

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the special meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Wednesday, 10th January 2018 at 3.30 p.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover ... (in the Chair)
Vice Chancellor
2. Dr. Ameer Sultana
3. Dr. Amit Joshi
4. Professor Anita Kaushal
5. Shri Ashok Goyal
6. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
7. Professor Keshav Malhotra
8. Professor Navdeep Goyal
9. Shri Prabhjit Singh
10. Professor Ronki Ram
11. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
12. Dr. Satish Kumar
13. Col. (Retd.) G.S. Chadha ... (Secretary)
Registrar

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, Shri Harjit Singh, DPI (Colleges), Punjab, Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh, Shri Sanjay Tandon, Dr. Subhash Sharma and Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha could not attend the meeting.

Condolence resolution

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

- i) Prof. R.S. Loyal, Department of Geology, PU, today morning at 7.00 a.m., i.e., 10th January, 2018, while he was with the students on a tour to Rajasthan.
- ii) Prof. Savita Dhir, formerly of the English Department at University School of Open Learning passed away on 6th January 2018,
- iii) Prof. K.K. Bhutani, former Director, NIPER, SAS Nagar (Mohali), a very distinguished alumnus of PU and founder member of CRIKC and one of the first students of Professor Harkishan Singh of UIPS, passed away on 6th January, 2018,
- iv) Prof. Baldev Raj, Director of the National Institute of Advanced Studies, Bengaluru and Chairman of Centre for Policy Research (CPR), a DST project commenced three years ago, Govt. of India, on 6th January, 2018. One of the CPRs with a focus on Industry-Academia cooperation is located at Panjab University, Chandigarh,. He has visited the campus on several occasions in the last three years.

- v) Shri Amolakh Josan, elder brother of Principal B.C. Josan, Fellow, PU and Principal, DAV College, Sector-10, passed away on 9th January, 2018,
- vi) Smt. Pushpa Khullar, revered mother of Dr. Rakesh Khullar, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, PU, she passed on 7th January, 2018.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Prof. R.S. Loyal, Prof. Savita Dhir, Prof. K.K. Bhutani, Prof. Baldev Raj, Shri Amolakh Josan, Smt. Pushpa Khullar 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 warmly welcome all the distinguished members to this first meeting of the present Syndicate. I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that –

- i) Prof. Dharendra Pal Singh, Director, National Assessment and Accreditation Council, has been appointed Chairperson of University Grants Commission by the Government of India, for a period five years.
- ii) Prof. R.C. Sobti, Vice Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow and former Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh, has been honoured with INSA Senior Scientist position from January 2018. The position carries an honorarium of Rs.30,000/- p.m.(Thirty Thousand per month) and contingency of Rs. 1,00,000/- per annum. The term of the position is for a period 3 years initially and extendable for another 2 more years after evaluating the consolidated report of the previous 3 years. He returns to PU Campus after he completes his term as Vice Chancellor at Lucknow on January 20, 2018.
- iii) Prof. Rumina Sethi, Department of English and Cultural Studies, has been nominated as a member of General Council of the Sahitya Akademi (National Academy of Letters), New Delhi, for a period five years w.e.f. January 2018.
- iv) Dr. Vandita Kakkar, Assistant Professor in University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU, has received the Biotechnology Ignition Grant (BIG) amounting to Rs.50 lakh by the Biotechnology Industry Research Assistance Council (BIRAC) for her work on Pediatric Dermatitis.
- v) Dr. Rohit Kumar Sharma, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, has been nominated as a member of the Indian National Young Academy of Sciences (IN-YAS) under the aegis of INSA, for five years w.e.f. January 2018. He is the first young

scientist to be inducted in INYAS from PU. He has also received a research grant of Rs.63 lakhs from Science & Engineering Research Board (SERB) for a project in collaboration with CSIR-IMTECH, Chandigarh.

- vi) Dr. S.K. Upadhyay, Department of Botany, has been invited by the National Academy of Agricultural Sciences to join Academy (NAAS) as Associate from 1st January, 2018. His Ph.D. student Ms Shivi Tyagi has also been honoured with the NASI –Springer Award in Biological Sciences for presenting the paper in the Symposium held at Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune in December, 2017.
- vii) Dr. Purva Mishra, Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration of U.S.O.L., PU, has been honoured with Empowered Women Award for her services in the field of education, by the Pratima Raksha Samman Samiti on the birth anniversary of Savitri Bai Phule.
- viii) PU Hindi Department has launched a joint student-exchange forum with Pennsylvania State University (Penn State) at University Park.
- ix) Padma Shri S. Balbir Singh Senior, PU Alumnus and recipient of PU Khel Rattan award inaugurated Panjab University Hockey Astro Turf in the presence of another alumnus Padma Shri S. Pargat Singh, MLA in Punjab, on 28th December, 2017 on the day of inauguration of Inter University tournament at Panjab University.
- x) Shri Jitender Yadav, Commissioner, MC Chandigarh-cum-Director, Swachh Bharat Mission, Chandigarh, launched the Swachhata-MoHUA (Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs) App during the seven days NSS Camp at Panjab University, Chandigarh. It is a complaint redressal platform with the opportunity for citizens to post civic-related issues (e.g., a garbage dump).

RESOLVED: That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to–
 - (i) Prof. Dharendra Pal Singh, Director, National Assessment and Accreditation Council, on his being appointed Chairperson of University Grants Commission by the Government of India, for a period five years.
 - (ii) Prof. R.C. Sobti, Vice Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow and former Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on his being honoured with INSA Senior Scientist

position from January 2018 for a period of three years.

- (iii) Prof. Rumina Sethi, Department of English and Cultural Studies, on her being nominated as a member of General Council of the Sahitya Akademi (National Academy of Letters), New Delhi for a period five years w.e.f. January 2018.
 - (iv) Dr. Vandita Kakkar, Assistant Professor in University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU, on her receiving the Biotechnology Ignition Grant (BIG) by the Biotechnology Industry Research Assistance Council (BIRAC) for her work on Pediatric Dermatitis.
 - (v) Dr. Rohit Kumar Sharma, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, on his being nominated as a member of the Indian National Young Academy of Sciences (IN-YAS) and also receiving a research grant of Rs.63 lakhs from Science & Engineering Research Board (SERB) for a project in collaboration with CSIR-IMTECH, Chandigarh.
 - (vi) Dr. S.K. Upadhyay, Department of Botany on his being invited by the National Academy of Agricultural Sciences to join Academy (NAAS) as Associate from 1st January, 2018 and to his Ph.D. student Ms Shivi Tyagi who has also been honoured with the NASI –Springer Award in Biological Sciences for presenting the paper in the Symposium held at Savitribai Phule Pune University.
 - (vii) Dr. Purva Mishra, Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration of U.S.O.L., PU, on her being honoured with Empowered Women Award for her services in the field of education, by the Pratima Raksha Samman Samiti.
- (2) the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No.(viii), (ix) and (x), be noted.

After giving the background of the case, the Vice-Chancellor abstained himself from the meeting. Shri Prabhjit Singh proposed the name of Dr. Satish Kumar to chair the meeting which was seconded by Dr. Ameer Sultana and a few other members. Accordingly, Dr. Satish Kumar chaired the meeting for this item.

Letter dated 05.01.2018 received from Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, Former Chief Secretary, Haryana and Chairperson of the Committee constituted to look into the specific complaint(s) of a Senate member against Vice-Chancellor

2. Considered letter dated 05.01.2018 (**Appendix-I**) received from Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, Former Chief Secretary, Haryana and Chairperson of the Committee constituted to look into the specific complaint(s) of a Senate member against Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 vide Para 6 (**Appendix-I**) recommended to the Senate a specific internal Committee to enquire into the allegations made by a Senate member against Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University.
 2. The Senate in its meeting dated 29.01.2017 (Para II) (**Appendix-I**) considered the recommendations of the Syndicate and decided to forward the same to the Chancellor for final decision in his capacity as the employer of the Vice-Chancellor.
 3. The Under Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource and Development, Department of Higher Education, New Delhi vide letter dated 13.12.2017 (**Appendix-I**) had requested the Registrar to go ahead with the newly constituted internal Committee to inquire to sexual harassment cases as recommended by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017.
 4. Accordingly, Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, the Chairperson of the new Committee was requested to proceed with the enquiry vide letter dated 27.12.2017 (**Appendix-I**).
 5. In response to the above directive, Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, has made certain observations regarding the constitution of the Committee headed by her. She has advised to re-constitute the said committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that before they take up the agenda, he wished to just read few notes as a preamble which was distributed among the members.

1. An incident happened on 15-4-2015. A complaint from a sitting Syndicate member alleging harassment at workplace against the Vice Chancellor, PU was received. DUI was consulted. The complaint was marked to a Standing Committee of PU and, also, referred to PUCASH (Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment).

2. The Standing Committee submitted a report within few days and which was forwarded to the Syndicate meeting on 20-4-2015 as an information item.
3. The complainant expressed lack of faith in PUCASH carrying out any enquiry. It was also contended by the complainant to the PUCASH that no directions had been given to VC to refer the matter to PUCASH. The PUCASH had opined that the complainant had not used the phrase Sexual Harassment in her complaint instead complainant had used the words misbehavior or harassment at work place for women employees.
4. The complainant approached the National Commission for Women (NCW) and the higher functionaries in Govt. of India in New Delhi and Chandigarh.
5. A complaint was also submitted by the complainant to the UT Police on 28-5-2015 alleging Sexual Harassment by the Vice Chancellor, PU on 31-3-2013 in a Hostel function at P.U. Campus.
6. A complaint alleging Sexual Harassment and criminal intimidation by the Vice Chancellor, PU was also filed by the complainant before the Union Minister of Human Resource & Development on 15-6-2015 in New Delhi, who in turn referred it to the UGC. UGC was also asked to carry out fact finding.
7. The Vice Chancellor, PU was called at the UGC office and asked to respond to a detailed input filed by the complainant before UGC on 19-6-2015 regarding the Sexual Harassment during a function held in Girls Hostel No.2 on 31-3-2013. The Vice Chancellor filed a detailed reply to the UGC Fact Finding Committee in July, 2015 itself.
8. UT Police sought a report on the complaints filed before them from P.U. authority. A report from PU was filed on 3-7-2015, which included an input made available by the Warden of Girls Hostel No.2, where the function had been held on 31-3-2013.
9. MHRD forwarded all the documents submitted by the complainant to the Registrar, PU to get an inquiry conducted by PUCASH. The letter arrived on 24 June, 2015.
10. The complainant raised some doubts about the constitution of the then PUCASH. PUCASH Chaired by Prof. Nishtha Jaswal, was, therefore, reconstituted to make it consonant with the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition & Redressal) Act-2013. They had a policy in the University and there was procedure by that policy, that procedure had some lacuna, that lacuna had to be repaired. That was pointed out by the complainant

so in response to an input given by the complainant, the new PUCASH had to be constituted.

11. The Registrar received a communication from Chancellor's office dated January 20, 2016 stating that 'PU Senate under the PU Act, has the statutory authority to constitute any committee, including the PUCASH, in accordance with the provisions of the applicable statute, to enquire into allegations of sexual harassment against Vice Chancellor and to receive such an enquiry report from committees constituted by it and it directed the Governing bodies of PU to kindly act accordingly for taking required action in this regard.
12. A National Commission for Women (NCW) member visited the Panjab University and interfaced with the Vice Chancellor.
13. NCW later convened a meeting on 22-12-2016 in New Delhi, in which Registrar, PU and the MHRD officials were called in.
14. The National Commission for Women, concluded that MHRD should look into the matter as per provisions of the Act enacted in 2013 and DOPT guidelines thereto. It asked for submission of report on the pending complaint within 30 days from 22-12-2016.
15. The MHRD issued a directive on 9-1-2017 that a new Internal Committee should be formed to take up the specific complaint. The New Committee was to be chaired by an External Member.
16. In the meanwhile, letters dated 6-10-2016 and 16-12-2016 were received by Registrar, Panjab University from the UT Administration which asked for a report from Internal Committee of PU to be filed with UT Administration within 15 days. UT Administration had desired to carry out investigation on it, if PU were not to submit the report of Internal Committee within the stipulated time.
17. The directives of MHRD and letters from the UT Police were placed before Syndicate Meeting of 21-1-2017 as an Agenda Item No.6. The Syndicate constituted an Internal Committee to be chaired by Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, Chief Secretary (Retd.) from the Haryana Government and it recommended the inclusion of one nominee of UT Administration in the New Internal Committee because the UT also wanted to participate in this. Syndicate also recommended the convening of a special Senate Meeting on 29-1-2017 to consider its recommendations in the Senate.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor read out Point No 19.

19. The recommendations of the Senate, along with the entire discussion of the meeting held on 29-1-2017, were sent to the Chancellor, Panjab University.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor read out Point No. 18.

18. In the meanwhile Chancellor office conveyed to MHRD vide their letter dated May 4, 2017, that the existing PUCASH is fully empowered to take up the enquiry into this particular allegation. Creating another committee with the same mandate would be a duplication. It was added that such a communication was being sent to MHRD with the approval of the Hon'ble Vice President/ Chancellor, Panjab University.
20. Further the office of the Chancellor (with the approval of Chancellor) sent a communication to the Joint Secretary, MHRD on 14-6-2017, stating that the existing PUCASH chaired by Prof. Nishtha Jaswal could be asked to conduct the inquiry into the complaints of a Senator against the Vice Chancellor. MHRD had clarified on 9-1-2017 that Employer of the Vice Chancellor is the Chancellor. A copy of this communication was received by the Registrar, PU on 18-1-2017.
21. The input from the Chancellor's office to Joint Secretary, MHRD was forwarded by Registrar, PU to Prof. Nishtha Jaswal. In response to this, Prof. Nishtha Jaswal sought further clarifications from MHRD in view of the Chancellor's letter of 14-6-2017. Prof. Nishtha Jaswal did not proceed with any inquiry until she was responded to. Registrar, PU wrote a communication to MHRD on 14-8-2017 informing them of the view point of Prof. Nishtha Jaswal. Another communication was sent to National Commission for Women on 17-8-2017 seeking opinion whether the then existing PUCASH chaired by Prof. Nishtha Jaswal was competent to proceed with the inquiry.
22. Syndicate was informed of all the developments on 20-8-2017. Syndicate directed that another communication be sent to MHRD stating that the matter was getting delayed. Registrar wrote another letter to MHRD on 21-8-2017.
23. The term of Prof. Nishtha Jaswal committee concluded on 30-9-2017 and a new PUCASH chaired by Prof. (Mrs.) Manvinder Kaur came into being from 1-10-2017.
24. The Registrar received a communication dated 13-12-2017 from MHRD on 19-12-2017 which states that the given case is a peculiar case. MHRD had consulted

DOPT, which is an office attached to the Prime Minister's Office who had opined that instead of PUCASH, an independent committee ought to inquire into it. MHRD therefore, directed that the committee recommended by the Syndicate on 21-1-2017 should inquire into the case and submit its report as per the Sexual Harassment Act-2013.

