Ram pleaded that the RSA material should also be given to them at the earliest.

At this stage, some discussion took place regarding the appointment of Principal at SD. College. The same has been made a part of the discussion at point number 2 above.

5. The Vice Chancellor said that this perhaps is the last meeting of the present Syndicate and he would wish that this whole Syndicate come again. He has been able to develop a good compatibility with them during the last 3-4 months. This Syndicate has proved to be very good for him because during the last 4 months, he could be able to do a lot. Though he has wished the present Syndicate to repeat again, they have to work according to the rules, which is must. The Vice Chancellor said that he would like to convey his thanks to the Syndicate members for extending their cooperation, help and giving inputs from time to time, not only on the floor of the House, but beyond the floor. He further said that a thanks letter would be sent to all the members of the Syndicate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that during the last 3-4 meetings of the Syndicate, he has observed that nobody has got his dissent recorded. He (Vice Chancellor) has managed the things in a very decent manner.

The members also thanked the Vice Chancellor for conducting the meetings of the Syndicate smoothly and assured that they would continue their support in future also, even if they do not become the members of the Syndicate next time.

Karamjeet Singh
Registrar

Confirmed

RAJ KUMAR
VICE-CHANCELLOR