25. The Registrar sent a communication on 27-12-2017 to Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary and all the members of the committee to recommend it on 21-1-2017. A reply from Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary was received on 5-1-2018 which was forwarded to them with the agenda papers.
26. Matter now stands referred to the Syndicate today and the Syndicate today needs to consider the reconstitution of the committee in the light of what Ms. Meenaxi Ji has said, by asking one of the Syndicate members to preside over the Syndicate Meeting, as the VC would recuse himself from further deliberations. The previous Syndicate on 21-1-2017 had asked Prof. Jarnail Singh to preside over the meeting. The new Presiding Officer of the reconstituted Internal Committee ought to be a 'Serving Member' if one has to go what Ms. Meenaxi Ji has written, serving member in an organization outside the PU system, instead of a Retired Officer, as it happened in the case of Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary.

The Vice-Chancellor said that she has also pointed out some other things. So the matter is before them to deliberate on it. If the members want to seek any clarifications from him, he is available for next few minutes.

Shri Ashok Goyal said he wants to know for his own knowledge as to under what provision the special meeting of the Syndicate has been convened and as to under whose instructions such a special meeting has been convened. It would have been better, had it been mentioned in the notice itself that as per regulation or this provision of the statute, special meeting of the Syndicate is being convened. Only after enlightened about this aspect, he would like to have further queries.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has the responsibility as Chief Executive of the University and Syndicate as the Government of the University has to carry out everything of the University on behalf of the Senate. So, there is a matter which has become a national concern because it is not only being looked at by our University, but by the U.T. Administration, Ministry of Human Resource Development, UGC, DoPT and so on. This thing has no precedent, but it requires deliberation in a time bound manner. Time is running out and everybody wants the matter to be settled. So, he took the initiative of referring the matter to the Syndicate because the matter requires some urgency.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, if there is any provision for convening the special meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the meeting of the Syndicate can be convened, but the word 'special' or not special is merely a technical thing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that every time the Vice Chancellor says, it is a technical thing, but he is asking only technical question. There is a specific provision for convening the special meeting of Senate, he asked if there is any such provision in the Calendar to convene the meeting of the special Syndicate. Because, but he could gather from the agenda which has been circulated, the Registrar has recommended it to the Vice Chancellor that this letter of Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary be referred to the Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor has duly approved it. He would like to comment on this thereafter. The Vice Chancellor has approved it, whereas the Vice Chancellor has nowhere mentioned that a special meeting of the Syndicate be convened. He only has approved the recommendation that this letter be referred to the Syndicate, but subsequently who took the decision on the same day to convene a special meeting of the Syndicate is not known. The only provision which is there in the Calendar that seven days notice has to be sent for any meeting of the Syndicate. However, some other items can also be placed before the Syndicate at a shorter notice. But there is neither any such provision of the special meeting of the Syndicate nor convening the meeting of the Syndicate at a shorter time. This meeting is not only special, which is violation of the regulation, this meeting has been called only at a notice of four days. Now, what he (Vice Chancellor) has said, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is also equally concerned about it. It is very unfortunate that the first meeting of the present Syndicate has been convened in such a circumstance. He takes it that besides this issue, being very sensitive and important, the way the special meeting has been called in the absence of any such provision, he thinks that this has sensationalized the issue, scandalized the issue, there have been objections that they should avoid publishing this case as far as possible so that the provisions of the Sexual Harassment Act are complied with. But, not only that, they in violation of their own Act, have also called a special meeting for which nobody, including the Vice Chancellor or the Chancellor, is entitled to. That is why he wanted to know under which provisions the special meeting of the Syndicate has been called. Secondly, why it is a special meeting, that this meeting of the Syndicate has been called only to discuss one issue and no other issue at par with what is provided for the special meeting of the Senate where there is a special regulation that in the special meeting of the Senate, only the agenda for which the meeting has been called, only that agenda would be discussed. The problem is that the office has advised the Vice Chancellor, or he does not know under what circumstances, it has been assumed that such a special meeting of the Syndicate can also be convened, thereby giving a rule as if the Panjab University Syndicate and Senate has no more important agenda except to discuss this issue only because one of the members of the Senate and the Vice Chancellor are involved in the dispute. He said that he might not be misunderstood. He wondered why this issue could not wait for another week. Of course a meeting of the Syndicate has to take place in the month of January only. A regular meeting of the Syndicate could have also been convened on 6th, the meeting could to be convened on 30th and this agenda would also be included in that. Why to give so much importance only to one particular issue just because it involves two important people related to this University, that is his point.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever he has learnt is by reading things, he had not experienced that himself even though he was a faculty member of this University. There are numerous instances when his predecessors have called meetings at notices shorter than seven days. So, meetings at a notice shorter than the seven days have been convened. So there are precedents and he has followed those precedents. The urgency is that this committee was asked to do its job within 90 days. The Chairperson of the new Committee had accepted the job and then she had convened a meeting and then she cancelled that meeting. As far as the task is concerned, for the Committee the 90 days have already begun. So, since the job has to be accomplished within a stipulated period and to enable the Committee to do the job in the stipulated period, he has to have another Chairman as the current Chairman does not wish to continue. So, how do they get a new Chairman.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thinks that they are going beyond the agenda. The agenda is not at all to appoint a new Chairperson. He requested the Vice Chancellor to read what the agenda says. The agenda does not say to appoint a new Chairperson. Agenda does not say that it is because of 90 days period. He requested to see the agenda. He said that they are telling something else and circulating something else.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that he is not telling something else and circulating something else.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the agenda says to consider the letter. First they have to see whether they to accept the letter or do not accept the letter. He said, he (Vice Chancellor) should not say that they have to reconstitute the Committee or they have to appoint a new Chairperson.

The Vice Chancellor said that as per his understanding he has given them the preamble.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that then the agenda should have been, in view of whatever has been stated by the Chairperson.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) can delete No. 26 that he has sent to him. It is his observation at point No. 26. If somebody has an issue on whether they want to constitute a new committee or they do not want to constitute a new committee, he withdraws No. 26 of his statement.

Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor said that they have the agenda as it is before them. Shri Ashok Goyal tried to say something, but the Vice Chancellor requested to allow him to first finish to which Shri Ashok Goyal said okay. The Vice Chancellor said that in response to the above directives she has made certain observations regarding the constitution of the Committee. He has interpreted it that she has advised to reconstitute the committee. The letter is before them, if they have some other interpretation of those things, he does not want to participate in it. They can decide it, that is why he wants to recuse himself. He has told him and he does not want to answer any more questions.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, can he respond? He is not asking. Probably, he could not express well, he may have misunderstood him. What he (Vice Chancellor) has mentioned in Para 26, it could have been circulated as an agenda item also, in view of the letter received from Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary to reconstitute the Committee. Further, he (Vice Chancellor) is saying that it is his interpretation. He got the answer to his earlier question also which he thought that he (Vice Chancellor) will give that the special meeting has been convened under the instructions and at the instance of the Vice Chancellor keeping in view the urgency of the matter. The answer would have been sufficient. You have already explained that keeping in view the urgency as his predecessors have been convening the meeting at a shorter notice, so he has convened it. The answer could have been sufficient. The only answer which could not be given, of course he wanted to know, that is there any provision in the calendar for convening a special meeting of the Syndicate. The answer is no and he has said that keeping in view the urgency and importance, the meeting has been called, even if there is no provision of the special meeting of the Syndicate, the matter ends. He requested not to misunderstand because it is not going to stop the things here only. He has been pointing it earlier also that the Syndicate has not taken the decision in consonance with the Act. Now a person who has been bestowed with the powers to act as Chairperson of the Committee has written, amongst so many things which were discussed in the Senate also. So, does he think that anybody including the Vice Chancellor or members of the Syndicate or Senate would like to face such an embarrassment in the media again and again. That is the only purpose that he wants to avoid as far as possible, let them try to act as per the statute of the University and also as per the Act under which the enquiry is to be conducted, that is what they want. Probably, he (Vice Chancellor) will be with him on this count that nobody wants embarrassment to anybody.

Professor Ronki Ram said, he thinks that they are looking into this case very critically.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that he has said nothing about the case.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he is also talking on the same basis as he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is saying. He thinks they can find a statement in the notes and it is quite clear that this case is not an ordinary case. This case has its dimensions which have gone much-much beyond.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not want to participate in the discussion that they want to have and requested them to have it in his absence and he wants to recuse himself from the merits and demerits of the case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, that is what he was saying, they are not discussing the case.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not want to get into this even though the complainant has been present herself in all those meetings. He has, in the past also, recused himself from the meetings and he requested to permit him to recuse himself today as well.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, why they are asking all these things because whosoever presides the meeting may not be well conversant with all the facts as he is. So they only wanted the Syndicate to be guided by his expertise and knowledge.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever he could guide them, he has given them as a preamble. It took for him some time to prepare this preamble. He has tried to be as objective and as detailed as he could. He does not want to say anything which again amounts to saying as if he is guiding things in a certain way.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested if he (Vice Chancellor) could instruct the office to give supporting documents in the notes which he has circulated.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would ask the office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said without your instructions, who is going to give him the documents.

The Vice Chancellor said that nothing is there which has not been circulated to all the members in the past.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this has not been circulated with this time.

The Vice Chancellor said that any supporting document, there is some statement which states about some date etc. and they want to have a relook at it, all those things have been submitted to the Senators and the Syndics in the past, so they can ask for any document which is already with them. He does not expect that everything they would remember, but there is no such document mentioned in the notes which has not been placed as a part of the agenda papers of one or the other Senate and Syndicate meetings over the last 2 ½ years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the case is running for the last three years and it for the first time that a copy of the Act has been given to them. Neither in the Syndicate nor in the Senate, it has never been circulated, but this time it has been sent. He is sure that somebody might have requested that they should have the copy of the Act.

The Vice Chancellor said that it came to him also on its own as it must have been provided by the Registrar being the Secretary of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that prior to this, it has never been circulated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is when the PUCASH was formed it was supposed to be as per the Act which is a Government of India Act. The PUCASH policy was as per the Act and that policy was circulated to one and all. It is not that where they do things as per the constitution (of India), every time they should supply a copy of the constitution.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this has been circulated for the first time. It has never been circulated earlier.

The Vice Chancellor said, let him conclude by saying that the office of the PUCASH had been existing. Somebody is to preside over the matters relating to sexual harassment, that office had been there before his arrival as a Vice Chancellor. It was pointed out by the complainant at one stage, long before the complaint happened that their sexual harassment policy practiced in Panjab University was not as per Act. She took initiative, she went to Kurukshetra University and brought several documents. She made them to adopt a policy for sexual harassment cases to be dealt in Panjab University. That document had a provision. something called ACASH i.e. Advisory Committee Against Sexual Harassment. So, they adopted it in the sense indicated. Later on when the complaint happened in which she became a complainant, she said that their policy was not as per the Act, whereas whatever policy they had brought in, it was at her initiative. He was not having knowledge of it, but there was a Senate member who says that if it passes through everything, so they could adopt a policy. Then it turned out that there was some technical flaw that ACASH should not have been there. ACASH was supposed to be headed by the Vice Chancellor and Vice Chancellor was not supposed to advise this. It is the employer who has to do everything. Now, who is the employer? Senate is the employer. So ACASH had to be removed and they brought in a new PUCASH. But, the new PUCASH, whatever was brought in, it had not envisaged that there could be an occasion that a Syndicate member lodges a complaint against the Vice Chancellor. It can also be the other way round that the Vice Chancellor is a woman and a Syndicate member is a male, so it can be that situation also. Again there would be a problem. So, this is not envisaged by the Government of India Act, but the Government of India is alive, that when the problems occur, the problems need redressal. In that background, the Government of India has given certain directives and those directives, given after consultations at the highest levels in the Government of India where the DOPT, MHRD, Chancellor's Office, U.T. Administration, U.T. Police, Home Secretary UT, are involved. So many parties are involved in it. So, they have given certain directives to do things. At some stage, clarification was also sought as to who is the employer of the Vice Chancellor. Whatever has happened in the last 2 ½ years, he tried to make a summary. First for himself and that summary he has placed before them. He said that he withdraws No. 26.

At that stage, the Vice Chancellor then requested to permit him to recuse himself and asked the members to proceed with the deliberations and he abstained himself from the meeting.

In order to run the business of the Syndicate, Shri Prabhjit Singh proposed the name of Dr. Satish Kumar to Chair the meeting who is the senior most member of the Syndicate as well as the Senate. This was seconded by Dr. Ameer Sultana and a few other members. Accordingly, Dr. Satish Kumar Chaired the meeting for this item.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he (Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma) is now sitting on a very important seat and chairing the Syndicate meeting. He said that he (Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma) is their role model.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that in the meetings much time is wasted and very few issues are solved and, therefore, he requested

that they should talk just to the point and finish the work at the earliest.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it would have been better if he (Dr. Mahajan) would have said that he (Shri Satish Kumar Sharma) has been on a very responsible position and that he would not favour any one or any group. He said that they are neither with the madam, nor with the Vice Chancellor. They are with the University. They were having the same expectation from him (Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma) which they were having in 1990. Today, they expect him that he should rise above all groupism and make proud the Chair where he is sitting.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that he appreciate every word which they uttered. Now, it would be better if they speak on the issue one by one as it would help to conclude the issue. He requested the members not to interrupt a member while he is speaking. Then he requested Shri Prabhjit Singh to present his view point on the issue.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said, it is very unfortunate that since 2015 till today, this issue could not be decided and whatever decision has to be taken, that should be taken. He said that this issue has come up in the news papers many times and with this the image of the University is getting affected very adversely. As has been said by Professor Keshav Malhotra, it should be done in a truthful way. The Syndicate and Senate has done everything. Now, the letter which has been received from Chairman, after that the University has sent a copy of the Act to them. It is right that some shortcoming is there and in order to rectify it, the today's meeting of Syndicate has been convened. He is not aware of the names of the persons who are senior, however, other members are very senior and associated with the institution, they might be aware of it which senior person could be appointed as Chairman. The name of whosoever person is recommended to be appointed, since the Senate is the employer, it would be rectified by the Senate. He is not sure whether or not it will go to the Chancellor or the MHRD for approval after the approval of the Senate. But he was of the opinion that whichever name would be finalized/shortlisted by the Syndicate and approved by the Senate, at least an intimation of the same must be sent to the Office of the Chancellor, because if the intimation is not sent, then the matter would remain hanging for a year or two. He requested that the matter should be clinched immediately in a time bound manner. Though the Senate meeting being held on 21 January, 2018 is to consider the issues relating to colleges, but this issue should also be placed before the Senate as a second item on that day in order to avoid any delay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that again they will be violating. The meeting of Senate being convened on 21st January is a special meeting only to consider the college issues, the moment they will do something else, they will be violating the regulations. He requested to note his objection, that is all.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it was his view only and it is for the House to decide it.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that a member has given his opinion and he has listened to him very carefully. It is beyond his

purview to decide whether that item can be taken up or not. Probably the right and the competent person will take decision on that issue.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said this only because they want to clinch this issue as early as possible.

Dr. Satish Sharma said that he will pass on his (Shri Prabhjit Singh) words to the Vice Chancellor he in his wisdom could take a decision to which Shri Prabhjit Singh said okay.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that as has been told by Shri Prabhjit Singh, a Committee is already there and it has been summarized. The issue was as to who is the employer, as it seems from the papers, this has already been settled. Now there is nothing to go in the things whether or not that Committee is competent to take decision or is it as per the law. The issue should be resolved in a speedy manner so that there should not any bad blood between two persons of such importance, one is the Vice Chancellor and the other is the PUTA President. Whatever complaint is there, which, to his mind, should not be there, but it should be disposed off in a speedy manner. The madam has written that the appointed persons are not as per Act. He has not read the Act, but they should check it whether they are as per the Act or not. He further said that a senior lady Professor could be appointed as a member of the Committee. Efforts should be made to sort out the issue as early as possible. Shri Prabhjit Singh ji has already summarized it. He requested to resolve the issue. They attended the first Senate meeting on 1st January, 2017, but otherwise he is associated with the University since 1992. It is very unfortunate when such things go outside. From 1st January till date, they have just heard about two issues, one is the current complaint and the second is the financial position of the University. There are many other issues of the University which are far more important than this. Ranking of the University is declining, there are many problems of the students. So, he requested that this issue must be resolved as speedily as they can.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Prabhjit Singh and Dr. Amit Joshi. A special meeting of the present Senate, the term of which commenced w.e.f. 1st November, 2016, was held on 29th January, 2017. At that time, he could not know the detailed sequence of the matter which he came to know today. From this it has become clear and he is of the opinion that since the Committee had been formed a year ago, he wanted to know as to why no meeting of the same has been held and why no conclusion has been arrived at, now his point is clear and he is satisfied. He is satisfied with the sequence of events which have now been provided which were not earlier known to him. He is satisfied with the way it has been taken up that the clarification has been taken from the Ministry of Human Resource Development and Chancellor's office. So he is satisfied with it. As expressed by Dr. Amit Joshi, they should clinch the issue today to save the time which could be utilized for other matters.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the meeting has been convened on a letter which has been given by the Chairperson of a Committee which was constituted by the governing body, initially by the Syndicate. In the Senate, it was discussed and said that the list be sent to the Chancellor and if he wanted to make changes or form

a new Committee, he could do so. This relates to January 2017. After discussing the matter in the Syndicate and Senate, it was sent to the Chancellor. No reply was being received from the Chancellor. Finally, after repeated reminders a reply came in June 2017 when he said that there is no need of forming another Committee and the PUCASH would enquire into the matter and if another Committee is formed, it would be a duplication, all this is clearly written in the letter. Obviously, when it was so said by the Chancellor, the matter was again referred to PUCASH to investigate the matter on the basis of the letter received from the Chancellor. What is the origin of the second Committee? The complainant made complaints to various quarters including Ministry of Human Resource Development, National Commission for Women, U.T. Chandigarh Police, Chancellor and others. National Commission for Women convened a meeting. Thereafter, they thought that nothing was happening, they gave direction to the Ministry of Human Resource Development to ask the University that since the PUCASH is not investigating the matter, another Committee be formed and it is clearly written in the letter. He would like to read the letter being important one which has also been sent to the members. This letter has been received on 19.12.2017 from Ministry of Human Resource Development. It was received because the University was writing the letters to PUCASH to enquire into as the Chancellor had asked to do so. But PUCASH did not start the investigation and said that first it should be got clarified from the Ministry of Human Resource Development because this Committee was formed on the asking of Ministry of Human Resource Development. Obviously, first the go-ahead of the MHRD should be obtained. Simultaneously, the letters were being written to the MHRD. Finally, a letter from the MHRD came on 19.12.2017 in response to letter dated 21.08.2017. This letter says that "In this regard, it is informed that the matter of constitution of a new Internal Committee to look into the allegations made by Professor was examined by the Ministry in consultation with the Department of Personnel and Training (DoPT)". It is very important. "DoPT has also examined the matter and has concluded that this is a peculiar case where the complaint committee, which consists of officers junior to the Vice-Chancellor, against whom the complaint has been made, is confused about its jurisdiction and the complainant is not convinced with the composition of the committee". It is listening to the complainant as also talks about the Committee", "in view of the peculiarity of the case, DoPT has suggested to consider constituting an independent committee" now they are talking about independent committee and not internal committee "specifically to look into all aspects of this matter to maintain fairness in such a sensitive matter, which was also recommended by the O/o Vice President of India in its letter dated 14.06.2017. You are, therefore, requested to go ahead with the Internal Committee, as recommended by the Syndicate, Panjab University in its meeting dated 21.01.2017" that means that now what they want is that the Committee should enquire, "for enquiry into the allegations made by Professor. It is also requested that the Internal Committee should inquire into all aspects of the case and submit its report to the Ministry", they do not want the report to be submitted as per Act which says that the report would go to the employer. But they say that it would go to the Ministry, "as per the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013. This issues with the approval of the Joint Secretary (Higher Education)". So, obviously what has happened is that looking into the peculiarity of the case, when they talk about DoPT or MHRD, the Government has decided that a

Committee is required and that Committee has to be a special Committee and said that the Committee formed in that particular meeting of the Syndicate would enquire. Once that letter comes, the letter is sent to the Committee members as well as the Chairperson. According to him, the letter and the Act were sent to the Chairperson and one has to go ahead with the procedure laid down in the Act. Dialogue and conciliation could also be done and how to proceed further in the matter. The Committee had been asked to do that as per the Act. But when the Chairperson saw the constitution of the Committee, it has earlier also been discussed many times, she raised two questions on the constitution whether the Committee is valid as per the Act. It is not valid as per the Act. If they talk about the Act, the Act says that the Chairperson has to be an employee of the place where the Committee is to be formed and if no senior person is available, then the other work place of the same employer. If such a senior person is not available at these two places, then an outsider could be for which the guidelines have been given. In this case, of course, it is right that Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary is not an employee. The second issue that she has raised that a member of the Committee has to be from the NGO, that member is not must because it is expected that the member could be from an NGO or a person who is conversant with the women related affairs. So, this point is not so much valid as far as other things are concerned. According to him, even if the Vice-Chancellor had withdrawn his point, but because everyone, who has talked till now, is saying that the matter should be resolved at the earliest. Keeping in view the urgency, a Committee could be formed which should be ready to accept the task. Only the Chairperson has talked to recuse her. So, keeping in view the sentiments of the Chairperson of the Committee, they could appoint a new Chairperson and not the other members as the approval of the Government is already there. There is no need to change the other members. Perhaps, one of the members, Justice (Retd.) Jasbir Singh, has also refused when their consent was taken. So, his name be excluded from the Committee and a new Chairperson be appointed.

Professor Ronki Ram said that Professor Navdeep Goyal has given the details. If they look into the whole case, after so many sittings at different levels of Government of India, UGC, MHRD, Chancellor's office, U.T. Chandigarh Police. The data explains that there was a lot of confusion as well as differences not the body which had constituted the Committee but the Committee which was itself constituted by the University. The very Committee to which the case was referred, at the first instance, in April, 2015, it was allegedly said that PUCASH was not fairly constituted. So, the Committee itself was targeted. Then, the PUCASH thought that if there is an accusation that the Committee is not properly constituted, another Committee could look into this. Immediately, the National Commission for Women was approached. Very sarcastic and unparliamentary words were used against the Committee. So, the PUCASH did not do its duty. So, the National Commission for Women came into picture. Similarly, a complaint was also filed in the U.T. Police which was again on sexual harassment. This was the time when the MHRD was also approached. First the complaint was sent to the Chancellor, according to that the Committee had to be constituted. They have a PUCASH and the complaint was referred to it. PUCASH was not enquiring because it was not properly constituted. Now, the case was referred to the MHRD which had referred the case to the UGC. So, for the first time the UGC had

invited the person against whom the complaint was made to come and give his opinion. Probably, from the first date when the case happened on 15.04.2015 till date, they could see that the UGC was inviting the Vice-Chancellor almost every two months because a complaint was filed there. The UGC had also filed its report before the authority which had constituted the Committee. Now, the MHRD forwarded all the documents to the Panjab University because it had done the job although the PUCASH did not do its job because there was some confusion. The MHRD has done the job through UGC where the Vice-Chancellor was given a hearing and the report was filed. The MHRD forwarded all the documents to the Registrar, Panjab University to get the enquiry conducted by the PUCASH which was accused to be a body of person who want to favour the Vice-Chancellor. So, the MHRD after going through all the cases including the UGC has come to the conclusion that the PUCASH has to look into the matter. The complainant raised some doubts about the constitution of the existing PUCASH. At that time, the Chairperson of PUCASH also raised some doubt. No enquiry/proceeding was done. This has made a peculiar situation and the time was passing on. The Registrar received a communication from the Chancellor's office. Something was also going on. After about a year or so, i.e., on 20.01.2016, the letter was received. The problem was with the PUCASH that since the Vice-Chancellor had constituted it, how could it look into the matter against the Vice-Chancellor. This was the confusion. But MHRD had already forwarded it and they did agree to that otherwise they would have got the enquiry conducted by PUCASH asking it that the MHRD has asked to do it. But now, the Registrar received a communication from the Chancellor's office that under the Panjab University Act which has the statutory authority to constitute any Committee including PUCASH in accordance with the provisions of the applicable statute to enquire into the allegation of sexual harassment against the Vice-Chancellor and to seek such an enquiry report from the Committee constituted by it and directed the governing bodies of Panjab University to act accordingly for taking required action in this regard. Let the Committee file the report and the report be sent in a sealed cover to the Chancellor's office. A new member of National Commission for Women visited Panjab University and interacted with the Vice-Chancellor because already the case was going which was not an ordinary one. On the one hand, the enquiry was going on and on the other hand, a new officer was appointed. The case had approached different organizations. Later on, the National Commission for Women convened a meeting on 22.12.2016 in New Delhi in which the Registrar, Panjab University and MHRD officials were called in. The MHRD officials were called in because they had already asked the UGC to conduct the enquiry and the UGC had conducted the enquiry and got a report. The National Commission for Women wanted to know through UGC as to what the MHRD officials were enquiring into. The things were going on. At this stage, it looks as if nothing was going on, but it was all going on. The National Commission for Women concluded that MHRD should look into the matter as per the provisions of the Act. The MHRD did not take the matter in its hands on its own and got the matter looked into by the UGC and sent the matter to the University to enquire into. The National Commission for Women says that the MHRD got the enquiry conducted by the UGC and the UGC also listened to the viewpoints of the Vice-Chancellor and then submitted its report to the MHRD. The MHRD sent that report to the University to conduct the enquiry and the Chancellor also said that the enquiry be

conducted. But the National Commission for Women said that the MHRD should look into the matter as per the provisions of the Act and DoPT guidelines. It is very important. It asked for submission of the report on the pending case within 30 days. This again was time bound. So, they could not say that the things were just being delayed, it was time bound. The MHRD issued a directive after a few days, i.e., on 09.01.2017 that a new Internal Committee should be formed. Who told it, it is the MHRD because earlier MHRD had said that they have got conducted the enquiry. Now, the MHRD directed Panjab University to constitute a new Internal Committee chaired by an external member and not by a member from the University. This relates to 09.01.2017 and now today (10.01.2018), it is exactly one year and one day. It was said that the Committee should perform its task soon. In the meanwhile, the letters dated 06.10.2016 and 16.12.2016 were received by the Registrar, Panjab University from the U.T. Administration because that parallel enquiry was going on by the U.T. Administration which asked for the report from the Internal Committee of Panjab University to be filed with the U.T. Administration within 15 days whereas the MHRD had asked to get the enquiry conducted by forming a new Committee. But in the meantime, the U.T. Administration asks to submit the report of the Internal Committee within 15 days. The U.T. Administration has desired to carry out the investigation on it if Panjab University was not able to submit the report of Internal Committee. They could see the urgency and the importance. The MHRD says that the Panjab University should form an Internal Committee and the U.T. Administration asks Panjab University to submit the report. The directive of MHRD and the letters from U.T. Police were placed before the special meeting of the Syndicate in its meeting held on 21.01.2017 and the Syndicate under agenda Item No.6 constituted a new Internal Committee, where Shri Jarnail Singh was the Chairperson because the MHRD had asked to do so and the U.T. Administration had asked to submit the report within 15 days. It recommended the inclusion of one nominee of U.T. Administration because it had asked to submit the report within 15 days. So, it was said that since already a Committee had been constituted, the U.T. nominee could also join the new Internal Committee. The Syndicate also recommended convening of a special meeting of the Senate on 29.01.2017 to consider the recommendation in the Syndicate because the matter was important in which the MHRD is involved. The recommendation of the Senate along with the entire discussion of the meeting held on 29.01.2017 was sent to the Chancellor, Panjab University. After this, the Internal Committee was to work on it but it did not work. This matter relates to six months back. Now, it is January, 2018. Now the Committee has to proceed, the Committee was properly constituted and properly ratified, the MHRD has agreed and the U.T. nominee was also there. But, somehow the Chairperson of the Committee has said that since presently she is not working, according to the provisions of the Act, she is not fit for this, therefore, she would not be able to convene the meeting as its Chairperson. Now, today the Syndicate of Panjab University is meeting, the MHRD has not asked so as it has already made it clear. It is the Chairperson of the Committee who is saying that the Committee is not as per the provisions but the MHRD has not said so that it should according to Panjab University Act. The MHRD has said this is a special Committee for a special case where an outside person has to be the Chairperson. When the Chairperson of the Committee has refused, so in place of her, they have to see whether the person to be appointed is serving or not or they have to consider

the senior most person. So, there is nothing in that. They have simply to proceed so that the things run smoothly so that the Panjab University should be able to tell the MHRD that they have acted on its direction and a Committee has been formed. They should not further complicate it as the matter has already been complicated a lot. They should start by fulfilling the minimum requirements. They have to tell the MHRD immediately that the Chairperson has asked such and such things, which have been complied with. So, this is the only way.

Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan said that in the letter which they received, the Chairperson has refused to chair the meeting. Now, they should stick to the point as to who is to be appointed in her place. All the issues have been discussed and they should not repeat the things. The recommendation of the names should be taken from the members and if there is unanimity, they should also seek the consent of the person so that it might not be a case that they recommend the name but the person refuses. They should fix a time limit so that the consent of the person be taken before the meeting of the Senate.

Professor Anita Kaushal said that a lot has been said. According to her, now they need to arrive at a consensus on what they have to do.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that the proposal that the senior most woman Professor of the University should be made the Chairperson is very good as Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary is not ready for it. The second point has been raised by Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary on Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights. If they look at section 4, clause 2 (c) of the Act regarding constitution of the Committee which clearly says that "one member from amongst non-governmental organizations or associations committed to the cause of women or a person familiar with the issues relating to sexual harassment". So, the second point raised by her is not valid. She agreed to the proposal that that senior most woman Professor of the University be made the Chairperson. They have to keep in mind that it is an Independent Committee but not an Internal Committee. Perhaps they are using these words in interchangeable terms. If it is an Internal Complaints Committee, it is to be as per the Act but if they go by the letter of Ministry of Human Resource Development, then it is an Independent Committee for a special case. So, they should use these terms very consciously. Earlier, in the Senate also it is written. If they talk in terms of the Act, then it is an Internal Complaints Committee but the letter talks about an Independent Committee.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that in the letter received on 19.12.2017 which has been read out, it is written that "you are, therefore, requested to go ahead with the Internal Committee, as recommended by the Syndicate, Panjab University". So, they are wanting the Panjab University Committee which is an Internal Committee and is having an external member as Chairperson. This is the Panjab University Committee and this is what the MHRD has also directed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said what Dr. Ameer Sultana is saying that there is some confusion.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that if they see the letter, they are referring to the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 and in the resolved part it is written that it is in accordance with the Act.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that they followed that the composition should have one member from NGO etc. as stipulated section 4(2) of the Act.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that if they go by it, then the Chairperson has to be internal person.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that it is the Internal Committee.

It was informed (by the Registrar) it would be Internal Committee with external member and that has been directed because of the peculiarity of the case as advised by the National Commission for Women.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the meeting notice is to consider the letter received from the Chairperson of the Committee to look into the specific complaint (s) of a Senate member against Vice-Chancellor. So, first they should read the letter carefully. But what is happening is that they read only the para of a letter which suits them. It would be better if they read the letter in detail. As everyone reads the para which suits them, if he also reads something which suits him, might not suit the other person. He read out the letter sent by Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary which says that "thank you for your letter dt. 27.12.2017 intimating the constitution of the Committee under the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013. I am also in receipt of the notice for first meeting of the Committee on 9.1.2018. A perusal of the documents and a copy of the above mentioned Act received with the above letter has raised a few doubts about the constitution of this Committee. I feel that the Committee's constitution does not entirely comply with the provisions of the Act and they may not stand the test of legal scrutiny on the following points." First of all, he saluted this lady who has taken a neutrality stand and given her viewpoint. He congratulated her because she has been an alumnus of Panjab University who also feels hurt whenever something wrong is reported. The issues pointed out by her have already been raised by Shri Ashok Goyal and other members in the Syndicate, Senate and at other forums that what they are doing is not right and they are not giving a reading to the Act and they had only one thing in mind that they would form a Committee which they wanted to form. Today, the same thing is also being done because they want to form a Committee of their choice. Last time, also the Committee had been formed within a time of 8 minutes which has been revealed by the complainant as she has seen the DVD recording, he has not seen the DVD. Then in the letter, it is written that "Section 4(2) of the above Act reads as follows: the Internal Committee shall consist of the following members to be nominated by the employer". He enquired as to who is the employer. Is the Syndicate or the Senate the employer of the Vice-Chancellor? He is again putting a question as to who is the employer as has been pointed out by Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary while quoting the Act. Are they (the Syndicate or the Senate) empowered in this matter to form the Committee? They should respect the employer who has been given the powers by the Act. First of all, the definition of the employer should be very clear. It is written in the letter which Mrs.

Chaudhary has sent and they are ignoring this point. It is also mentioned in her letter that “a Presiding Officer who shall be a woman employed at a senior level at workplace... provided ... of the other department or organisation”. So, this point also needs discussion. Again the letter says “I would like to bring it to your notice that after my retirement as Chief Secretary Haryana in 2006 & later as Chief Information Commissioner Haryana in 2011, I have not been employed in any workplace. Again, the Committee in terms of section 4(2)(c) of the Act should necessarily have one member from amongst non-governmental organizations or associations associated to the cause of women or a person familiar with the issues relating to sexual harassment. The Committee, in my view, does not seem to be fulfilling the requirements of section 4(2)(c) of the Act. Though the brief particulars of the members show Commission for the Protection of Child Rights Chandigarh as NGO yet it is not a NGO. It is a statutory body set up by the Government under the Commission for the Protection of Child Rights Act 2005”. This is another important point which no one has raised. “Again ‘brief particulars’ of the member (listed on p.5 of the minutes of the meetings) do not indicate that any of the members has the familiarity with the issues relating to sexual harassment”. She has challenged the Sexual Committee itself whereas they are talking about only two members. She has given the suggestions and they should look into it. So, they should rise above the occasions. That is why in the beginning of the meeting he had said that they should take a non-partisan view whoever as the Vice-Chancellor might come, madam might come, but the University would go on forever. He pointed out that no member of the Committee has any working experience on issues related with sexual harassment which has been challenged by Mrs. Chaudhary. The letter further says “thirdly, I feel that it may not be legally feasible to nominate a representative of administration as member of the Committee. The membership has to be in name of a person as half of the members (excluding Presiding Officer) nominated have to be women. Again, the Internal Complaints Committee is to be constituted by the ‘Employer’ as defined under section 2(g) of the Act. It is either ‘head’ of the organization or such other officer as the appropriate Government may by an order specify. The documents received by me do not refer to such an order or ‘order’ by the head of the organization”. He did not know the technical details of the papers provided to Mrs. Chaudhary but he understands as to what has been approved on behalf of the employer. It needs the stamp of the employer and not by the Syndicate or the Senate. He is a layman but not a legal man. These things have not been read but only the part which suits one has been read. On the one hand, they are saying that this issue is pending for a year or two, but on the other hand, even today they are not-serious on this issue. If they had been serious on this issue, they would not have violated the Act on the first day itself. They would have looked at the Act, formed the Committee according to the Act and would have approached the Chancellor. If he had been the Vice-Chancellor, he would have himself approached the Chancellor and asked him to look into the issue whether it was wrong or right and would have left the formation of the Committee to him. But it is being done otherwise that the Committee is formed according to the choice. The main bone of contention for delay is that such a Committee is being formed which the authorities want but not an independent Committee. Just by giving the name ‘independent’ to a Committee, it could not be an independent one. Today, the Syndicate should approve that let the Chancellor form a Committee and let the persons whosoever face the

enquiry. If the complainant is at fault, he would not defend her. If the Vice-Chancellor is at fault, he would also not defend him. They should respect the employer and not deflect or ignore him and not ignore him. They should play a simple game so that the University is not defamed. That is why he had said when Dr. Satish Kumar had occupied the chair that all would depend upon him as to which direction the University would take. The letter further says "I am bringing these facts to your notice placing them before the competent authority so that 'employer' as defined or as notified by the appropriate Government may consider re-constitution of the Committee". So, they do not have the power, it is the employer who has the power. They are deciding that they are the employer. The letter further says "in view of the above, the meeting fixed for 9.1.2018 be cancelled".

Dr. Satish Kumar enquired from Professor Keshav Malhotra that since he is a Professor of the University, who is his employer.

Professor Keshav Malhotra replied that his employer is the Senate.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that, that is what he is saying that the Syndicate is the outcome of the Senate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to who appoints the Vice-Chancellor. If there is a case of sexual harassment against any Professor, citing an example he said that when he was the Chairperson of Department, a case of sexual harassment was reported to him by the student, without seeing the contents, he sealed the envelope and sent immediately to the PUCASH as it had been formed by the Senate, the employer. Since he is a Professor, his employer is the Senate and not the Vice-Chancellor. He enquired as to who is the employer of the Vice-Chancellor, it is the Chancellor. The Professor whose case he had forwarded to PUCASH had quarreled with him to which he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) had said that if some student had come to him, he wanted justice to be done even if the Professor was his friend or a colleague and had been serving long with him for 30 years. But nothing happened and the case was solved. His conscious is clear that he has worked with neutrality and done the justice. The letter further says "in view of the above, the meeting fixed for 9.1.2018 be cancelled. Kindly get the information about the cancellation of meeting conveyed to members expeditiously on phone. While sending the cancellation notice, a copy of my letter be enclosed so that the members are aware about my views and the reason for cancellation of the meeting. I regret the inconvenience caused to them." He said that the other things about her inability have been mentioned in the letter and she has praised the University which they deserve. But she also deserves and they should pass a resolution to appreciate her work and stand that they are proud of their alumnus as they have such kind of a person who had been a former Secretary, Ministry of Sports and Youth Affairs, Government of India, former Chief Secretary, Haryana Government, former Chief Information Commissioner, Haryana. They should pay standing ovation to such a person. He saluted the bureaucracy that they read thoroughly and understand the matters which otherwise is being criticized. It is not that they approve something or brush aside or put under the carpet. He became emotional because this is a matter related with the University. If they are serious today that they have to form a Committee, but they could not form a Committee

because the Act clearly says the formation by the employer. They are just trying to snatch away the powers of the employer. How it would be felt if a son snatches away the power of his father and exercises the same. The employer does not have the knowledge of the matter. At least, his permission should be sought that they are holding a meeting. The matter should be brought to the knowledge of the Chancellor even if they wish to do whatever they like. Only, then it could be challenged and the dates would be verified. Who is responsible? He proposed a resolution that Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary be appreciated for the work done by her.

Shri Ashok Goyal seconded the resolution.

Professor Ronki Ram said that then such a resolution should also be sent to the other quarters also like the Ministry of Human Resource Development, UGC and other Committees and that the MHRD has said that the employer is the Chancellor. Today they are not going to form a Committee but just taking a decision on members.

Continuing, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Dr. Satish Kumar had asked him as to who is his employer. He requested Dr. Satish Kumar to define the definition of the employer of the Vice-Chancellor as he is having such a great experience. He requested that the legal opinion could also be taken on it. If MHRD has said something, it is also wrong as it has not been made known as to who is the employer of the Vice-Chancellor. If the letter had been sent by the employer, then the complainant would have accepted it. She (Mrs. Chaudhary) is using the word 'employer' again and again and she has said emphasized it. They should read the directions clearly. Some of the things even if unsaid are supposed to be said but the unsaid things have not been looked. She has said everything in her letter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Syndicate had taken a decision in January, 2017. He enquired whether they had taken the consent of Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary. He wanted to know it from the Chair (Dr. Satish Kumar) and if he wanted to ask the Registrar, it is okay, but nobody should reply except him (Dr. Satish Kumar).

Dr. Satish Kumar replied that since he was not a party to that decision, he could check it with the Registrar.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the reply is 'yes', then he should be given a copy of that.

Dr. Satish Kumar replied that no written consent was taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to why the consent was not taken as it was decided by the Syndicate on 21.01.2017 where the names were suggested, it was said by all that the consent be taken from everybody.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the consent was to be taken after the meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then why the consent has not been taken.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that every member must have been requested. If any member has information on it, he could share it.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that prior to the names put to the Syndicate, the consent was not taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is talking about the consent to be taken later.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that after the due approval by the competent body, Ministry of Human Resource Development, when everything came, only then they could ask for the consent otherwise if it is not approved, it would be premature to ask for the consent.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, it meant that the Registrar or the Vice-Chancellor is above the Syndicate.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that it is not a question of who is above or not. There is a set procedure of getting clearance of the Ministry's approval to proceed and they have adopted that procedure.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to could they send the name of someone without seeking the consent.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the matter was again referred in August where the whole Syndicate was informed that this matter has been referred and they asked to please advise to seek again the permission from the MHRD. The Syndicate was always kept informed of everything. At no point of time, any action was taken without bringing it to the notice of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his simple query is that the Syndicate on 21.01.2017 said that the consent be taken before sending the names to the Senate because the recommendations of the Syndicate were going to the Senate. The Senate also deliberated upon it presuming that the consent of all those members who have been recommended in the Syndicate had been taken and that is why they did not want to discuss anything. But now the Registrar is saying that how is it possible to take the consent without getting the approval from the competent authority. He has yet to hear that the consent is taken after the competent authority approves. Supposing the competent authority approves and the concerned persons says no, is it not insulting and embarrassing for the competent authority who has approved it. What are they talking? The Syndicate in its wisdom has told to take the consent of everybody. Even a person who was suggested in addition to all the names which were suggested by one person, it was also said that the consent of Justice (Retd.) be also taken and his consent has not been taken. It is only after the Committee has been approved from the MHRD, he (Justice Jasbir Singh) has the occasion to say 'no'. It is only after the Committee has been approved by MHRD, the Chairperson of the Committee says 'no'. Is it not an insult to MHRD also, is not an insult to Syndicate and Senate of Panjab University also, is it not an insult to the office of the Vice-President of India also.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that all the members had given their verbal and only Justice (Retd.) Jasbir Singh had expressed his unavailability.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it be noted that the names were sent to the Senate without asking for the consent from any of the member recommended by the Syndicate in its meeting on 21.01.2017. He asked a question from the Chair and requested to reply to the same himself only because it looks as if he is putting allegations.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that it is his prerogative to seek the opinion of someone.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Dr. Satish Kumar) should observe that first the answer is given as 'no' but then it is said 'verbally'. That meant that it was the verbal consent.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that the office is not hiding anything and whatever has happened, it is before the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the letter which has been written to the Chancellor there also it has not been mentioned that the recommended names list is being sent with the consent from all the members. That is why the doubt arose. Why at this stage they are saying that they do not want to continue with the Committee because it is not in accordance with the statute. There is a letter which has been written to Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, the Chairperson of the Committee by the Registrar on 27.12.2017 where it is written that "in view of the above, may I request you (being Chairperson of the Committee) to kindly suggest date and time for the meeting as per your convenience so that other members could be informed about the same". That is the practice that they follow. He enquired whether the date and time was given by the Chairperson.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the date was fixed on 8.1.2018.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that was it postponed.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that on 05.01.2018, Mrs. Chaudhary wrote to him that because of this issue, she could not continue and requested to cancel the meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested to show the related letter.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that no letter was received but she (Mrs. Chaudhary) talked on telephone.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that he is sorry that he has to point out the wrong information being given. It is nowhere mentioned that the date has been fixed by the Chairperson and even if it is presumed to be correct, the date is not 8th January but it is 9th January.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that it was 8th and it was told that one of the members from them had expressed that he could not come from Delhi on this particular date and the date was suggested to be changed to 9th. All this communication happened on telephone and it was being coordinated as per convenience of all members.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to who has certified that the Committee, so called one side as they are saying, has been constituted in consonance with the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act. On the other hand, they are saying that except that the Chairperson is from outside, that means that it is beyond the scope of the Act. That is what they want to say. It meant that it is on the basis of the letter of MHRD that they have made some compromise keeping away the Act.

Professor Ronki Ram said that this is a cross argument, cross questioning because the matter has not been clinched but the matter has to be rolled into such thing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that did they know that this University has issued a certificate. Probably, this is the reason why the Chairperson of the Committee has got provoked because the notice which has been issued under the signature of the Deputy Registrar which says that "the Committee constituted in consonance with the Act" and that is why she (Mrs. Chaudhary) was to go through the Act and pointed out all the things. Who has given this certificate that the Committee is as per the Act specially when the Committee, the Senate took the decision and the letter which is being referred to by the members including Professor Ronki Ram, and giving all powers to MHRD that this is the MHRD who has written it, this is the MHRD which did it. They have to decide whether the Act is supreme or the Government of India is supreme. According to him, all of them including specially Professor Ronki Ram a person of Political Science teaching Constitution to everybody, whether the Act is supreme or the Government is supreme. After the Act, is the Senate supreme or the Vice-Chancellor is the supreme. Is the Syndicate supreme or a body consisting of the Chairpersons of the Departments is supreme? Is the MHRD supreme or the Act is supreme? The answer to that is that the Act is supreme, Senate is inferior to that, Syndicate is inferior to that, but all the bodies including the MHRD, the Act also says the same thing, the Senate and the Syndicate also say the same thing and MHRD also says the same thing and the same thing is that in the instant case, the Chancellor is the employer of the Vice-Chancellor. After having been said by MHRD itself, that it is the Chancellor who is the employer of the Vice-Chancellor, what business they have got to tell the University to get the enquiry conducted by this Committee or that Committee. The decision which was taken in the meeting of the Senate in December 2015 was that since the Chancellor is the employer let it be sent to the Chancellor for appointment of a Committee. He had already pointed out these things in the Senate but since he did not have anything else to speak, at the cost of repetition, he has to remind this body that on that decision of the Senate, which they a number of times say that the Senate is supreme, this point be noted that on that decision of the Senate, the Registrar instead of acting accordingly preferred to take legal opinion on the decision taken by the Senate in December 2015 to check whether the decision taken by the Senate is legally tenable or not from three Legal Retainers. Two Legal Retainers sent the legal opinion, as far as his knowledge goes because he did not have the access to the files, that it is the Chancellor who is the employer. The third Legal Retainer refused to give the opinion saying that he would give the opinion only if it is asked by the Chancellor and who is he (Registrar). He wondered as to what is the sanctity of the decisions of the supreme body, the Senate as they all say in one tune. Then that also did not get the desired results. In January

2017, they again took some decision to convey to the Chancellor the Committee recommended by the Syndicate in its meeting on 21.01.2017 and thereafter along with the deliberations which took place in the Senate since no recommendation from the Senate. Of course, the recommendations of Syndicate along with the discussion of Senate were directed to be sent to the Chancellor, those were sent after 29.01.2017 probably, as he has been told, in the month of March 2017 vide letter dated 07.03.2017. He is trying to read out the things only from the papers which have been provided to him, of course there might be different papers with the Chair, he would like to be enlightened, that the Chancellor did not accept the constitution of that committee which was recommended by the Syndicate in its meeting on 21st January. The Chancellor took a different step and wrote a letter on 14th June, 2017 to the MHRD negating what they have recommended from the Senate and they took the stand that it is the PUCASH which is competent to conduct the inquiry. Chancellor's office did not accept their recommendations of January, 2017, meaning thereby that this committee of which they are talking today, has for all practical purposes, been negated by the employer, i.e., the Chancellor vide letter dated 14th June, 2017, i.e., three months more than three months after, they had sent that letter. The Chancellor office wrote to the MHRD that they are of the opinion that PUCASH is competent to conduct the inquiry, the copy of which was sent to the Panjab University also. Probably on the basis of which they had sought out to conduct an inquiry. The second option which was given as per letter dated 14th June, 2017 again escaping the responsibility on the part of the employer; he has no hesitation in saying that employer was duty bound to constitute a committee but instead of discharging the duty which he was supposed to do as per Panjab University Act, he passed on the buck to the MHRD giving the option that however, in pursuance of the directive from the National Commission for Women, however should the MHRD consider constituting a committee specifically to look into the all aspects of that matter, it may do so. The Chancellor instead of endorsing their committee which is this committee, or constituted another independent committee on his own, told MHRD that from their viewpoint PUCASH is right but if they do not accept it, they could form their own committee. That is what the para 7 of the letter says. The report of the said committee could be presented through MHRD to the competent authority of the University meaning thereby they have escaped the responsibility of defining even who is the competent authority. They left everything to the MHRD and as per the Act, MHRD has no locus standi even to go into it except if some complaint is received by them they could ask for the status, they could monitor and they could do anything. But they could not direct anybody to go beyond the Act. Now this letter of 14th June, 2017 he has read, the letter which has been received by the Registrar in December, 2017 based on which they have written a letter to Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary. It particularly refers to the letter dated 14th June, 2017. He stated that the letter dated 13th December, 2017 is based entirely on the letter dated June 14th, 2017 written by the office of the Chancellor and the Vice-President of India. The letter says that, "in this regard it is informed that the matter of constitution of internal committee to look into the allegations made by the Professor was examined by the Ministry in consultation with Department of Personnel and Training (DoPT)". Then he drew the attention of the Chair to the letter where it is mentioned "in consultation with DoPT has also examined the matter and has concluded that this is a peculiar case where the complaint committee which consists of

officers junior to the Vice-Chancellor, against whom the complaint has been made is confused about its jurisdiction". He would like if it is not possible now, through the Chair, that he had been asking the papers time and again, he has never been supplied. He would like to see a line written by PUCASH wherein they have shown their hesitation in conducting the inquiry on the plea that they are junior to the Vice-Chancellor. He does not know where from this contention has come except in the proceedings before the NCW where Registrar on behalf of the Panjab University appeared and gave a statement that Chairperson of the PUCASH is reluctant to proceed with the Inquiry since they are junior to the accused or the Vice-Chancellor.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that the word 'junior' has not been used.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that okay, all right. He is sorry if he is wrong. If the word has not been used there, has this word been used by the PUCASH that they would not be able to conduct the Inquiry since they are junior to the Vice-Chancellor. Then wherefrom this aspersion has been passed by the MHRD that the committee is confused because of the contention that they are junior to the Vice-Chancellor against whom the complaint has been made.

Dr. Satish Kumar clarified that it is because the complainant had fear and that nobody cast aspersions on this body.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that complainant must have reiterated hundred times that the committee is junior. He is saying that wherefrom this allegation has come that the committee is confused. Has committee ever shown that confusion that because they are junior, they are not ready to proceed with? He said that he is not saying anything wrong and there is no point of order.

Dr. Satish Sharma said that point of order is not when one is wrong but it is when one is not in a position to understand what the other person is speaking.

Shri Ashok Goyal further read out from the letter that in view of the peculiarity of the case, DoPT has suggested to consider constituting an independent committee specifically to look into all aspects of that matter to maintain fairness in such a sensitive matter, which was also recommended by the O/o Vice-President of India in its letter dated 14.06.2017. Now letter dated 14.06.2017 asks to form a committee. Just because Vice-President of India has told the Ministry of Human Resource Development, are they entitled to form a committee as per the Act because they had already decided that the Act is supreme? If the Act says that the committee has to be appointed by the employer, it has to be appointed by the employer. MHRD, of course, could have suggested to the employer, but the appointment has to be done at the hands of the employer. He is trying to bring to their notice where the MHRD is playing the role. Has the MHRD constituted an independent committee? The Chancellor office requested MHRD to constitute an independent committee. But what MHRD did. They wrote that "you are, therefore, requested to go ahead with the internal committee as recommended by the Syndicate on 21st January, 2017". Meaning thereby that since the employer passed on the buck to the Ministry of Human Resource Development, it shifted the responsibility to the Syndicate, thus bringing the whole Syndicate and Senate to face embracing situation

just because that letter was received. He simply wanted to know that if that letter was received as per the recommendations of the Syndicate and Senate and also based on a letter written by the office of the Chancellor and subsequently the Registrar received this letter on 19th December, 2017. Was it not obligatory on the part of the University to place that letter before the Syndicate? On one side in the letter it is said that it is also requested that the internal committee should enquire into all aspects of the case and submit its report to the Ministry as per the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013. So they do not want to go away from the Act and they also want to suggest something which is not in accordance with the Act. He simply asked, is there any provision in the Act that the report by the committee would be sent to the MHRD. Who is Ministry of Human Resource Development? How could they ask to send the report to them and if on the basis of that letter without taking Syndicate into confidence, a notice is issued.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the Chancellor letter dated 14th June, 2017 which Shri Ashok Goyal is reading, it is clearly mentioned in para 6 of that letter that “in pursuance of the directive from the NCW, however should the MHRD consider constituting a Committee specifically to look into all aspects of this matter, it may do so. The report of the said Committee can be presented through MHRD to the competent authority of the University”. So it had implied approval of the Chancellor as the letter was issued with the approval of Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said he has already dealt with letter dated 14th June, 2017. Probably he could not express the way he should have. Letter dated 14th June, 2017 is also in violation of the Act. He (Chancellor) is trying to pass on the buck to the MHRD. While as employer he is duty bound to do it. On being asked by Professor Ronki Ram as to who is the employer, he said that it is the Chancellor. It is the Act which says so and Chancellor, in violation of the Act in the capacity of an employer instead of constituting a committee, has tried to pass on the buck to the MHRD who is not competent at all to deal with this case as per the Act.

Professor Ronki Ram said because the MHRD was approached by the complainant to act, as the complainant has no faith in the PUCASH. Therefore, the MHRD called UGC to hold an inquiry thereby, the MHRD was duly informed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is only interested in the interest of the University. He would like to be pointed out where he has uttered even a single word against the interest of the University. He is not bothered about individuals. To approach MHRD, PM's office, Home Ministry, IG and SSP and for that matter to approach Court, does not mean that they would take over all the responsibility for which they are not entitled to as per the Act. If somebody has approached the MHRD, the MHRD is not entitled to act if they do not have the power to deal with issue.

It was informed (by the Registrar) there is relevant point which would help Shri Ashok Goyal. Letter dated 14th June 2017 is not addressed to the University. It is addressed to in response to their query. It is the MHRD who has been asking the Chancellor's office and the Chancellor's office has given that as per the Act

whatever the University has made the PUCASH and in their wisdom it is correct and they should proceed. However, with the intervention of National Council for Women, wherein they have opined that there should be an external member in it. If MHRD felt that a committee be specifically be constituted they may do so and report be submitted through MHRD to competent authority of University.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired if a copy of NCW's proceedings is attached with that.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that it is attached.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the copy is not attached. If a copy is provided, it could be seen as to how they are asking to have an external member. NCW is also not above the Act.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the NCW has given the directions and that has been given to the MHRD but not to the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked for a copy of the proceedings to which the Registrar said that he has to trace it out.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it is being said that the Senate of Panjab University is above the Parliament and it could not do any wrong.

At this stage, a din prevailed as a couple of members started talking simultaneously.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has also the same purpose as that of Professor Ronki Ram, i.e., to save the University.

Professor Ronki Ram said that then they should not make the things complicated. Rather they should help the University to make the things clear to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is what he is doing. The point is that this Syndicate has formed a Committee on its own but some people say that they are not party to that because they had given their dissent because the Syndicate had formed a wrong Committee. It means that they are casting aspersions on their own.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if he has said so as is being stated by Professor Ronki Ram, the same could be viewed by playing the video.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he has not mentioned his (Shri Ashok Goyal) name but he has just said this about a member of the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even if any member has said so, he is ready for any punishment. He only said that they have been objecting to it in the Senate also but has not said that they are not party to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are giving their opinion strictly as per agenda and that probably seems to some members that they are wasting time, they are not. The agenda which has been given to them is to consider the letter written by Mrs. Meenaxi Anand

Chaudhri wherein it has been assumed and presumed even by the office including the Vice-Chancellor who said as if she has said it that she is not available to serve on the committee. He is unable to find where it is written except that she says that as per the Act she is not a working woman any more. She nowhere said that she should be recused.

The Registrar intervened to inform that in the 2nd but last para of the letter it is mentioned that "I am bringing these facts to your notice placing them before the competent authority so that 'employer' as defined or as notified by the appropriate Government may consider re-constitution of the Committee." His point is that the points given by her and for them even if they have to approach the Chancellor or to the employer, it has to be routed through Syndicate or Senate. So it has to be processed with that and that is why this matter was placed before them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that she (Mrs. Chaudhary) has nowhere said that she is not available. If they say that this letter means that she is not available then she has said so for all members also though on different grounds. If she has not said, then where is the question of appointing a chairperson other than her or appointing somebody in place of her.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that she is not saying that whereas in her letter she says that she is not serving any more. So, she does not meet the condition of the Act.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if she has said about herself, she has said the same thing about other members also. If they have to accept the letter, they have to accept the letter by saying that the letter in toto accepted or this convention is accepted and this convention is rejected. That is how they would be dealing with the agenda. His simple solution is that he does not want University to face such kind of embarrassment time and again. Today, what Dr. Keshav Malhotra says, he is with him, she has the guts to write all these things, but of course not to the likings of the University. But she has tried to puncture the belief of the Syndicate and Senate that what they do, in fact, is always right. She has tried to challenge the decision of the Senate but he is really happy on one count that the Chancellor is not party to it. At least Chancellor has not confirmed something to which she could raise objection. It is MHRD who has said that they go ahead with the constitution of this committee. He further said that they are of the view that it would be in the fitness of the things and in consonance with the Act that the employer is requested to constitute a committee. Let them not send him (Chancellor) any recommendation, just send a copy of the Act which they have sent to the members also. If at all they have to send, let them send all the discussions which have taken place starting from 2015 to 2018 to the Chancellor for his consideration and appointing committee at his own end. That, in fact, would be completely in consonance with the Act specially if the Chancellor's office also looks into it that the provisions of the Act are followed in letter and spirit. That is what he wants to say and he reserves the right to respond to anything at any point.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that they have discussed this issue quite for some time and he desired that not to speak further to

elaborate the things. But he would definitely request to all of them to be brief and give their views.

Professor Ronki Ram said that in that regard he wants to say two-three simple things. He stated that MHRD in consonance with the Chancellor's office had requested the Panjab University to go ahead with the Internal Committee as recommended by the Syndicate of Panjab University dated 21.01.2017. That committee had to its start proceedings. Chairperson of the committee is of the view that she is not according to the Calendar the right person. So thereby it should be re-constituted. That is one view taken into account. MHRD has clearly said to them that this is the committee which has been formed under peculiar conditions after consultations with DoPT. But it is a different issue that DoPT and MHRD are above their Calendar.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma that it is not a point of discussion.

Professor Ronki Ram said now when the letter has been received by them, they are not going to make a thorough overhaul of the committee. They would in her place suggest a person in the wisdom of the Syndicate and another name to be sent to the concerned authority. He requested that the letter of Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary be also attached with the things which are to go to the MHRD as to why they have to change it. They have the duty of informing the body which has asked them to make the committee. The committee was constituted and it was going to conduct proceedings, but, due to certain reasons it was again undeliberately and inadvertently delayed because the thing that they want to tell the world that they are sincere enough is that they should help the proceedings to be done. They should not stall the proceedings. Whatever the thing, if the Calendar is in between, then nobody is going to say that things are not going according to the law. This would be according to law. So, make whatever change and send it along with letter and let them decide. Who are they to say that who is MHRD or Chancellor to make that, their Calendar is better. The thing is that they are not over and above everybody. They might think that they are two parts because they could do whatever they like. They know they tried to fiddle with the UGC in API scores in response to which the UGC told them to do the things in a right way otherwise they would stop the grants. Since they are demanding with begging bowls, they could not dictate terms. They have to follow rules and regulations. In that account, the letter of Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhri along with the proceeding be sent. Let them decide. His intention is that they should help the proceedings to be started. The matter started around April 2015. They are all responsible.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they are not responsible because they did not act as per the Act. If they had followed the Act and had approached the Chancellor then the committee would have been formed by the Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he needs information as how the Syndicate recommendations dated 21st January for forming a committee reached to the MHRD.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that a direction was given to have a Committee by the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal reiterated as to how the Syndicate recommendations dated 21st January for forming a committee reached to the MHRD.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that it was on a direction.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Senate in its meeting held on 29th January had asked to send the Committee formed by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 21.01.2017 to the Chancellor. But the Chancellor did not pay any attention to that. Then how this Committee reached the Ministry of Human Resource Development as the Chancellor has not sent it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the office of the Chancellor has written the last letter on 14th June. There they had not mentioned anything about this committee. They have rather taken a stand that PUCASH is the competent authority and the second option they had given that they themselves could constitute the committee. This committee which was sent to the Chancellor's office, how it reached the MHRD.

Professor Ronki Ram said that meanwhile the Chancellor's office conveyed to the MHRD vide letter 4th May, 2017 that the existing committee is fully empowered to take up the inquiry into this particular case and creating another committee with the same mandate would be duplication. Now it was added that such duplication was being sent with the approval of the Hon'ble Vice-President and Chancellor, Panjab University. Now the recommendations of the Senate along with the entire discussion of the meeting held on 29th January, 2017 were sent to the Chancellor, Panjab University. Now further the office of the Chancellor with the approval of the Chancellor sent a communication to the Joint Secretary, MHRD.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is written in the letter dated 14th June, 2017. They have not given any reference of this thing.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if today they did not obey the Act, the things would be repeated again and again.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has a request for today and for future also. For future, all the papers instead of selective papers be given to the Syndicate. Whole correspondence exchanged between the University, the Chancellor's office, the MHRD before communicating the correspondence exchanged should be supplied to them because these gaps when would not be there, they need not to spend so much time for that. Now there is no query as to how that committee has reached MHRD.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he does not want to say something new but wants to repeat which would provide an answer to the query of Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that one independent person has said in the meeting of the Senate that "this matter has already been decided by the Senate in 2015 that matter be referred to the Chancellor to constitute a committee. He did not know why it is taking so long. It is the same story. They are at the same place from

where they started. He suggested to refer the matter to the Chancellor and let him make a committee to look into the matter". That is very simple thing.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma intervened to say that all these things are already on record.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that when everything is on record, let it be clear, crystal clear.

Professor Ronki Ram said that Shri Ashok Goyal is asking as to how that letter reached to MHRD. He said that the letter dated 14.06.2017 was referred back to the University. The input from the Chancellor's office through the Joint Secretary was forwarded to the Registrar, Panjab University and the Registrar forwarded the letter to Professor Jaswal who was the Chairperson of the committee (PUCASH). Professor Jaswal sought further clarifications from the MHRD. They decided not to do the inquiry. They further asked the MHRD. The letter was received from the Chancellor's office in the University. They are not conducting that inquiry. They said that they do not obey the Chancellor and the MHRD should give the directions. Again they sent the letter to the MHRD to tell them what to do regarding the Chancellor's letter. Professor Jaswal did not proceed with any inquiry. While he was referring to the letter dated 14.8.2017, Shri Ashok Goyal said that this letter is dated 14.06.2017 and not 14.08.2017. However, Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that another letter was written on 14.08.2017.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that some of the members are having such letters while the same have not been provided to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor before leaving the House in his preamble had said that all the papers have been provided to them, if not, they would get the same. Now the same thing has happened that some papers are with some people but the same are not provided to them.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said all related papers were circulated to all the members.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he was telling that because he was the member of the PUCASH. He is repeating the same thing which he had already said so that Shri Ashok Goyal could get an idea. When the letter came from Chancellor, the matter was referred to the PUCASH but PUCASH questioned that since the Committee was formed as per the letter of MHRD and not on the direction of the Chancellor because according to the Chancellor PUCASH is right committee. As the committee was made in accordance with the MHRD, so clearance for committee is must from MHRD before the matter is taken up. So MHRD was to be provided all the details about the committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that means what he was doubting has been confirmed. The committee which had been constituted on the recommendations of the Syndicate by the Senate and duly sent to the Chancellor does not have the concurrence of the Chancellor and without the concurrence of the Chancellor; the MHRD has sent the approval meaning thereby that what to talk of the appointment by

the employer, it does not have even the endorsement by the employer. What kind of a committee it is?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they are not having the requisite papers. Even the Courts also grant time to provide the required documents.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the stand taken by them that only the Chancellor is the employer, is wrong. This case is a peculiar one. On one side, the employer of the employee is Senate and on the other side against whom the complaint is made is Chancellor. So, they could not leave aside both of them. They could not ask the Chancellor to constitute a committee but could just tell him what has happened. He (Chancellor) asked PUCASH to hold the inquiry. When PUCASH did not hold the inquiry, the Chancellor again wrote to conduct the enquiry. It was a very particular case where they could not ignore both of them. They could not ignore Syndicate, Senate and Chancellor. So it was said in the meeting of the Senate that Senate should recommend to the Chancellor and Chancellor should pass the same. They could not ignore either the Senate or the Chancellor. That is not possible that the matter brought to the notice of Chancellor for constitution of committee without Senate's approval because the employer of the complainant is the Senate. So, it is wrong to say that the Chancellor should form the Committee.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that every member has been given plenty of time and requested them to conclude the discussion.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked who is complainant.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that complainant is a Professor and her employer is Senate. So, they could not ignore the Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Shri Ashok Goyal has explained all the things in detail which he might have forgotten. The first thing that is being talked about that the Chancellor should constitute the committee. The Chancellor was requested in 2015 and in 2016 to constitute a committee. The Chancellor says that he would not constitute the committee. Already the Chancellor had written that Senate would see to it and for that reason only it was processed properly and Senate had formed the committee. So far as the PUCASH is concerned, it is right that in the case of the Vice-Chancellor, the Chancellor is the employer. But the Chancellor's office did never agree for the constitution of the committee. They are saying in their own authority that Panjab University's Senate should look into it. They have said it again and again. Second thing when one is talking about sexual harassment complaint, there is one mechanism i.e. Internal Complaint Committee. As far as the internal complaint committee is concerned, it is PUCASH on which the complainant raised the question again and again, there is no doubt in it. Ultimately, they presumed that complainant is complaining and perhaps PUCASH is also. Shri Ashok Goyal has said right that PUCASH never said that. But somehow MHRD presumed that.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested to provide him a copy of the proceedings of the NCW.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is no doubt that the Chancellor is refusing. Second issue is that complaint has been

made to the MHRD also and ultimately Panjab University is concerned, they could not neglect their version which is not possible because the Panjab University is running on the funds provided by the Government. MHRD has not taken a decision on its own but in consultation with DoPT. As already said by Dr. Ameer Sultana, there is confusion as sometimes they talk about Internal Complaint Committee and sometimes about independent committee. As rightly stated by Shri Goyal, nobody, i.e., either the Chancellor or the MHRD is ready to constitute a committee, they ask the governing body to constitute the committee. Now finally because of that confusion only ultimately whatsoever directions come from the MHRD or Chancellor because they could not refuse the directions from the MHRD or Chancellor. If directions come from the Chancellor that PUCASH would inquire accordingly University request PUCASH to conduct the inquiry. But PUCASH is refusing to conduct the inquiry. MHRD is giving direction that committee would inquire but the Chairperson has refused to chair the inquiry. As Registrar had said in the meeting of Syndicate when the committee was constituted, it might be kept in mind that after the approval of the committee, the members might not refuse. Perhaps the Registrar had taken the verbal consent.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the consent was not taken but it was taken after approval.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the consent was taken after the approval by the Syndicate.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the consent was taken after approval by the Syndicate. The consent was not taken before recommending the names by the Syndicate. After approval by the Syndicate, the consent was taken. Except Justice (Retd.) Jasbir Singh, all had given their consent.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked then how the name of Justice (Retd.) Jasbir Singh was sent.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they would discuss the same in the Senate meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has information that no consent was taken from anybody. It is only after the Senate meeting that the names were sent. Had this 'no' from Justice (Retd.) Jasbir Singh come; his name at least would have been deleted in the meeting of the Senate. Still his name was there in the Committee sent to the Senate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if they had taken the consent from the members, then the committee was right.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that according to him enough discussion has taken place.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he wants to say only two-three lines.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted copies of all the correspondence exchanged and also the proceedings of the NCW. In the absence of that if they want to take the decision, no problem.

They are going to face the same problem that they have been facing till now. If they have to postpone the meeting to tomorrow or they could sit till midnight also. But this is no way that in the absence of papers they want the decision to be taken.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice-Chancellor has said that if they need any paper, out of preamble, he would provide.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the Senate meeting also, he had been requesting that no papers were given. Today also, he has been asking for the papers for the last two hours but it is being said that these would be provided.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is not disagreeing with Shri Ashok Goyal. The obvious thing is that they could neither refuse to MHRD nor to the Chancellor. So, finally Chancellor's office asked MHRD to constitute committee which is mentioned in the letter. Citing reference to that letter, MHRD decided that committee would hold the inquiry. Then, naturally University referred the matter to the committee. The Chairperson of that committee refused to chair the inquiry. The first option is that citing all these quotes, the committee be requested to hold the inquiry. The second option is that as the Chairperson of the committee is reluctant to chair, another chairperson could be appointed after discussing the same and let the Committee enquire into the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is simply saying that until and unless they get all the papers, any decision if taken, would amount to denial of privilege to the members who are responsible for taking the decision.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that they have discussed the matter for such a long time to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have discussed in the absence of the papers.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that all the papers have been put up during various Senate meeting.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that all the papers referred to by the Vice-Chancellor in his preamble are available in the proceedings of various meetings of the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if he points for one paper to be given only, would they agree. For example, in the preamble it is written that the Vice-Chancellor gave a detailed reply in July 2015 in UGC, where is that.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that he (Vice-Chancellor) has not said that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then let they not say that. He further said that then let they not give a sweeping statement that whatever is mentioned in the note, everything has been circulated to the members. Anything which has not been routed through the office of the Registrar and the University, if no such paper is included in the agenda papers of the Senate, he could understand that. But if such other papers have been annexed, how could they say that the Vice-Chancellor has not shared. Whatever has been written by the

complainant before the UGC that was annexed in the agenda of the Senate.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that it is because that came through the MHRD.

Shri Ashok Goyal further said that if it come through the MHRD why did not this annexed in the agenda.

It was replied (by the Registrar) that because the Vice Chancellor statement had not come through the MHRD.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that same day the papers were given in the UGC by both the complainant as well as the accused.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that he has still intact with him the whole bundle which had come from the MHRD along with the letter of Shri Sanjeev Narayan which had the whole bunch of the information as it is which he had produced in the Syndicate meeting and has not changed anything.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since he is not naming the Registrar why did he take it on him. He said that why then one particular letter of the similar nature is appearing in the agenda and other is not appearing whether it is MHRD responsibility or the UGC. He is not supposed to ask them where is that.

Professor Ronki Ram said that now the question is that already the situation has come to some level. They should not stall the process of the inquiry. Let the new members be sent to MHRD along with the letter (of Chairperson) but do not stall the inquiry.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his simple suggestion is that Professor Navdeep Goyal has rightly said though it is not in his knowledge that when the Chancellor has categorically said that he, as an employer, would not make a committee. He (Chancellor) has not said 'no'.

It was informed by the Registrar that there is no communication. The Chancellor has always suggested/directed that PUCASH is correct and if MHRD wants to modify it, change it, they are welcome to do it and give the directions.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier there was one letter. He is not saying that the Chancellor had said so, but the Chancellor had said that PUCASH would enquire.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been said three times but their limitation is that the Act says, irrespective of the fact what is the view of the Chancellor, the Act says that the committee has to be appointed by the Chancellor. They must reiterate and request the Chancellor once again that as per the Act it is he (Chancellor) who is empowered to constitute a Committee. He said that a Committee constituted and recommended by the Syndicate and the Senate was sent through the office of the Chancellor, if it was sent through the office of the Chancellor, because there is no such evidence to show that the Chancellor office has sent it to MHRD. If it was sent directly by the University to the MHRD, whatever way was adopted, that should be told to them also and advise the employer that this is what

they have done and in response to this MHRD has desired to do this and the Chancellor office has desired vide letter of 14th June but the Syndicate and Senate of the Panjab University hold their views and reiterate that as employer it is his goodself who is to constitute the Committee let they try that so that the Act is not violated.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that copies of three legal opinions defining the employer are not attached.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra repeatedly asked for the papers and the ruling.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that the point of Shri Ashok Goyal is well taken. He has listened to them and it would go on record.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the documents are not provided, then the Chair has to give a ruling also.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that for future, the office would be careful.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the thing is that it would not be good at this moment to sit on the judgement over the proceedings and decisions of the Chancellor's office and MHRD's office simply saying because Panjab University Senate is now thinking in its own wisdom. Some committee has been constituted and MHRD has sent them the committee, the internal committee that they sent. They have already started the proceedings. The committee meeting was fixed but due to some confusion the Chairperson of the committee has given her opinion. So now they do the minimum which is that let they not sit on the judgement and simply say that the new Chairperson has been nominated by that committee and send it to the MHRD along with the letter of the Chairperson so that they should not look like as it would be a gossip round in the MHRD and Chancellor's office. He requested that for God's sake, they should start the proceedings as already two years and eight months have passed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked as to who is responsible.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma requested Professor Keshav Malhotra to let Professor Ronki Ram complete his version and after that he could speak.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) is responsible to stall the proceedings. He requested that they should immediately let it do as the hell is not going to fall on this issue. The MHRD is pressing for giving the report within 15 days. The UGC, and the U.T. Administration are also asking for the report whereas they are repeatedly asking for the papers. Want are those papers which they still want. Let they try to see whatever decision would come and have faith in MHRD, Chancellor's office and in their own Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should have faith in the Act passed by the Parliament as nobody is above the Act.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are not above the Government.

Professor Ronki Ram also said that they are not above the Government.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Government is not about the law/Act.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when the letter is sent to them, they have started reviewing the whole office of Chancellor and MHRD.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said if they do not want to answer their queries, they should not call the meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Chair that he take strong exception to the allegations that they have started reviewing the letter written by MHRD and the Vice President's Office. While showing the letter, he said that this is the letter which has been written by the Chairman of the Committee and a meeting has been called for this purpose. It is the Chairperson who has questioned the authority of the MHRD and also questioned the constitution of the Committee as per the Act.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the letter was sent to the Chairperson of the Committee, the word 'in consonance' was written and she just wrote this letter on the basis of that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that to say as to why they are reviewing, he explained that they have the right in the light of the Act and if somebody tries to terrorize them in the name of Government of India, MHRD or in the name of Chancellor, sorry, they are not going to be chased away.

Professor Ronki Ram said they could not be befooled by the name of the highest body of the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they trying to save the dignity and sanctity of the Senate who has clearly said it is the Chancellor who is the employer, it is his prerogative to constitute the Committee. It is he who has been requested to make the Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he (Chancellor) has refused to constitute the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if he has refused, the same should be shown, whereas the Registrar has categorically said that the Chancellor has not refused to constitute the Committee.

Professor Ronki Ram said that MHRD has clearly told that constitute a committee and send the proceedings.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is saying so because the MHRD is not competent.

Since there was a pandemonium, Dr Satish Kumar Sharma said intervened to say that much has been spoken on the issue. Now they could do only two things. One, if they can reach on any consensus, they should tell him. If this is not possible, then he has to go by the rules.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should be given complete papers.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have not been given all the papers despite repeated requests and if the Chair compels them to take a decision in the absence of the papers, it is alright, he is the within his right to give any ruling.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that he could tell if there is any specific letter as there are volumes of files.

Shri Ashok Goyal said whatever has been mentioned in the note, at least those supporting documents should be given.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that annexures should be given.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that it is all in the sequential manner which has been taken from the various proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it is in sequential manner, then it would be easier to find out the proceedings of NCW etc. He further said that he has no problem if it is written that they are taking decision in the absence of papers. He suggested to hold the meeting tomorrow so that they can study the papers. If the decision is to be taken in the absence of the papers, he has no problem, of course he has the right to give his dissent. But he would like to say that they should be given all the papers and given an opportunity to study and then take the decision because he is not for and against anyone. He does not want the University to face the same embarrassment which they have faced in the media at the hands of the Chairperson of the Committee whom they have appointed.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they should not show outside that they are not interested in stalling the proceedings. He requested, let the proceedings be done, whatever papers they need would supplied by the office.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked when these papers would be supplied. He was also supported by Professor Keshav Malhotra. He said to Professor Ronki Ram that he was in the Senate when on 29th January when this Committee was constituted. Was it not assured from the Chair that the relevant papers which have been demanded, specifically the biodata of members which have been recommended by the Senate will be supplied immediately after the meeting. They do not believe that they will supply the papers and take a decision.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that now the last person would speak on the issue.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that if the supply of papers is the only hitch, then they should supply the papers which are being asked for.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma asked Shri Ashok Goyal as to what papers he requires.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he needs all the papers exchanged on this issue.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma asked him (Shri Ashok Goyal) to be specific on which Shri Ashok Goyal said, how could he know about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, show them the papers, they would inspect it. They do not know which papers have been there. So, he said that all the papers which have been mentioned in the note, the legal opinion which have been sought on the decision of the Senate in its meeting of 10th December, 2015.

Professor Ronki Ram said that his dissent be recorded that proceedings are to be done immediately and if at this stage the proceedings are being stalled, they are not going to do this.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said while stopping Professor Ronki Ram said that they could not continue for more time. So, it is better if they could specifically tell something about this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could tell specifically only after watching the file.

Shri Satish Kumar Sharma asked him just tell, what is required as everything is before him (Shri Ashok Goyal) and again asked him what actually is needed. He further said that if one ministry has sent a copy of the complaint to the University and has not sent the copy of the reply of other, how he could give that.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to how this committee has reached in the office of the MHRD because Chancellor office has not sent it to them. Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Chancellor office did not send it to the MHRD, then who has sent it to MHRD to which the Registrar said, he does not know; and what does the letter say the letter says that they still reiterate that it is PUCASH who is competent to do it.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that the Chancellor's office was in direct communication with MHRD, they were having meetings, they were having consultations.

Shri Ashok Goyal stressed that the MHRD has nowhere said to refer to any other letter from the office of the Chancellor except the letter of 14th June. That means the Committee has not gone from the employer to MHRD as they are believing.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have referred to that letter only.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested that they should read the letter of 14th June where the Chancellor office has said that the PUCASH

should hold the enquiry or the MHRD should form its own Committee, But the MHRD approved that Committee which they have formed by them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is one more letter which he referred to as letter No. 1514/R/DS dated 21st August, 2017 which was written by the Registrar to MHRD.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is what he has been saying and he required this letter. This means his doubt that this letter has not gone through the Chancellor. It is the University who has got it approved from the MHRD. Shri Ashok Goyal further said that they should be provided these papers and it is not necessary to do it today itself. It would put aspersion on them also.

The Registrar read out a letter No. 1514-14/R/DS dated 21st August, 2017 which was written by the Registrar to Venkata Shastri and he said that he will read it out, however, Shri Ashok Goyal requested to see that letter himself.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if he (Registrar) is reading from a letter which has been written by MHRD and the letter has been sent from the University, he asked, does he (Registrar) not think that this letter should have been circulated to the members of the Syndicate who have to take a decision.

The Registrar said that he has not circulated it to anybody to which Shri Ashok Goyal said, why? The Registrar said that there are so many other letters.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that if they want to be happy, he can read it for them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wants to inspect the file and thereafter only he can decide which papers are required to take the necessary decision.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said then it would take five years to decide the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, why it will take five years, give him the documents and call the meeting on day after tomorrow.

The Registrar again read out a letter available with him which states that "you are once again requested that necessary confirmation may please be given to allow PUCASH to proceed with the enquiry at the earliest as prescribed time limit is gone" This was instructed by the Syndicate. Syndicate had asked him that he (Registrar) will write to expedite the matter and tell whether it is valid or not. The Syndicate which was Chaired by Professor Pam Rajput had given him the directive to write to them again whether it is competent enough or not because the Chancellor office is saying this. So, he has communicated his correspondence there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University has not sent any letter to the MHRD to approve this Committee. The Chancellor office has also not sent any letter to MHRD.

Professor Ronki said, how do they know whether the Chancellor office has sent any letter in this regard to MHRD or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said they must be knowing about it as they are giving reference of the University letter. If they have given the reference of their letter, then where the employer comes into the picture. Why they are saying that it was recommended and endorsed by the employer? He further said that the decision regarding appointment of Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary was taken in the meeting of the Senate held on 21st January and the letter which he (Registrar) is referring to has been written to MHRD on 17th August, meaning thereby that seven months after, the Senate took the decision to recommend this Committee under Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary. The University is writing to MHRD that they should be allowed to go ahead with the PUCASH.

Some members pointed out that this was with reference of the Chancellor office letter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Chancellor nowhere has said that to go through this.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that in March they have asked. Thereafter, on 4th of May again, the Chancellor Office has communicated to Ms. Ishita Roy in MHRD stating again that PUCASH is competent enough. Thereafter, it is again reiterated in the month of June that PUCASH is there, but here he modified, but should they want to have any changes to the PUCSAH. If so, please do it, but that should be routed through the MHRD and then come to the competent authority. So, this is what they have communicated. The Registrar said that they have been following it. They have forwarded the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate to the Chancellor's Office as well a copy of it to the MHRD also. So, they would have come to know of it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it means that the University got the leverage on the directions of the Chancellor or on the directions of MHRD or any other authority to go and supersede the decision of the Senate which was taken in January 2015.

Professor Ronki Ram requested Shri Ashok Goyal not to say this as this is not the issue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked, what is the definition of employer.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that Chancellor is the employer, but Chancellor is seeking some kind of strength of MHRD, DoPT or whatever, he wants to take of this. So, he wrote the MHRD and asked them to see it and vet it and thereafter the MHRD gave them the directions to do it. Ultimately, the authority lies with the employer only.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he also knows mathematics. The letter was sent from here on 7th March and in May, the Chancellor office has written to the University, on 14th June they (Chancellor's Office) wrote to the MHRD. It took seven months.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if the Chancellor's office wanted to put strength, the letter should have come to them from the Chancellor's Office which was also endorsed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to why they were shying away from getting the Committee appointed from the employer and the employer is the Chancellor.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they should send a letter to the Chancellor stating the meeting of the Syndicate was held and a new Chairperson was appointed. It should also be mentioned that there is an opinion from the Syndicate that MHRD should get it from the Chancellor's Office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would supplement Professor Ronki Ram by suggesting that if it is to be written then they should write to the Chancellor because ultimately he is the employer. He is to take the decision whether it is MHRD or PMO, they are nobody to guide them. To tell us that with reference to a letter written by them in August 2017, this is the communication which they have received from the MHRD. Accordingly they have requested the Committee so recommended and approved by the MHRD, the Chairperson has pointed out these discrepancies. To consider her letter, a meeting of the Syndicate was called and some of the members were of the opinion that the decision to appoint a Committee has to be taken by the Chancellor in his capacity as employer. And some were of the opinion that MHRD is competent to approve the Committee so that they can go ahead with it and he (Chancellor) be requested to give his consent.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that instead of writing 'some members' they should write two members to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that they may write one member.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that he has listened to every member very carefully and requested that now they should clinch the issue. There could be two things. One is that with a consensus, they could clinch the issue which is much graceful and this is the civilized way of settling the issue. Secondly, he would not crush anybody's opinion, everybody has the right to give his opinion and he value the opinion of everybody. There are certain guidelines, how to clinch the issue in a situation where they have divergent opinion. He said that he requests all the members with folded hands, in the beginning, all of them wanted that they should work to protect and to improve the image of Panjab University. So, he humbly requested that in case if they can have consensus on it, he would be grateful. He gave five minutes to the members to discuss the issue among themselves and said that they would meet after five minutes. After that, he would go by the Calendar.

Professor Ronki Ram said that before this, he would like to say that as told by Shri Ashok Goyal they should write that the House has met in a situation which has arrived out of the letter and the House is of the opinion that the Ministry of Human Resource Development under the guidance of that, the Committee which was constituted is going to work, but due to this urgency, it has to be reconstituted and now the House is of the opinion that some members of the Committee i.e. Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra, that this act of MHRD has been, to their view

point, not in consonance with the Act. Thereby, MHRD is requested to that if the Committee is going to proceed, before that if it consider appropriate, the opinion or consent of the Chancellor's Office has to be taken, but this decision of today of the Syndicate is nowhere to stall the proceedings to be done and let the proceedings start.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma adjourned the meeting and said that they would assemble after five minutes.

When the meeting resumed after five minutes, Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that the Registrar wants to read some lines and requested to listen to him.

The Registrar said that in his opinion there are certain things which they need to comply whatever Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary has also observed in her letter. In compliance of that, first is the Chairperson i.e. Presiding Officer. The second issue is that there should not be less than two members from amongst the employees, preferably, committed to the cause of women, that has to be ensured that they are amongst the employees. In addition to that, they can have more members and there is no embargo on that. The members which they already have, they may continue to be there. They can add on two members who are amongst their employees and who are fulfilling this clause. The members can suggest the names and they can include them. The third one is that one member from amongst the NGO (Non-Government Organisation). That clause has to be clarified. If it is there, then the members may replace or they make it the same. This can be thought of so that the composition of the Committee could be sent to the Chancellor's office for approval after the Senate has gone through it. He said that after the 21st meeting of the Senate, if they recommend it, they will send it to the Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has strong reservation if they intend to include this in the agenda of Senate meeting of 21st because on one side they are calling a special meeting of the Syndicate, though there is provision, for discussing this issue and the Senate for which there is a provision of special meeting, there they are trying to include this also.

The Registrar said that it can be taken as additional item.

However, Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no such provision and he asked the Registrar to read the relevant regulation. He asked, why they are hurrying on this issue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked if the college issues are not important.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that there was a limitation of 90 days which has been given by the MHRD to sort out the issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that two special meetings of the Senate could be held on the same day.

The Registrar said that on the same day they can have another meeting of the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that had they intended to expedite the process, they would have right from the day one, proceeded in a manner what they were expected to be.

Professor Ronki Ram requested Shri Ashok Goyal that now there is a new Syndicate and they should now start in a proper manner and clinch the issue by forgetting what has happened in the past.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Registrar would like to tell something and requested him to say what he would like to say.

The Registrar said that one/half of the total member shall be women and requested that this aspect has to be taken care of then to be amended.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Registrar) is right but let him tell that in the Syndicate of January 2017, it was discussed that before recommending it to the Senate, let them should verify and confirm that with the Act. Everybody said that they should verify it, but unfortunately, it was not verified and confirmed. Same thing went to Senate, there it was said that it should be in consonance with the Act and he remembers that an objection was raised in the Senate that Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary is not working anywhere. One of the learned members also suggested to replace her with another IAS Officer who is working and still in service. But, nobody took note of anything, except that what are the facts, whether by way of verification or confirmation, this is to go. Let them do not do that. Now he (Registrar) is saying that they should ensure that the Act is followed in letter and spirit. Because today, according to him (Registrar), leave aside Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary who has pointed out, even before she pointed out, the University has written a letter that the Committee constituted is in consonance with the Act. He asked, is it the right statement?

The Registrar clarified that whatever has been written, it was resolved by the Syndicate. The Syndicate has resolved that it is in consonance with the Act and the same thing has communicated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Syndicate has not said it and they can read the proceedings of the Syndicate. The Syndicate has said that they should see whether the Committee is as per the Act. He said that he remembers that Professor Navdeep Goyal has said that they should see whether the Committee is in consonance with the Act.

Professor Navdeep Goyal accepted that he has said it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that nobody checked it and the names were sent. He further said that the name of one more member was also added. In the Senate also it was asked to check whether the names are in consonance of the Act, but nobody bothered and the names were sent.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan requested to make the Committee as per the Act, but the Committee should be formed.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma requested Shri Prabhjit Singh that if he has some proposal, he could speak for a minute or two and requested not to take more time.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if all the members agree, they should suggest the names which needed to be replaced. The

suggestion of the Registrar regarding inclusion of women members to the tune of one half of the total members of the Committee, be also taken care of. The names along with the letter (typed copy) of Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, be sent to the Chancellor for approval, only then it would be in consonance with the Act. He further clarified that they should replace the Chairperson and the names of two members, one in place of Justice (Retd.) Jasbir Singh and one senior-most woman Professor from the University, be added. It would suffice the purpose of approval of the Committee by the employer which would also be in consonance with the Act. A copy of the same be also sent to the MHRD for information. He expected that it would solve the problem, otherwise, there is no way out.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that everybody has listened to the hon'ble member (Shri Prabhjit Singh) and wanted to know the opinion of Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he does not agree on a minor point that they have not come prepared with an idea that here the Committee is to be reconstituted. They had come with an idea that only letter is to be considered and it is not possible for them to suggest any name that to keeping in mind that whatsoever name is suggested, that is in consonance with the Act.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have come here to consider the letter, but this is not the only thing that the members be changed. This is not the agenda. Had it been like this, then they would have come with some names in mind.

Shri Prabhjit Singh requested that he did not name any member and they could even now suggest the names.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if they have to name any member, they should at least know what is his background, what his biodata, who will give them all this.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if they do not have biodata, it will again be the same thing as it was earlier. While referring to the letter of Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, he said that it is written "Again 'brief particulars' of the members (list on p. 5 of the minutes of the meetings, do not indicate that any of the members has the familiarity with the issues relating to sexual harassment".

Shri Prabhjit Singh requested the members to tell if the proposal given by him is okay with them or not.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma also wanted to know as to whether they accept the proposal given by Shri Prabhjit Singh.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Ronki Ram, Principal Anita Kaushal and Dr. Ameer Sultana and some other members endorsed the proposal.

Shri Prabhjit Singh further said that if they have any other name, they can suggest it.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that the proposal given by Shri Prabhjit Singh is approved and they should adopt it.

Dr. Satish Kumar requested Dr. R.K. Mahajan to give a name if he has in mind.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he would like to suggest two names. He further said that does not know these persons, but he has just read about them somewhere. The two names suggested by him for appointment as Chairperson of the Committee are as under:

- (i) Mrs. Jyoti Arora, Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Government of Haryana, Chandigarh
- (ii) Mrs. Navraj Sandhu, Additional Chief Secretary (Departments of Cooperation and Vigilance), Government of Haryana, Chandigarh; and

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he has suggested the above two names and the members could see to it and approve any one of the names.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired about the persons suggested by Dr. R.K. Mahajan as to which office they belong to which was explained to him by Shri R.K. Mahajan.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they should forward both the names to the Chancellor and it is for the Chancellor to approve any one of them. He further asked as to who is the senior-most Professor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that Professor Meenakshi Malhotra is the senior most Professor.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that they do not discuss the personalities. The Registrar would check it from the seniority list and put the name of the senior most Professor in the Committee. The person may from law or from Commerce or from somewhere else and they should also consult the calendar.

Professor Ashok Goyal said that they have appoint two persons and suggested that one women Professor could be appointed from Law. He further suggested that the Chairperson of Law Department may be appointed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that senior most women Professor from law should be appointed.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu suggested that the person who is currently heading the PUCASH, he/she could also be appointed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Chairperson of PUCASH cannot be appointed as a member of this Committee.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the same problem would again emerge.

Professor Navdeep Goyal again suggested that the Chairperson of Law Department could be appointed.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma asked Shri Prabhjit Singh as to what names have been suggested for appointment as Chairperson and members of the Committee.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said two names i.e. Ms. Jyoti Arora and Ms. Navraj Sandhu have been given for appointment as Chairperson. They are Secretaries in the Government of Haryana. The third name to replace a member is the senior most woman Professor of the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Professor Shalini Marwaha is the Chairperson of Law Department to which Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he should not suggest about the member by name. Shri Navdeep Goyal then suggested that they could say it as Chairperson, Law Department.

Shri Ashok Goyal said they should say that one member could senior most Professor of Law.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the senior most Professor of Law has not done the enquiry earlier, then why they should include that name again.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that her name should be included as a member of the Committee.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that they should leave the name of Professor from Law and suggest the other name. He said that they could also appoint three persons.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that one persons from the NGO could also be appointed.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma informed that a name already exists in the list from the NGO.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested to appoint a senior most Professor from the UIIS.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said why they ask to appoint a senior most Professor from the UIIS. They should appoint a person who is senior most Professor in the University.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is unable to understand that if there is so much discussion in the constitution of the Committee, then how much time would it take to discuss the report of the Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Dr. Ameer Sultana has told him a name which is more appropriate i.e. the Chairperson of current PUCASH for appointment on this Committee as one of the members. Professor Navdeep Goyal further said that the names be sent after verifying them.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma informed that they are adopting four names and asked Shri Prabhjit Singh to read the names.

Shri Prabhjit Singh read out the names of the persons which were suggested by the members. They included, Ms. Jyoti Arora, Principal Secretary to Govt. of Haryana and Ms. Navraj Sandhu, Additional Chief Secretary, Govt. of Haryana. Any one of them could be appointed as Chairperson of the Committee. Secondly, one senior most women Professor of the University and Chairperson of PUCASH

for their appointment as members of the Committee. He said that he does not know their names, but this should be got approved from the Chancellor. The Chancellor may also be requested the he can add or delete any name, if he deems fit so that there should not be any confusion. It would also meet the requirement of approval by the Chancellor required for the constitution of Sexual Harassment Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as regards appointment of one member from the NGO, the clarification as told by madam (Dr. Ameer Sultana) may also be attached with the letter to be written to the Chancellor.

When Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma announced to close the meeting, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to say something which was allowed. Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma asked him if he would like to suggest some name, he should convey it in just 2-3 minutes.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he does not want to suggest anything, except that his dissent be recorded because the suggested names are not in consonance with the Sexual Harassment Act.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that his dissent be also recorded on the same ground. He said that they should give free hand to the Chancellor.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma asked, how the names are not as per the Act.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when he (Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma) is not ready to listen. He said that the suggested names are not in consonance with the Act.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma asked him to tell the names to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that the names have been read, what he has to tell about it. He again said that the suggested names are not in consonance with the Act.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that all the members have expressed their opinion and he is thankful to them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Chancellor should be give free hand.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should also clinch the issue about holding the special meeting of the Senate meeting on 21st of January, 2018.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that special meeting of the Senate cannot be held on 21st January as the 21st meeting of the Senate is to be held to consider the issues relating to colleges. However, they could hold the special meeting on 22nd January.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that he is Chairing this meeting only for this item. For rest of the things, the Vice Chancellor would come and decide about it. It is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor whether he would like to place this item before the Senate meeting or to hold another special Senate meeting.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that if all this item is to be included in the agenda of Senate meeting of 21st January, then it should be included as a last item.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that this item would be considered in a separate meeting of the Senate on 21st January.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that he would convey their sentiments to the Vice Chancellor. He specially requested the Registrar to convey their sentiments to the Vice Chancellor that the agenda already circulated must be taken up and enough time should be given to the college people to discuss all the points.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it be recorded that whatever decision has been taken, though they have recorded their dissent, those were taken in the absence of the papers required by them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he wanted to get noted three things i.e. one, they have not been supplied complete documents,, two, they have not been given the copy of legal opinion, three they have not been supplied the correspondence, four, they have not been given NCW proceedings. He further requested that free hand be given to the Chancellor.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu requested to hold the normal meeting of the Senate in this month.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma informed them that the Vice Chancellor is coming soon, they can convey their concerns to him about the meeting of the Senate.

After winding up discussion on the item, Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma requested the Registrar to call the Vice Chancellor to Chair the meeting for the rest of time.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) it be recommended to the Senate that the Committee recommended by Syndicate on 21.01.2017 to look into the specific complaint(s) of a Senate member against Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University be reconstituted by substituting the Chairperson of the Committee, Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, Former Chief Secretary, Haryana, by any one of the following senior women IAS officers from Haryana Government:
 - (iii) Mrs. Navraj Sandhu, Additional Chief Secretary (Departments of Cooperation and Vigilance), Government of Haryana, Chandigarh; and
 - (iv) Mrs. Jyoti Arora, Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Government of Haryana, Chandigarh

Further, following two additional women members be included in the above Committee:

- (i) Senior most woman Professor of the University namely, Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, Dean of University Instruction, Panjab University; and
- (ii) Current Chairperson of Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH) namely, Professor Manvinder Kaur, Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies & Development.

Rest of the members as recommended by the Syndicate dated 21st January, 2017 may remain the same, except Justice (Retd.) Jasbir Singh, who had expressed his inability.

- (2) The reconstituted Committee as proposed, be sent to the Chancellor for approval with any deletion or further inclusion, as may be deemed appropriate by the Hon'ble Chancellor.
- (3) a copy of the letter to be sent to the Chancellor be also forwarded to the Ministry of Human Resource Development for information.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra recorded their dissent, as in their opinion, the names suggested for the Committee were not in consonance with the provisions of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013. They reiterated their stand articulated in the Senate meeting of 29.01.2017 that Chancellor should appoint the Committee to look into the specific complaint(s) in this case.

(G.S. Chadha)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Satish Kumar)

After the conclusion of the discussion on the Item C-2, the Vice Chancellor joined to Chair the meeting for the rest of the time.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed the Vice Chancellor that discussion regarding holding the meeting of the Senate was going on and Dr. Satish Sharma has suggested them to discuss this issue with him (Vice Chancellor). He said that the meeting of the Senate being held on 21st January, is a special meeting and only one issue could be discussed in that meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not a special meeting for one issue. In this meeting all the college related issues would be discussed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in the previous meeting of the Senate, it was decided to hold a special meeting for college issues.

The Vice Chancellor said that their mandate is to consider the matters relating to colleges, so there are several matters. One was regarding extension to the Principals. Another was Inspection Committees/Selection Committees which were sent to the colleges. So there are 4-5 items. One issue relates to the CMJ University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that first they hold the Senate meeting already scheduled and thereafter they could hold the second special meeting of the Senate on the same day on the present issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since most of the members would come to attend the Senate meeting, the special meeting could be held on the same day itself.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu requested that in the meeting convened on the issues of the Colleges, the zero hour should be kept for discussion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the zero hour discussion has already been held in the Senate meeting and there is no need of it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the meeting be convened at 11.00 a.m. as nowadays it is a foggy weather. He further said that the information about the Selection Committees should also be placed before the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be placed. He was not stopping the members to discuss the issues which they wanted to discuss. It is his job to facilitate the discussion. Whatever issues related to the Colleges the members wanted to discuss would be put together in that meeting of the Senate.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu enquired whether the regular meeting of the Syndicate in January would be held or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would not be possible to hold the regular meeting of the Syndicate in January as the meeting of the Senate is scheduled to be held on 21.01.2018 and thereafter for a week, he would be away as on 29.01.2018 there is the inaugural function of India Institute at the University of Birmingham. The

Chancellor of the University has specifically invited the Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University for the inauguration of India Institute along with the High Commissioner of India in United Kingdom. So, he would be there. During the last three years, they have signed MoUs with the University of Nottingham and Nottingham Trent University. So, the visitors from these universities are also coming for the inaugural. The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Nottingham is retiring very soon and he has invited him (Vice-Chancellor) to visit Nottingham and take stock of whatever they have done for the last four years. He has to spend a day at University of Nottingham and one day at Nottingham Trent University. Then the London School of Management Education is organizing a conference at Panjab University in April 2018 whose Vice-Chancellor has invited him along with the High Commissioner of India in London to sign the MoU on 5th February, 2018. He would be back to Chandigarh on 6th February, 2018. So, from 29th January to 6th February, 2018, he would not be available. Since the agenda is to be sent 7 days prior to the meeting, they could hold the Syndicate meeting on 17th February and if there is some left over agenda, they could continue the meeting on 18th February, 2018.

A couple of members requested that the meeting could be held on 24th and 25th February, 2018.

Finally, it was decided that the meeting of the Syndicate would be held on 24th February, 2018 at 10.00 a.m. and if some items are left, the meeting would continue on 25th February.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to when they would hold the meeting of the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that the Senate meeting could be held on 11th or 18th March, 2018.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate to be held on 24th February would be ready and placed before the Senate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the concern of Shri Ashok Goyal is that the minutes of the Syndicate to be held on 24th February should be placed before the Senate meeting to be held in March, 2018.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that to be on the safer side, the meeting of the Senate be held on 25th March, 2018.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the meetings of the Faculties are also to be held with the Senate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh suggested that the meeting of the Senate be fixed on Sunday as some of the members are working and the meetings of the Faculties be fixed on 26th and 27th March.

Finally, it was decided that the meeting of the Senate would be held on 25th March, 2018 and the meetings of the Faculties would be held on 26th and 27th March, 2018.

Thereafter, the Vice-Chancellor read out the index of the proposed agenda for the meeting of the Senate to be held on 21st

January, 2018 at 11.00 a.m. He said that the information on the Selection Committees would also be placed as an agenda item. The remaining items of the enquiries conducted by the CVO would also be discussed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the CVO reports is not an issue related with the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then the Item C-71 be deleted from this agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that all the issues other than the Colleges should be deleted from this agenda.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Professor Navdeep Goyal also endorsed this.

The Vice-Chancellor agreed to it and said that they would not consider the other items and would defer the same in the meeting itself.

This was agreed to.

Shri Prabhjit Singh requested that all the documents related with the issue of CMJ University be provided to arrive at a conclusion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has directed the office to provide all the related documents.

Shri Ashok Goyal, regarding the documents related with the CMJ University, shared with the Vice-Chancellor that there are some documents in the University records but he did not know for what reasons, the same have never been placed before the Syndicate and the Senate. He was utterly shocked that whatever he was speaking on hearsay, in fact, is part of the University record.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to provide the related documents whatever he has with him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has nothing like that. All the documents are available in the University record.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has never said that anything should be hidden.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not saying so, that the Vice-Chancellor has said it. He said that why the office in such a sensitive issue has not provided to the Vice-Chancellor all the relevant papers when the issue was being discussed in January, 2015. As said by Shri Prabhjit Singh, it be ensured that all the documents should be provided in the meeting of the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would ensure it that whatever documents which are not being sent with the agenda of the Senate, are sent again to the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how he could know what documents would be provided. He requested that he should be allowed to see the file.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) could see the files, he has not refused it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he never goes through any file unless and until the instructions in this regard are given. He even does not come to the administrative office.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to have a look at whatever files he wanted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the second special meeting of the Senate be held on 21.01.2018 itself on the day of earlier scheduled meeting. They could discuss the issue within a short period.

Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan said that they could hold it at the end on that day itself.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is right but it would be considered as a separate meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a special meeting is being convened as per the decision of the Senate. Professor Navdeep Goyal is right. If at all the proposal of Professor Navdeep Goyal is to be accepted for a special meeting of the Senate to be called, he had said it explaining in the Senate also that there is a specific procedure of calling a special meeting of the Senate given in the Panjab University Calendar. Why they are again committing mistakes after mistakes.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that if they have to convene a special meeting, it should be convened as per the provision of the Calendar.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no problem if the meeting is convened as per the provisions of the Calendar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could hold the special meeting on the same day itself.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a special meeting could not be held on 21.01.2018.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that if time permits, they would hold the meeting and if there is shortage of time, then they might not hold the meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are habitual in violating the Calendar time and again. The Vice-Chancellor has stated time and again that his intention is not to violate the Calendar. So they have to help and assist in ensuring that the Calendar is not violated.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this item could be placed before the Senate with its consent.

The Vice-Chancellor said that on 21.01.2018, there is a meeting of the Senate and they are just holding a special sitting of

the Senate where issues related to the Colleges would be taken up, then who says that they could not take up this thing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is his (Vice-Chancellor) view and whatever he wanted, he could do.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as per the Calendar urgent business brought forward by the Syndicate but not included in the agenda could be discussed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is for the ordinary meeting of the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the meeting on 21.01.2018 would be in continuance of an ordinary meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now the Vice-Chancellor has started reading the Calendar, but when in the morning he had enquired why the special meeting of the Syndicate had been called, then the Vice-Chancellor had said that the matter was urgent. Everything is mentioned in the Calendar as to how a special meeting could be convened.

(G.S. Chadha)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR