

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the **SYNDICATE** held on **Sunday, 14th October 2018** at **11.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

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

Professor Ronki Ram, Director Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh and DPI (Colleges), Punjab could not attend the meeting.

At the very outset the Vice Chancellor while addressing the Hon'ble members of the august House, officials of the University and supporting staff of the University congratulated each and everyone on account of Foundation Day celebrations held on 13.10.2018 and that they have completed today a very glorious year of journey since 1882. He is very hopeful that with their blessings and with experience, he shall be in a position to move forward in an accelerated mode.

Condolence resolution

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

- i) Prof. S.P.Chawla, who had an illustrious career in the Department of Mathematics on October 6, 2018.
- ii) Bibi Satnam Kaur ji, mother of Professor B.S.Bhoop, UIPS on October 10, 2018.
- iii) Principal S.S.Randhawa, Former Fellow of our university on 13.10.2018.

At this point of time Shri Satish Sharma informed about the sad and sudden demise of Professor L.S. Chawla, former Vice Chancellor of Baba Farid University of Health Science, Principal of Dayanand Medical College, Ludhiana and former Fellow of Panjab University. He remained on the Senate of Panjab University for three terms. He requested the Vice Chancellor to convey his family the condolences of the Syndicate to which the Vice Chancellor said his name be also included in the Vice Chancellor's statement and accordingly his name was included.

- iv) Professor L.S. Chawla, former Vice Chancellor of Baba Farid University of Health Science, Principal of Dayanand Medical College, Ludhiana and former Fellow of Panjab University, on 31.8.2018

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Prof. S.P. Chawla, Bibi Satnam Kaur ji, Principal S.S .Randhawa and Professor L.S. Chawla and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that-
- i) Our university has been accredited for swimming Sports/discipline under Khelo India Talent Development Program for a period of one year by the Ministry of Youth Affairs & Sports, Government of India.
 - ii) Dashmesh Shooting Academy of Dashmesh Girls college campus, VPO Badal, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib has been accredited for Shooting (Residential) Sports/discipline under Khelo India Talent Development Program for a period of one year by the Ministry of Youth Affairs & Sports, Government of India. This college is the only college from the North India region having been selected and is already known for its sports activities having won many national and international medals. Their student Avneet Kaur Sidhu, an Arjuna Awardee, was the first women Olympian in shooting from North India and bagged Commonwealth Gold Medal.

At this point of time Shri Satish Sharma said that they should congratulate the Principal of the college as well as the team working with him for this notable achievement.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should also congratulate the whole University fraternity for getting this chance. He was told that they are among the six institutions and this one has been given to their University.

This was agreed to

- iii) Government of Assam has expressed its willingness to set up a Shrimanta Shankardeva Chair with a one-time provision of Rs. 5 crore in our university.

At this point of time, Shri Satish Sharma said that they should appreciate the efforts of the Vice Chancellor as he has been managing all this in a very short time

- iv) Dr. Indu Pal Kaur, Prof. of Pharmaceutics, UIPS, Panjab University, Chandigarh has been conferred

- the Women Scientist Award 2018 by the organisation of Pharmaceutical Producers of India.
- v) Former Prof. and Head of Hindi Dept. Dr. Dharam Paul Maini has been conferred Dindyal Upadhaya award in the field of languages.
 - vi) Dr. A.K. Singh, an alumnus of the Bio Physics department of our university has been appointed Director General, Life Sciences of DRDO.
 - vii) Youth delegation from Sri Lanka visited our university on 13.10.2018 under the International Youth Exchange Programme between India & Sri Lanka organised by the Ministry of Youth Affairs & Sports, Govt. of India for inter cultural tradition/heritage sharing.
 - viii) Ms. Mani Kamboj of P.U. Campus, student of University institute of Legal Studies, represented India in the 18th Asian Roller Skating Championship (Asia-Oceania Rink Hockey) held from 4th September to 13th September 2018 Held at China. She was the Best scorer of the championship and scored 29 goals.
 - ix) Dr. G.S. Gupta, Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Biophysics has been honoured with a most prestigious Bharat Ratna Dr. A.P.J. Abdul Kalam Excellence Award of India by India International Friendship Society on September 29, 2018 in recognition of his meritorious services and outstanding contribution in the field of scientific research and education.
 - x) Dr. J.S. Sehrawat, Dept. of Anthropology has received a grant of Rs.30.58 lacs from Science and Engineering Research Board, Department of Science and Technology for the project on biological profiling of the Ajnala remains.
 - xi) The University Business School Alumni Association has donated Rs.11 lacs to the University Business School for the purchase of new furniture.
 - xii) Ministry of Human Resource Development has sanctioned a grant of Rs.6.63 crore to the Panjab University for setting up a Centre for Academic Leadership and Educational Management (CALEM) out of which an amount of Rs.2.42 crore has been released.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is also very very prestigious programme. They are the sixth and only one in north India and the others were bagged by the Southern States. These are things which they got with their blessing and support and for that he congratulated every Fellow for boosting the moral support and togetherness for the

betterment, further growth and further development of the entire University.

RESOLVED: That –

1. Felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Dr. Indu Pal Kaur, Prof. of Pharmaceutics, UIPS, Panjab University, Chandigarh has been conferred the Women Scientist Award 2018 by the organisation of Pharmaceutical Producers of India.
 - (ii) Former Prof. and Head of Hindi Dept. Dr. Dharam Paul Maini on having been conferred Dindyal Upadhaya award in the field of languages;
 - (iii) Dr. A.K. Singh, an alumnus of the Bio Physics Department of our university on having been appointed Director General, Life Sciences of DRDO
 - (iv) Ms. Mani Kamboj of P.U. Campus, student of University institute of Legal Studies, on being representing India in the 18th Asian Roller Skating Championship (Asia-Oceania Rink Hockey) held from 4th September to 13th September 2018 at China.
 - (v) Dr. G.S. Gupta, Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Biophysics on having been honoured with a most prestigious Bharat Ratna Dr. A.P.J. Abdul Kalam Excellence Award of India by India International Friendship Society on September 29, 2018; in recognition of his meritorious services and outstanding contribution in the field of scientific research and education
 - (vi) Dr. J.S. Sehrawat, Dept. of Anthropology on having been received a grant of Rs.30.58 lacs from Science and Engineering Research Board, Department of Science and Technology for the project on biological profiling of the Ajnala remains.
2. Information contained in Vice Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (i), (ii), (iii), (vii), (xi) and (xii) be noted and approved.

At this point of time Shri Prabhjit Singh welcomed the Registrar, Professor Karamjeet Singh in his first meeting of the Syndicate. He thanked the Vice Chancellor for giving him the chance. He said that there is an item in the ratification items regarding the Registrar and requested that it should be passed. He hoped that under his guidance, the University would excel.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha also appreciated the choice of the Vice Chancellor and he said that Professor Karamjeet Singh is such a person who has been a teacher in the College, a union member and also remained a Fellow in the Panjab University. Professor Karamjeet Singh has also acted as Director of Academic Staff College besides remaining on many other administrative posts. He has in-depth knowledge of everything. He

once again appreciated the choice of the Vice Chancellor and hoped that the other posts like Dean College Development Council would also be filled soon as the University has lot of pending work to do.

All the other members also endorsed the feeling expressed by Shri Prabhjit Singh and Principal Surinder Singh Sangha.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested the Vice Chancellor to throw some light on the Shrimanta Shankardeva Chair being set up by the Government of Assam.

The Vice Chancellor read out the letter received from the Government of Assam, Department of Higher Education & Technical Education which reads as under:

“It is my pleasure to inform you that the Government of Assam is setting up the Shrimanta Shankardeva Chair in the leading Universities of the Country.

The Chair in the University will focus on the literary and cultural contributions of the great 15th - 16th Century Saint-Scholar Shrimanta Shankradeva in the contemporary life of Assamese Society. The Chair will also take up extensive research and study on the neo-vaishnavite movement in the North-East of India propagated by Shankardeva. The broad aim is to raise consciousness about the enlightened contribution of the saint outside the periphery of the Assam and the country.

Government of Assam proposes to set up a Chair in your esteemed University with a onetime provision of Rs. 5 (five) Crores. Therefore, I request you kindly to look into the matter personally so that the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) may be prepared and funds may be released to the University.”

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to give their views.

Shri Satish Sharma asked in which department this Chair would be set up. Is it history?

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be seen later on.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to see about the recurring expenditure. Will they be able to meet the recurring expenditure out of this amount or it has to be managed separately or for how long it would be run with 5 crores? This could be considered and approved only when the details are there.

The Vice Chancellor said that in this regard he would like to supplement here that since they have to sign the MoU many things would be clear at that time. He had a talk with the Government of Assam and they would send a delegation to their University. It is an opening.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should agree in principle provided it is feasible from all angles.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is a very good effort through which they would get information about Shrimanta Shankradeva. There are many great personalities in Punjab but they are known only at the regional level. He said that they can also reciprocate to the Assam Government by setting up such Chairs in North-East India in the name of great personalities of Punjab etc. This would also strengthen the image of their great personalities.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should request the Punjab Government to reciprocate.

Shri Satish Sharma said that it is a welcome step.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is very good for national integration.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 14th October 2018

The Vice Chancellor said that they have set up such Chairs in number of Universities such as Central Universities, IITs and Central Institutes.

The members said that it is because of the efforts of the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that in honour of Shri Guru Nanak Dev Ji, a Chair in the name of Guru Nanak Dev Ji could be set up in the University of Assam.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should send a request to the Government of Punjab in this regard.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that before taking up the agenda item he would like to know about the action taken on a decision taken in the last meeting of the Syndicate. Regarding the Aurobindo Colleges, they have decided that after taking the legal opinion, notice of disaffiliation can be served to them. He wanted to know whether the said legal opinion has been received or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are some other things also which have to be seen.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that a decision in this regard was taken, so the legal opinion, whatever it may be, should be forwarded.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said he wanted to say something about the notice issued for the meeting of this Syndicate meeting. In the notice meeting, it has been written that Item No. C-2 to C-21, Item No. C-47 to C-50, Item No. C-55 to C-58 (Total items 27) were withdrawn from the Agenda of the Syndicate meeting dated 7.7.2018 as the action had been taken by the former Vice Chancellor, under Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar volume 1, 2007 and these items have already been considered by the Syndicate on 27.08.2018 as Ratification Items. He said that in respect of the ratification items, many members have said that in number of appointments, no time-table was enclosed. How it has been done? Though the matter has been discussed three times in the Syndicate, but the matter is still standing there. First the former, Vice Chancellor was not authorised to do this. He (Vice Chancellor) has authorisation for one year only. His question is still the same as to how the former Vice Chancellor has done it. Secondly, when there was no time-table, how they can ratify the item. Now in the notice it has been written that these items have been ratified. What is the purpose of that, what was discussed here.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that whatever Shri Prabhjit Singh is saying is right. There is no justification for ratifying these items, but the former Vice Chancellor has done it. Whether the departments have given the time table or not, it is not clear.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he as a member of the Syndicate go for an RTI, was the former Vice Chancellor competent for making these appointments or not. The Vice Chancellor has not power to make any appointment beyond one year. If he would ask under which provision he has done it. There is no power with the Vice Chancellor to do so. How do the members of the Syndicate know whether there is requirement or not.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested the Vice Chancellor to look into this case seriously.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they are wasting the money of the University.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that Professor Karamjeet Singh, Registrar is sitting here. He has very long experience. Nobody can know much better than him. He has served in various capacities and he is the most appropriate person. The knowledge which he has about the P.U. Calendar, he thinks, nobody knows more than him. He further said that, it may be a harsh word, there is total abuse of power used in approving the agenda items. The appointments are made in those departments where these are not even needed and were not made where these were needed. The appointments are made arbitrarily. There is need to take an objective view to see whether the appointments are need or not. They have been passing the items continuously. Now these would continue in the tenure of the present Vice Chancellor. Then what change has come, nothing.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that it is a very serious matter. The pick and choose policy is occurring.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is not against anybody, but they should know what they are approving.

Shri Satish Sharma said that those appointments which are made for one year they should be separated from those which are made beyond one year. These should be put in different categories and examined accordingly.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what Shri Prabhjit Singh and Dr. Amit Joshi has said it right, but the appointments which were approved were not one or two, they are in hundred, they were necessary also. But he would like to talk about one teacher of the Department of Public Health which has not been ratified. There is only one teacher who is also on contract. He could not be given salary as this item could not be passed.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu informed that such persons had been working without salary since July so such cases should be passed.

Continuing Professor Navdeep Goyal said that such items should be passed as salary is must for everyone.

The Vice Chancellor said that one mistake has occurred and the persons are being penalised due to that. It is really very serious.

He said that they can take a decision that after completing the current agenda, after lunch, they should take these items first so that the salary of the teachers does not stop because the items are already there in the consideration.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that those teachers are teaching the classes for the last 3-4 months without salary and now they cannot go anywhere. He requested that their cases should be considered. While agreeing to Shri Prabhjit Singh he said the former Vice Chancellor was not having any power and he has done it arbitrarily wrong. So, they should mend that mistake.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they have to see to it also that if there is no workload, the funds of the University cannot be wasted like this. If there is workload, then there is no problem in approving the appointments.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is problem in it, in some cases there is involvement of even Dean of University Instruction office.

The Vice Chancellor said, that is why the issue has come to this level.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested where there is no workload they should shift such teachers to some other department so that they could take work from them and the teachers should also not be put to any harm.

The Vice Chancellor asked the opinion of the members.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should discuss these issues today.

Shri Satish Kumar Sharma said that in principle they should agree that the teachers who are working should be paid salary.

Professor Keshav Malhotra also said that they should be paid salary.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is right, salary should be paid to them.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they could make a Committee to examine these cases. He would like to talk in respect of Science Departments. In most of the these departments the workload is inflated as they are taking only six theory classes and 10 practical classes. A temporary teacher is just taking six theory classes and 10 practical classes and he is taking a salary of Rs. 52,000/-. How they could approve that appointment. They could appoint him on part-time basis. All these need to be taken care of very seriously. Many such appointment have been made, then they say that they have financial crunch. That is why they have differences either with the U.G.C. or with the Punjab Government. This is the main point.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the time he (present Vice Chancellor) has joined this University, this is the third Syndicate. Neither in the first nor in the second Syndicate, this action was not got ratified by the former Vice Chancellor. It has been recorded that it has been

ratified in the meeting 27.8.2018 and as a result of that the items stand withdrawn. If somebody does not pass, that means it has been ratified by the Syndicate in spite of the fact that so many reservations were there. So, this also needs to be looked into as to who has put up a note to the effect that this item was ratified on 27th August, 2018 and it has been withdrawn because barring one item where Dr. Amit Joshi has raised question, rest of the items as far as his understanding is, will be taken up in the next meeting, that was the resolution. So, this should also be taken into consideration and, of course, he also support the idea that objectively, the workload should be analysed and only need based appointments should be made. Whatever has to be done, that has to be done, but they have to keep the University's interest first and rest of the things as secondary issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that someone has to be responsible. Let it be like that only, when they were appointed, they were appointed in such a way by brutal use of power.

Professor Keshav Malhotra informed that the Panjab University is ahead in arranging blood donation campus. He said in the colleges, the Principals compensate the blood donor and in Panjab University they were compensated. Three days lecture were given to them.

Principal Anita Kaushal said that they are just given a certificate in the Colleges.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that three days lectures should be given to such students over and above the 10% lectures.

The Vice Chancellor said that these things could be taken up later on, first they should take up the agenda.

When the general discussion took place, Professor Navdeep Goyal again said that in the previous meetings held in the month of June and July, there were cases of contractual employees where persons are working since more than 10 years, but the competent authority has not passed their appointments and so their salary has stopped. So, he requested that the Vice Chancellor be authorised to deal with these cases.

This was agreed to

Request of Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar, Director, Computer Centre, P.U. with regard to extension of Extra Ordinary Leave/ Deputation

2. Considered request dated 27.09.2018 of Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar, Director, Computer Centre, P.U. with regard to extension of Extra Ordinary Leave/Deputation without pay for three years w.e.f. 13.10.2018, to serve as Vice-Chancellor on deputation in Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar.

- NOTE:**
1. Dr. Tankeshwar was granted EOL without pay w.e.f. 22.07.2014 to 12.10.2018 to serve as Vice-Chancellor at Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar vide order No.14072-75 dated 04.07.2014 which was ratified by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.10.2015 (Para 22 R(i)).
 2. A copy of rules meant for deputation available at page 121 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016 is enclosed.
 3. An office note containing the brief history of the service particulars of Dr. Tankeshwar is enclosed.
 4. A copy of decision of the Syndicate dated 12.07.2018 (Para 35) vide which Professor P.S. Jaswal was treated on deputation is enclosed.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 14th October 2018

Professor Navdeep Goyal said Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar when he was Director Computer Centre, he was under Faculty Recharge Programme (FRP) in Physics Department after taking leave from Directorship of Computer Centre. So, he would need leave as FRP and they should make that correction. He is now in Physics Department.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar went on leave when he was Director Computer Centre.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is on leave from Computer Centre as well as from the Department of Physics.

Shri Prabhjit Singh wanted to know whether they would be giving him E.O.L or they are sending him on deputation. There are two separate issues. As per the rules attached herewith, the neither EOL nor deputation could be beyond five years. He wanted to know whether the note is for E.O.L or for deputation. The earlier orders are for E.O.L which are available at page 4 of the agenda papers. He said that he knows that deputation and without pay leave is allowed, but as per the rules quoted, neither the E.O.L. deputation is allowed more than 5 years. If they read the office note, they would know that Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar has already taken leave for 4 years 2 months and 21 days. So, under what rules they are doing this, he just want to know the rules.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has given application for grant of EOL/Deputation.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that as per the regulation, the leave and deputation could be five years only. He pointed out that at page 8 of the agenda papers, it is written that the maximum period of leave is five years in the entire service.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is on E.O.L. for five years and they should now grant him deputation.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that deputation is also for five years. He pointed out that when a person is taken by another institution on deputation, then he is given leave salary. He asked if the university would send his leave salary contribution.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they would give him only one thing either E.O.L. or deputation.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the University cannot send him on deputation, rather it is for that University to ask for it.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they cannot convert it like this. Whatever has been done, that is done.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should not amend it and he should be sent on deputation.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said they cannot do so as there are separate orders for deputation. They cannot change the historical fact.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that as per the rules given at pages 7 to 9 of the agenda papers, at page 8 under the heading Extraordinary Leave, it is written "Provided that the maximum period for which such leave may be availed of shall not exceed 5 years during entire service Now in this case 4 years and 2 months have already availed. They can now give him leave only for 8-10 months which is available to him. If they consider his deputation period he referred to page 9 of the agenda where it is written that the maximum period for which such leave may be availed of shall not exceed 5 years during entire service. If he is granted deputation, he will have to be paid leave salary. Will the University pay leave salary to him? They are not sure, what they are passing.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that at page 9, it is written 'maximum period of deputation will be of 5 years and this period will be independent of any other leave to which one is entitled under Panjab University Calendar'.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if they send a person on deputation i.e. a different issue, leave can be sanctioned to anybody anywhere. But when they send someone on

deputation, there has been negotiation between the two institution where the terms and conditions have to be agreed to between both the receiver and the giver. One of the terms and conditions, as Shri Prabhjit Singh has said, who would pay the leave salary contribution. There may be other conditions as well. So, they cannot go back and make those terms now. If they want to do that, then they have to agree with the terms and conditions of deputation. Unless they do that, by sitting here they cannot send a person on deputation. The two Universities have to decide about the terms and conditions.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is not against the item. But if someone files an RTI, then there would be problem. They have to see how to do it rightly. He asked how the leave salary contribution would be taken care of, whether it is to be paid by the University or by the employee. There are other conditions of deputation. Whether that University is ready to take him on deputation etc. etc. Deputation means that University could send him back at any time.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it has to be discussed with that University. Can it be done with retrospective effect, if yes, then from the day one they have to agree on the deputation terms. The terms and conditions have to be defined so they should not do that in a hurry.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as per their Calendar they can change it from the back date.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it is as per the Calendar of Panjab University, but not as per their Calendar. They cannot thrust a deputation person on the other. One may not accept that.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it is upto the other University whether they accept a person on deputation or not, it is their prerogative.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they cannot do it one sided, the terms and conditions have to be agreed upon.

Shri Satish Sharma, Shri Gurjot Malhi, Dr. Subhash Sharma, Shri Prabhjit Singh Malhi and Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the Vice Chancellor should be authorised to take a decision.

RESOLVED: That the Vice Chancellor be authorised to take a decision on the request dated 27.09.2018 of Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar, Director, Computer Centre, P.U. with regard to extension of Extra Ordinary Leave/Deputation without pay for three years w.e.f. 13.10.2018, to serve as Vice-Chancellor on deputation in Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar as was done earlier in the case of Professor P.S. Jaswal, Vice-Chancellor, Rajiv Gandhi National University of Law, Patiala.

Fixation of deemed date of confirmation of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor (now Associate Professor), Department of Biochemistry, P.U.

3. Considered if, the deemed date of confirmation of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor (now Associate Professor), Department of Biochemistry, P.U., be fixed as 29.06.2011 i.e. after completion one year from the date of his joining on notional basis i.e. 29.06.2010 on his previous post i.e. Assistant Professor, as has been done in the case of Dr. Puja Ahuja.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate and Senate in their meetings dated 29.6.2010 vide Para 2(xxxix) and 10.10.2010 vide (Para III) respectively have approved the appointment of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor. But the appointment letter was not issued as he was not NET qualified.

2. In terms of the decision dated 12.11.2013 of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court

in CWP No.2974 of 2012, the Vice-chancellor has approved the appointment of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor in the Department of Biochemistry in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/-.

3. Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura submitted his joining on 15.01.2014. His appointment was also got noted by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 15.03.2014.

The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.09.2015 (Para 29) and Senate dated 05.12.2015 (Para XI) respectively approved the notional date of joining as 29.06.2010 of Dr. Naura.

4. Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura has joined as Associate Professor on 08.04.2016 in the Department of Biochemistry through direct recruitment.
5. The Senate in its meeting dated 10/24.09.2017 (Para XV) considered the recommendation of the Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 (Para 6) with regard to confirmation of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor and it was resolved that the recommendation of the Syndicate be approved. However, it was further resolved that the matter to decide the deemed date of confirmation of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura keeping in view the case of Dr. Puja Ahuja be referred back to the Syndicate.
6. Dr. Puja Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Institute of Education Technology and Vocational Education appeared for interview on 01.08.2011 for the post of Assistant Professor. As she was not selected, she filed CWP No.19285 of 2011 in Punjab and Haryana High Court challenging the recommendations of the Selection Committee. The Hon'ble High Court had passed interim orders dated 14.10.2011 and directed the University to keep one post of Assistant Professor as reserved.

The Hon'ble Court on final hearing of the case on 19.12.2014 had passed the following orders:

“the action of the respondent University is held to be bad in the eyes of law and the petitioner is held entitled to appointment to the post of Assistant Professor subject to her fulfilling other conditions that may be accompanying such an appointment.

Necessary exercise to appoint the petitioner be carried out within four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Needless, to say that the petitioner would be entitled to seniority etc. from the date when the appointment pursuant to the same selection were made. However, no monetary benefits will be given to the petitioner as she has not worked during that period”.

Pursuant to the orders of the Hon'ble Court the appointment letter was issued to Ms. Puja Ahuja vide orders dated 22.01.2015 mentioning that she will be deemed to have joined as Assistant Professor on 01.10.2011

7. The Senate in its meeting dated 09.10.2016 (Para XI) approved the deemed date of confirmation of Dr. Puja Ahuja as Assistant Professor w.e.f. 01.10.2012 i.e. after one year from the deemed date of her joining as such i.e. 01.10.2011.
8. Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate vide legal opinion dated 07.09.2018 has written that Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, Assistant Professor (now Associate Professor) can be treated as deemed confirmed on his previous post as Assistant Professor w.e.f. 29.06.2011 i.e. one year after from the date of his joining on notional basis, as has been done in the case of Dr. Puja Ahuja.
9. A detailed office note containing the comparative brief history of the case of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura and Dr. Puja Ahuja is enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the deemed date of confirmation of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor (now Associate Professor), Department of Biochemistry, P.U., be fixed as 29.06.2011 i.e. after completion one year from the date of his joining on notional basis i.e. 29.06.2010 on his previous post i.e. Assistant Professor.

Regarding Review of cancellation of Ph.D. registration of Ms. Anuradha Jaidka

4. To review the decision of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 (Para 22) with regard to cancellation of Ph.D. registration of Ms. Anuradha Jaidka, pursuant to the discussion of during the consideration of Item No.15 of the Syndicate meeting dated 23.09.2018.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 28.05.2017 (Para 22) while examine and suggest action on the report of PUCASH on complaint of sexual harassment resolved that Ph.D. registration of the student be cancelled and a DDR be lodged against her for making a false complaint of sexual harassment.

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

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that last time also she has said that to look into the issue thoroughly a Committee should be constituted. Legal system says that one hundred guilty persons could be let off, but an innocent should not be punished. They should do accordingly. So, it should be studied thoroughly do according to it. She again suggested to make a Committee to consider it.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they should make a Committee to resolve the issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are two things. One, she has prayed for restoration of her Ph.D. registration cancellation and the other is financial issue relating to scholarship.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that until the case is in the Court they should not take any decision.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they should form a Committee and get this issue solved.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he could not understand why they are making a Committee. They have taken a decision in the last meeting that as per the High Court, there is stay on her Ph.D. issue. Last time the Syndicate has passed to implement the orders of the High Court. It means, meaning thereby that her Ph.D. would continue. The Syndicate has further resolved that the letter which has been written to the UGC regarding her scholarship, that should be withdrawn as it was wrong. He asked, now for what purpose the Committee is to be formed.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it was discussed in the last Syndicate that if any compromise could be arrived at between the two, they should see to it, though it is not there in the rules.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said then why the Syndicate is making a Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should not complicate the issue. First of all, Shri Prabhjit Singh is right, that they can discuss here on the official platform but within their purview. It is not a Panchayat sitting here. They cannot do 'Panchayati decisions' here. Last time the decision could not be taken on this. As pointed out by Dr. Ameer Sultana that let they should not take a decision to review the decision of the Syndicate taken in 2017 and also writing the letter to UGC so that she cannot get encouraged. Then one of the members said that this item is not on the agenda. The only item on the agenda was the complaint made by the candidate. At that time it was said that if they want to discuss this, then, separate item be brought to this effect which has been brought today. But unofficially it was said, in the meantime, though it was not decision of the Syndicate, it was specifically said that it cannot be treated as decision of the Syndicate. Now item has come which says that if the Vice Chancellor is in a position to tell if there could be any amicable solution or not. Now the question is that

the High Court has stayed the operation of the orders of the Syndicate vide which her enrolment was cancelled. One is that they should stick to their stand and go to the High Court and defend their action of cancelling the registration and get the decree from the High Court, which they know and then they do. Another is, just they realised that the enrolment would have been cancelled, so that nobody could stop them from being wiser and review their own decision and thereafter telling the Court that they have already done, the writ petition has become infructuous, he may also withdraw. The University has already decided that letter has to be written. Thereafter, if the efforts can be made unofficially by any member of the Syndicate or for that matter any official of the University, that can be taken up separately. But if they try to link it with that, that means Syndicate the is keeping the score hanging that if they do not compromise then they will not do it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they have taken the legal opinion from the Advocate.

Shri Ashokj Goyal said that they have to cut a sorry figure when it was highlighted in the media. He does not know who made that story. A Committee was constituted, he does not know whether it was constituted by the Vice Chancellor or the D.U.I. The constitution of the Committee was such that it raise eye-brows that what this is happening. Are they trying to do it transparently or to pressurise the candidate or the one against whom the complaint has been made.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that as far as he could understand, he may be wrong. One is, that she made a false complaint of sexual harassment for which a DDR should filed with the police. Two, she has made an allegation of creating environment against the former Vice Chancellor. Three, is the cancellation of her Ph.D. They have to decide on three issues.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Prabhjit Singh asked to what is the item on the agenda?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested them to see item No. 4 at page 40 and further requested to read note 1 and 2.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that even the Legal Retainer has advised to implement the order of the Hon'ble high Court. The order of the High Court is that the decision taken by the Syndicate in the year 2017 to cancel her Ph.D., that is null and void.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it has already been discussed.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that what they have to do.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they have already taken action as has been mentioned at page 60 of the agenda papers.

The Vice Chancellor said that the action has been taken after that.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it means that they have done as per the orders of the High Court. Now the issue is, one, it was taken up by the Committee, though it was done arbitrarily, whether they were qualified, whether the Committee was properly constituted, whether the case was within its domain to consider that, but they considered the case and gave recommendations. One recommendation was that her Ph.D. enrolment should be cancelled. Second, her fellowship should be withdrawn and a letter in this regard should be written to the UGC. This is the decision of the PUCASH and it was brought to Syndicate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said, could they check whether the DDR was filed or not?

On being asked by Dr. Amit Joshi whether this is the recommendation of the PUCASH, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the PUCASH has said that the complaint is false.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi again asked if the DDR has been filed or not? He wants to know the factual position. He wanted to know whether the decision of the Syndicate of 28.5.2017 has been carried out or not.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the decision has been done.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked whether as per the decision dated 28.5.2017, a DDR has been filed or not?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said, this is what he wanted to know.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that DDR has been done, but DDR is not an FIR.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi wanted to know if a copy of the DDR is attached in the agenda papers.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that DDR is not attached here. He further said that the item is not under consideration. This is not the work of the Syndicate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it means that the first question is over that the DDR has been filed. Shri Malhi asked the Registrar if the DDR has been filed and if it has been filed, then they would close the issue. The second thing is the case against the former Vice Chancellor. He asked as to what action has been taken in that regard.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was discussed in the last meeting that, complaint which was filed by the complainant was not within the purview of PUCASH. The PUCASH was not authorised to conduct any enquiry into that. As a result, whatever findings have been given by the PUCASH is completely false to which Dr. Ameer Sultana objected. Continuing, he said that he is not speaking by interpreting anything. He is speaking what is written in the Act. The PUCASH who has taken up the case, he talked to them as to how they conducted inquiry into it. They said that they were under lot of pressure to conduct it, but they honestly admit that it escaped their attention that it was not in their purview to conduct it, when he told them that this is what is clearly mentioned in the Act. If they go by the interim order of the High Court, there also it is clearly mentioned,

“the issue in this case would be as to whether firstly, a complaint would be by the petitioner to the Vice Chancellor, with regard to alleged sexual harassment by a person who is not an employee of the University, secondly, whether such complaint was referable to the local police or to the Internal Complaints Committee of the University and lastly, based on the aforesaid two questions, whether the Committee could have given a report exonerating the respondent, i.e. the alleged perpetrator of the offence, on the strength of which the enrolment of the petitioner for a Ph.D. degree could have been cancelled by the Senate on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor..

Notice of motion be issued to the respondents, returnable on 23.02.2018.

In the meanwhile, operation of the impugned communication Annexure P-14, shall remain stayed till the next date of hearing”.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that now the question they can discuss, whether it was within the purview of that Committee or not. If they finally conclude, yes, that it was within the purview of that Committee, then let they should defend their case in the Court of Law and prove the Court that whatever has been done, it was within their purview. But after examining, they find that it was not within their purview, then has anybody stopped them to review the decision.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that his answer to his (Shri Ashok Goyal) question is that as far as the cancellation of her Ph.D. enrolment is concerned, the order stands removed by the Hon'ble Court. So, there is no point in discussing them. She could conclude her Ph.D.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, that is the stay and the other is that whether they are taking a decision that they are reviewing the decision or they have to get it only from the direction of the Court.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the complainant has made a complaint one copy of which was given to the PUCASH. He was a member of the PUCASH. This issue was discussed whether they can take up this or not. The Chairman of that Committee was the Chairperson of the Law Department and according to her this could be taken up. Shri Ashok Goyal may be right. Second part was that the complainant has also given a complaint to the police also. The police has also given a report which is not available in the agenda papers. The police has also said very clearly that the complaint of sexual harassment is false. So as far as the complaint regarding sexual harassment is concerned that whether it lies with PUCASH or Police, the enquiry has been conducted at both the places. The police has given the report to the University and it has been clearly mentioned that the sexual harassment complaint is false.

They have filed many cases against it in the Court. Many cases are being disposed off and many new are being filed. As Dr. Ameer Sultana has said that it may not happen that they end the harassment of one, and the other's should start. So, they should deal with it very consciously.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Court cases which are already there or which would be filed, they have to deal with them. They cannot say to end the cases under pressure. If the police has found that the complaint was false, then probably, they need to bring that report before the Syndicate for consideration as to what action is to be taken if someone has filed the false complaint, provided that is also not contrary to the deliberation that the matter is not subjudice. He is saying, if the police has filed complaint, then let they should say whether it was in the purview of the police. How can parallel enquiry be held. They have to decide whether it is within the Police or the Internal Complaint Committee. The police has not submitted the report till the PUCASH submitted its report. The PUCASH can only act against a person or accused who is an employee of the University.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said, that is not necessary and he does not agree to it.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that if the Vice Chancellor receives a complaint from anyone that has to be sent to the PUCASH and there is no question of jurisdiction. In the Act of the Parliament, under Section 2-APart-1, which reads, who is an aggrieved woman? Any person who is in relation to a work place a women of any age, whether employee or not, who alleged to have been subject to any act of sexual harassment by the respondent. So, in this case the student is a Ph.D. student, she comes to the P.U., so it is her work place. So, they cannot challenge her jurisdiction. It is within the jurisdiction. There can be many number of cases decided by the High Court and the Supreme Court, so the action has been taken. She has not been compelled by anyone. She has herself lodged a complaint against sexual harassment to the PUCASH. So, the question of jurisdiction does not come here. In number of Committees they used to challenge the jurisdiction of a Committee. So, when they challenge, they should see whether it is in their jurisdiction or not. So, this question ends there. She said it may not happen that while solving a case, they may create ten such cases. There is no pressure on them. They have the provision to review their own decision.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he agrees with Shri Ashok Goyal that under no canons of justice, they have *quid pro quo*, that one can do this or that. That would be totally illegal. There is no way that one should ask the Committee to sought out the differences and have compromise. That cannot be done and it should not be done. If the Syndicate decides to constitute a Committee, then they can ask the Committee to look into all the three aspects in totality. One aspect is that she has made a false complaint as alleged by the PUCASH and police. Some action needs to be taken against her for that false complaint, such as a DDR or something else. First is the action regarding cancellation of her Ph.D. under whatever rules. Second issue is that now she has made a broader complaint saying that sexual harassment atmosphere was created by the precious Vice Chancellor under which she could not get justice. Third is that her Ph.D. registration has been cancelled which has been stayed by the High Court. On that, Shri Ashok Goyal is right that they have to take a stand on that. They have to tell the Court whether they agree with them or not. They have to fight it out or surrender. The Committee should look into all the three aspects impartially and make a recommendation to the Syndicate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that to his mind, what Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has said is okay. They could discuss it in the next meeting. Why they should do it in hurry.

Principal Anita Kaushal said that the Police report should also be brought here.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that when we discuss the agenda in piece-meals it gets diluted. The DDR has no value when the FIR is already lodged. They should see the documents supplied by the University. At page number 73 of the agenda papers where it is mentioned on 15.2.2017 FIR No. 27 was registered under section 279/337. The first FIR was for the accident, then she tried to add the sexual harassment complaint. She made a sexual harassment complaint to the Vice Chancellor which was marked by the Vice-Chancellor to the PUCASH. The Syndicate in 2017 took a decision to cancel her Ph.D. enrolment which was totally arbitrary and wrong of the Syndicate. When the decision of the Syndicate was

communicated to her, she went to the Court and the Court stayed the decision of the Syndicate. Now the decision of the Syndicate which was stayed by the Court. He just want to know from the Registrar, who has taken the decision to vacate the stay because the case did come again to the Syndicate. Who ordered for vacation of the stay? In how many cases the Vice Chancellor has ordered to vacate the stay. Why the vice Chancellor done it of his own? Why he did not bring it to the Syndicate? If the candidate has made a wrong complaint, they should take action against her, there is no problem in it, but as regards her studies and her scholarship, it is neither concerned with her studies nor with the accident. The students are even studying in jails. He gave example of Ram Rahim who is also studying in jail. The question is, how they could prevent a student from studying. If she has made a wrong complaint, they can take any action against her, but they cannot prevent a student of Panjab University from studying. They are not concerned who is the lady, where she is doing Ph.D. etc. etc. He requested not to consider both the cases together. If the sexual harassment complaint is wrong, reject it out-rightly. If they go on deferring the case, then there would be problem of extension in submission of her Ph.D. thesis. They should also think about the career of the student. He requested to withdraw the stay vacation immediately. It means that the Syndicate is saying something else and the Court is saying something else. On the one hand they are saying that she should be allowed to continue her Ph.D. and on the other hand they are asking for vacating the stay. They should take one stand.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the Committee should see as to what has to be done with the stay.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said what Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi ji said is the best.

The members of the House suggested that a Committee be constituted for the purpose.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh while intervening said that he has no problem in constituting the committee but what is to be done by the Committee.

Sh. Satish Sharma said that the terms of reference should be informed to the Committee.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh said what he is asking is only that what should be terms of reference, the Syndicate in its meeting has already decided on the matters relating to scholarship and Ph.D. and now the members want to reconsider it.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that for the guidance of the Committee, whatever Committee will be constituted.

The Vice Chancellor said that are you talking about the terms of reference of the committee.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said to Dr. Ameer Sultana that she was talking about the jurisdiction of the PUCASH for the complainant but he was talking about the jurisdiction for the accused. It was clearly mentioned under Section 11 of Enquiry into the Complaint subject to the provisions of Section 10 the Internal Committee and the Local Committee as the case may be, shall waive the respondent either employee, proceed to make an enquiry. That is what she is telling in the Court. Who appoints the PUCASH, it is the employer and now whose employer, that is employer of the accused, the complainant could be any outsider also even if she has come to visit the University in connection with some work and she is entitled to file the complaint. But the accused has to be employee of the employer whose Internal Complaint Committee is to enquire into the matter. Now, let they should say that PUCASH has done something. The letter came to the Syndicate. Let they should say that the PUCASH has given the information that the accused is guilty of the misconduct. What the Syndicate and the Senate would have done to him because he is not an employee. That is why it is said unless and until the accused is under their employment, their Internal Complaint Committee cannot look into it. So, when he asked the PUCASH, they said it escaped their attention and under lot of pressure and under great hurry this decision has to be taken. No doubt, he is in agreement that it was a great nuisance in those days which was created in the University and under that pressure, the Syndicate also took the decision, may be the harsh decision only to convey message that this kind of nuisance will not be tolerated. But once the person gone to the Court of Law, then the University should be on a strong footing, after deliberation, they are

convinced that whatever they have done is correct and that they are able to defend their case in the court of Law. If they already know that they are on the weak wicket, simply because that they have some ego problem and they say that let the orders of the Hon'ble Court come, that probably is not in the interest of the University. That is that they are compromising with the image of the University. As far as the terms of reference are concerned, the only term of reference which cannot be made a part of the term of reference is that they should not try to make a compromise.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that she is not saying that. The case is in the Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal said whatever they may say, what everybody wants that this case should be settled. He requested that a Committee should be formed. Whatever they could do, they would do unofficially.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi suggested to put a few women members in the Committee, that is must.

RESOLVED: That the Vice Chancellor be authorised to form a Committee with a clear and explicit term of reference to review the decision taken by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 28.05.2017 (Para 22) regarding cancellation of her Ph.D. Registration.

**Change of name of
Department of
Evening Studies-Multi-
Disciplinary Research
Centre**

5. Considered recommendation of the Committee of the Regular Faculty (including Re-employed Faculty) dated 22.03.2018 (**Appendix-I**) (forwarded by the Chairperson, Department of Evening Studies- Multi Disciplinary Research Centre vide letter No.1934/DES dated 22.03.2018, pursuant to the Joint meeting of the Academic and Administrative Committee dated 09.03.2018 (**Appendix-I**) that the nomenclature of Department of Evening Studies-Multi Disciplinary Research Centre, be changed to Department of Multi Disciplinary Studies and Research.

- NOTE:** 1. The Vice-Chancellor has observed that 'A more appropriate name could be Department of Undergraduate & Post Graduate Studies: A Multi Disciplinary Research Centre'.
2. A copy of the discussion of the Syndicate meeting dated 30.03/21.04/29.04.2018 is enclosed (**Appendix-I**)

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it is a good thing if the Department of Evening Studies be renamed as Multi Disciplinary Research Centre as the grants and new projects will come, therefore, it should be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that there was a lot of discussion and Hon'ble members opined many things but ultimately what was concluded could not be done.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked who recommended these as Multi Disciplinary is already added with it. He said the word Evening Studies is the outlook of the University as there are USOL and Correspondence departments in Panjab University. There is separate identity and sanctity of Department of Evening Studies. The USOL Department may ask in future that its name be changed to Research Centre where as its main purpose is Correspondence Studies. Dr. G.K. Chadha had studied from Department of Evening Studies who was elected as Chairman of the U.G.C. and the Vice Chancellor from J.N.U. and Dr. S.K. Gupta was the students of the Department of Evening Studies.. If a student is doing Ph.D and other certificate course then it can be known that he is the student of Department of Evening Studies as it has a very distinct identity.

The Vice Chancellor said according to Dr. Amit Joshi the word Evening should not be removed.

Prof. Keshav Malhotra said that the Evening Department practically has become the Afternoon Department. The classes are started from 3:00 p.m. and the Department never get certificates from employees as proof of employment. In the past certificates were received and the classes were from 5:40 and the employees used to attend the classes and when the USOL department opens the strength of the Department of Evening Studies declined. In B.Com Course there is no employee student as the classes are from 3:00 p.m. and there is demand of students for introduction of Honors Studies and to meet the demands of the students, the courses of Honors School have to be started from 2:00 p.m. and this the best use of resources of the University which is very much clear. He further said that he was the Chairman of the Department and the committee of the NAAC visited the Department and the Department was very happy with the feeling of proud that they are teaching the students in the Evening and the students and teachers are coming in Evening but the NAAC team made fun of the Department and in its report they specifically said something should be done for this Evening Department as the Department was very happy after giving presentation of the Research, projects and functions but the latest problem which is raised is that the projects are not given to Department of Evening Studies as the identity of Department of Evening Studies is not acceptable to them. Therefore, it is submitted that classes will be working in the evening in the existing set up, but for the use of best resources, the word Evening Studies should be removed. Therefore, the faculty and students agreed that name of the Department of Evening Studies be changed. The students of Honors are to be sent to S.D. college for attending the classes and similarly no Hons studies are available in B.A. also and the previous Vice Chancellor reduced the seats from 340 to 200 and students from Punjab, Jalalabad and Malout at coming to Evening Studies and cut off percentage for admission to Department of Evening Studies reached to 85% to 87%. He said that according to him this is the right time to change.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that he will only submit while appreciating the sentiments of Prof. Keshav Malhotra that in University changes when the Man in the Chair changes. What Dr. Amit Joshi said that the University is depriving of the major rights of the employees for pursuing further studies. The Department of Evening Studies was made only and only for the employees and the time table was set only keeping in view their convenience. The argument was given that Department of Evening has completely lost its relevance, when USOL was opened in Panjab University and employees and non-employees would pursue their studies in USOL. Then ultimately it was discontinued and said that there is no need of Employer's Certificate, it was diluted and thereafter the timings of the department was preponed to 3:00 p.m. There are some Colleges in Chandigarh where the cut off percentage for admission to B.Com. is much lower than what is in the Evening Department. They are Day Colleges and was there any employee who come to attend at 3:00 p.m., if he has to work till 5:00, how this is expected that he can attend the classes from 3:00 p.m. So this department is no more for the employees this should be find out by the Vice Chancellor that how much percentage is there but he still maintained the same

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that the timings should remain from 5:40 if they really want to serve the employees but if they cannot go to 5:40 timings only for the name sake it is the Department of Evening Studies but practically it is a day study department. Now the question is after deliberation the decision was taken not more employees have come, they come and show the certificate, no Government employee comes, it is only the private employees, slowly all the day scholars started coming there it is a step only to utilize the resources to the maximum possible extent. The only thing is that they want to find via media that let us speak this also and let us start utilizing the resources at par with the Departments working during the day otherwise this decision has to be taken that whether the University want to run the Department of Evening Studies or to run the Department as it is or to run the Multi Disciplinary Department starting from 9:00 a.m., this decision has to be taken. Now more Mr. G.G. Chadhas and S.K. Chadhas will come. Dr. G.K. Chadha was the employee of Punjab Secretariat when he did the M.A. from Department of Evening Studies. It was also understood and these were the arguments which were given at that time, more than 10 years that it was converted into. In that prospective he was always in support of taking a clear cut line whether we have to run Evening or in Day or as it is.

Dr. S.S. Sangha said that if the word of Evening studies will be removed then the Department will become Morning as problem has arisen that admissions are not full due to timing of 5:40. On the same pattern the USOL Department will tell that seats of admission are not filling and the same may be converted to a Day Department. If the word "Evening" is removed this department will become Morning Department. What is the benefit of changing the name of Department of Evening Studies to the Multi Disciplinary Research Centre ? It is a back door entry in making the Evening Department to Morning Department.

Sh. Ashok Goyal while clarifying in the matter said that he did not say that because admissions of all the seats are being done, then they want to change the nomenclature. He said that only timings of 5:40 be remain the same. The University has started B.Com and the syllabus of B.Com cannot be completed from the time schedule of 5:40 to 10:00 p.m. therefore, the B.Com timings have to be changed to 3:00 p.m. instead of 5:40 . It is not said that this is not only due to the reason that admissions of all the seats have not been filled.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that first of all he is totally agreed with the statement of Sh. Ashok Goyal and informed the House that the reference of NAAC has come and in all the previous 3-4 meetings it has been clarified that the report of NAAC has been "got written" and it is on record. All the statements regarding the timings of 5:40 or 3:40 or 4:40 is right but the said Department had been stated as College but later on slowly and steadily it was converted to Department. But still it has a very different identity whenever NAAC comes either the University is not able to portray that this is the only University which is giving correspondence education, day education and there are evening studies departments also to cater to the needs of the students studying in Evening. What is being done exactly is that the House is killing the identity of the Institute which has been running since 80s' and which has a very distinct identity. He said that he totally agree with Sh. Ashok Goyal that no G.K. Chadhas are coming, no Dr. S.K. Chadhas are coming, but who will come he cannot predict but still this again does not mean that the Panjab University should not take a stand to maintain the sanctity of identity of this Institute.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Prof. Ameer Sultana to offer her comments.

Prof. Ameer Sultana said that if Panjab University wants to change the name of the Department of Evening then the objective while starting the Evening Studies be kept in mind. She said that she totally agree with that the main objective is to give chance for students in the Department of Evening Studies who are working. The one important thing is that it is the matter of policy and not that to change only the name of the Department. If the name of Department of Evening Studies be changed to Department of Evening Studies and Multi Disciplinary Research Centre then it should also be kept in mind that there are various Multi disciplinary departments in the Panjab University including her Department i.e., Centre for Women Studies, Gandhian Studies and various other departments in Science Department , then what is the fate of these Departments. She said that if the University wishes to create a School on the pattern of J.N.U. which can bring various other problems related to it.

Sh. R.K. Mahajan said that in Panjab University, every Department is Multi disciplinary department where students are studying and they why the Panjab University is keeping it in Evening Studies. If the Panjab University stick to the timings of 5:40 and admit only the employees who wish to study in Evening then the name of Department of Evening Studies is right. If the classes are to be started from 3:00 p.m. then why it is called the Department of Evening Studies. Every Department is Multi disciplinary which has been done by U.G.C. then there is no problem in it.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said the he is also of the same view that if options of this Department is blocked due to the observations of the NAAC, it is Ok with him to change the name of the Department for the sake of the benefit of students and teachers community. For the sake of grant of teachers and keeping in view the future, it should be done as it is not a big matter.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Prof. Keshav Malhotra to offer his comments on the timings of 5:40 in the matter.

Prof. Keshav Malhotra said that if the timings of 5:40 be changed then the Department will fail. This time the Department of Evening Studies received 1100 applications last year and

this year it has 800 forms for admission to B.Com course due to the timings in all over the Punjab. He said that his situation is that his grandfather Prof. P.L Anand who founded the Department of Evening Studies, he was the champion of Evening Studies and now his Grandson is in this situation that for the benefit of the students and teachers where the name of Department of Evening Studies has to be changed and his Grandson have to change the name of the Department but he will change the same keeping in view the interest of the Department. He also think that it is very useful to change the name of the Department and he supports the same.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Grandson Prof. Keshav Malhotra compromised on the issue of change of name of Department.

Prof. Keshav Malhotra said what the Grand Father done, the same is being "Undo" by the Grandson and he is in the situation where for the benefit of the students and teachers of the University at large he want to change the name of the Department. This Department is very talented Department where students come from different fields and excel in co-curricular activities and beat the students of Jhankar in such performances.

The Vice Chancellor asked Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi to give his comments.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi talked about the Committees of this Department.

The Vice Chancellor interrupted and said that in the Committees and MHRD, if the word Evening is added, then in the present scenario the bureaucrats have been left and that should also be kept in mind while taking the decision regarding change in name of the Department. They are saying that the word of evening be removed and in JNU, the students want to study in L.L.B and want to pay much higher for the course if the word of evening be removed.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that minimum time table should be of 5 hours which is not possible from the time schedule of 5:40 p.m.

The Vice Chancellor said he discussed the issue with Bar Council and they said the word Evening be removed then the Panjab University can run the L.L.B Course.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this is a very healthy discussion and he observed that the Departmental Committee unanimously resolved and the House first should respect the sentiments of the people working in the Department from many years and the second is that this Department was started in the evening but after passing of time many changes occur just like amendments in our Constitution and rules and regulations also changes in the Panjab University. In the Department of Evening Studies, less number of employees are coming, even at the negligible state, if the word evening is removed then the employees will not be allowed to enter. If the better interest is receiving by removing the word evening, then there should be no restriction in it. More than 90% students have been given to chance in the study in the Department which is more beneficial. In other way what Sh. Ashok Goyal had said one should stick to the old system and follow the old timings of Evening then the millions of students who get benefits of connecting to University be lost. He said that one should go forward and not in backward direction and adopt the change for the right cause.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi agreed with the view point of Dr. Subhash Sharma and said that this is a very excellent logic put forward by him, being a good educationist. For the sake of academic credentials, one should move forward for the benefit of students which raises the status of the students as well as the growth of the Panjab University. On the other side the argument is that the Evening Studies was established with a certain purpose and that difficulty of merging the same with the University will arise. The other thing is that name change can be benefitted to large number of students and the identity of the department is likely to be submerged. He said that this decision should not be taken in a hurry as per his suggestion. He is not aware whether this is statutory requirement or regulatory requirement to change the name but that has also to be studied thoroughly. If the timings like 3:40 or 5:40 are concerned then it can be renamed as Department of Part time studies instead of Evening Studies so that it can be started any time.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said it should not be a part time studies department as the full time courses are being run. In part time courses two years course is extended upto three years and three years duration course is extended upto 5 years.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it should be of distinct identity and should not be merged with other departments.

Sh. Prabhjeet Singh while addressing the Vice Chancellor said that whether the name be changed to Afternoon studies, Day Studies or Night Studies there will not be any major change provided the timings of the Department should not be changed. The timings of the Department should remain the same whereas the name can be changed.

Sh. Satish Kumar said that there should be few seats reserved for employees in this Evening Studies. The basic purpose was for the employees and those cannot afford to be a regular student. If it is possible then the seats for employees can be reserved.

Prof. Ameer Sultana said that it should be kept in mind that by the word Multi Disciplinary the problems may not arise after four years in the morning Departments.

Sh. Ashok Goyal clarified the statement of Prof. Ameer Sultana and said that if Department of Evening Studies be named as Department of Multi Disciplinary then what is the fate of other departments which is working on the pattern of Multi disciplinary faculties just like Gandhian Studies and Women Studies.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that for example there is M.A. in Political Science and M.A. in English and other 5 post graduate courses which are running in parallel, and if the everything is removed slowly and steadily then this will be a cause for the problem in future. He said that if this is a major cause for release of grants then in this place the University should open 3-4 new departments. If there is requirement of M.A. English to any bureaucrat then there is full fledged Department where M.A. (English) is available. The Department of UBS and Political Science is also working in Panjab University on full time basis, anyone can do whatever he want to do. The main problem is of timings as told by Sh. Prabhjit Singh. If the Multi Disciplinary will be applicable then the Courses will be run in parallel manner and the problems will arise. The problems like over lapping will come due to this change in name and the Committees of Deans be constituted to get it approved objectively.

The Vice Chancellor said that the major crunch which can be received through Police Administration, Defence and Corporate employees as they want that the word Evening be removed from the Department.

Sh. R.K. Mahajan said that only name is to be changed and timings should be same.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the employees want to study in Evening Studies and wishes to get degree of Day Scholar then what should be the distinction between two courses.

Sh. Ashok Goyal clarified that there is no distinction in both the Courses then the alumnus could not be nominated as members or Chairman of the U.G.C.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if the Vice Chancellor becomes the Chairman of the U.G.C. with this name then why there is problem to others with this name.

Prof. Keshav Malhotra said that at present also both the post graduate courses are being run in Day and Evening Department.

Dr. Amit Joshi interrupted and said that there is distinction between both the Post graduate courses being run in Morning and Evening Department.

Prof. Keshav Malhotra said that the degree of both the Courses is same.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if degree of Morning and Evening Department is same then the same should be informed to the students and there is no need of changing the name.

Prof. Keshav Malhotra said that this is the concept forward by him at the level of B.A. and in near future the Department of Evening Studies will produce IAS and PCS Officers and the student of Department of Evening Studies has won gold medals continuously from the last two years. But when they go in foreign for further studies they said they are considered as

part time scholars. He said that it is also mentioned in the Hand Book of Information that Evening Department is Multi Faculty Department.

Sh. Ashok Goyal is that the Multi Disciplinary Department is also existed in its name only the work Evening is to be removed.

The Vice Chancellor said that matter may be brought to the Committee.

Prof. Keshav Malhotra said that the decision should not be forwarded to Committee.

Sh. R.K. Mahajan further said there is no requirement of constituting the Committee as the Department has given the unanimous decision.

Sh. Satish Kumar said that every one wishes that he may come to attend the Department at 3:00 p.m. instead of 5:40 p.m.

Sh. Keshav Malhotra clarified that they come at 3:30 p.m. He said the evening studies was running in the Colleges like Khalsa College and D.A.V. College but it was stopped.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the said College can be converted to Morning College.

Sh. Satish Sharma said that Evening College classes in Punjab were stopped due to the riots in Punjab.

Whereas Sh. Keshav Malhotra said the Evening classes were taking place in Chandigarh and not in the colleges of Punjab. He said that he is talking about the Colleges situated in Chandigarh like D.A.V. College in Chandigarh. Does it mean that Panjab University will lag behind?

Sh. Keshav Malhotra further said that is University remains outdated and cannot adopt the latest methods. He said that Panjab University will have to change .

Sh. Rakesh Mahajan said that whether the timings can be changed or the name of the Department be changed.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee will be constituted of the members of the Syndicate to visit the case.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that Committee of Deans of University be constituted.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal that a Committee of mix of members of Syndicate and Deans of Faculties be constituted to deal with the case keeping in view the discussion held in the House.

The Vice Chancellor said that the said item is passed and the members of the Syndicate said that the item stands passed.

Sh. Keshav Malhotra said that if the Committees are constituted then it is only a brain wash, Committee means "to put the matter in dust" and Sub Committee means "to put all the matters in dust". He said that if the name of the Evening Department will be changed, then it will serve the benefits of the students and teachers community.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh said that he neither in morning or evening, he is just an employee and his main interest is just to watch the benefit of the morning departments and the second concern is that if the Department is changed, then there is no harm in it but timings are not to be changed. Keeping in view the interest of the morning Departments, the timings of Evening Department are not to be changed.

Prof. Keshav Malhotra and Dr. Amit Joshi said that both the issues may be resolved.

All the members agreed that the said issue may be passed.

While interrupting Prof. Ameer Sultana said that her objection remains the same that problems will arise in future, she said that she is not against the view that name should not be changed, but in future it will cause problems.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter is resolved and let other items be discussed in the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That –

1. The proposal of the Department of Evening Studies-Multi-Disciplinary Research Centre dated 22.3.2018 for change of name to that of Department of Multi Disciplinary Studies and Research **is accepted in principle.**
2. the academic timings of the Department shall remain the same.
3. the department would explore the possibility of reserving certain seats to the Panjab University Employees.

Amendments in the guidelines for organizing seminars, conferences etc.

6. Considered minutes dated 29.08.2018 (**Appendix-II**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to recommend suitable amendments in the guidelines to organizing seminars, conferences etc. including acceptance of sponsorships/contribution from private bodies:

While discussing item No.6 of the Agenda, Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that some of the items are good but some conditions are contradictory according to his view. With regard to sponsorship, it will be difficult to get sponsorship if the same is required to be passed from the Syndicate. He read out one of the conditions written in the Agenda is that "Sponsor should not have any hidden agenda/scheme for publishing or marketing their own product or using Panjab University as a platform to promote their own publicity for commercial purpose" and the other condition that "Donation in the form of cash is prohibited for conference. All legal donations should be in the form of account payee cheques." He said that many of the sponsorship of Departments are not in the form of cash or cheques, these sponsorships are in the form of payment to be made for Lunch and payment to be made for purchase of kits during the Conference/Seminar where as it has been said in the Minutes that these things should be avoided which is not proper and appropriate. These conditions are required to be reconsidered.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal, Sh. Satish Sharma and Sh. Rakesh Mahajan said that these conditions should be reconsidered.

Prof. Keshav Malhotra said that recently a Conference was held wherein Coco Cola has sponsored Rs.2.50 Lacs and advertisement of its product has been done by the firm.

The Vice Chancellor said that the view of the FDO be taken on the issue.

Prof. Keshav Malhotra, the purpose of the University is not to create hurdles for the Chairperson rather its objective to show the path to move in the right direction.

Finance and Development Officer said that there is no check on the sponsorships given to the Departments and whenever there is any query on the issue about the sponsorships regarding its accountability, in that situation Panjab University is in dark and such type of cases are coming to the University. Sometimes the firms gave sponsorships to the Departments but its commercialization is on disproportionate pattern. Any sponsorship given in kind in the form of hospitality and sponsorship for payment of kits should be on the pattern on proportionate commercialization.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that some of the points requires changes. FDO may be directed to modify the language of the same. He suggested that at Page 89 point No.2 is ok whereas point No.1 is to be deleted and whatever is required, the same may be added to it.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that besides the changes relating to the language/wording, who will decide in the matter about the sponsors, whether it is to be decided by an individual department or otherwise.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that reference of the Committee has been given very rightly which describes about the working of the Committee, and through that Committee all the guidelines are to be framed.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that for any kind of sponsorship, there should be a sponsorship Committee which can approve according to the ethics of the University. After the approval of the Sponsorship Committee/Standing Committee the matter may be further initiated.

Finance and Development Officer intervened and asked Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi to read point No.1 at Page 89 which was deliberated and discussed to prepare an exhaustive list, which was not possible to prepare.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it should be specified that the advertisement of the sponsors may be permitted for a certain period of time whether it is required to be permitted for display for minutes, hours and the number of days. The main purpose of Sponsorship is look after only to all these concepts to decide whether what he is getting and what sponsored firm is getting. Sponsorship Committee consists of expertise in every field to deal with the cases and that expertise will have bigger responsibility. The second point what Prof. Navdeep Goyal told that the word "kind" should not be removed, is very good suggestion. For example in the meeting of Vistara, no money has been given, and sponsorship was done and seats were given. Chandigarh Administration informed that some film personalities are coming then the University has given the seats to them in response to it.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that the main problem arises is that which is not mentioned is that if any programme is sponsored by any Company and banners are installed in all over the University Campus, that should not be allowed.

Dr. Amit Joshi said what Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi is telling is right but it is submitted that all the Chairpersons of the Departments are basically teachers and whenever any Seminar/Workshop is organized it is the duty of the Chairperson to prepare invitee lists, invite the guests and ask for sponsorship which is a very herculean task and then the University ask for some other Committee for the processing then it will be more difficult task.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that the main problem is that the sponsor has been agreed to give sponsorship then the Sponsorship Committee raised objection which can be a great cause of hurdles.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that what is written by the Finance and Development officer in the minutes that a separate bank account is to be opened is correct and the sponsored money will be disbursed subject to audit, which has already been taken up. The second thing is that when the sponsor gives sponsorship relating to Lunch, Dinner or purchase of kits, then the advertisement banner will only be applicable on the Lunch/Dining Area and on kits. It should not be allowed all over the Panjab University Campus. If the full event is sponsored, then only two or three gates of Panjab University be allowed for the purpose of installing the banners and not on the entire campus.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said while continuing the view point of Dr. Amit Joshi that a Committee be constituted which can define the categories of sponsorship in which it is to be mentioned that this is the money and these are deliverables. Everything should be clarified whether the size and number of the banners depending upon the amount of sponsorship for an event. If the sponsorship of Rs.10 Lacs is being given and being the platinum sponsor, 10 banners are to be installed. The category of deliverables should be fixed depending upon the amount of sponsorship.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that the same has been placed before the Academic Administrative Committee and also been approved by the Technical Committees of the Departments. The University guidelines relating to it should be identified and the Purchase and Technical Committee of Departments will be responsible for the sponsorship and accountability can be checked at the level of the Departments.

Sh. Satish Sharma said that he want to bring one suggestion that all the programmes are educational programmes and the advertisement relating to Smoking/Tobacco/Liquor should not be permitted to be part of it.

Dr. Amit Joshi intervened and said that the suggestion put forth by Sh. Satish Sharma is 100% correct.

Dr. S.S. Sangha said that the list of NGOs and Charitable Societies who have been blacklisted should be put on website

Finance and Development Officer replied that the exhaustive list of blacklisted firms can not be prepared as some or other is included or excluded after passing of time.

The Vice Chancellor said that the after modifications in the guidelines the same can be approved.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh suggested that the Registrar along with one or two members can be part of it and necessary modifications be made.

The Vice Chancellor said that the item stands passed whereas Point No.5 at Page 90 be referred whereas it has been mentioned that 60% of the share be given to Department whereas Vice Chancellor felt that it should be more than 60% as the Departments are very much involved in all the work.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal that the same should be broadened and should be sent in Development Fund as per previous practice but it should also be authorized to use the said amount for organizing further Seminars/Workshops in future. He suggested that 75% of the amount should be authorized to use according to the requirement of the Department and the remaining 25% be sent to Development Fund.

It was suggested Prof. Navdeep Goyal and Prof. Keshav Malhotra will jointly do the needful in the matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that the input on part of Colleges is also required and hence Dr. Amit Joshi be also included in the same.

Dr. Amit Joshi and Sh. Rakesh Mahajan said that the pattern on the part of Colleges is totally different from the Departments therefore the same should be done only both Prof. Navdeep Goyal and Prof. Keshav Malhotra.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Committee dated 29.08.2018, **as per appendix** be approved in principle with the modification in clause (v) that 75% of the surplus money shall be given to the organizing department for the general development and the remaining 25% shall be deposited in the University account.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Registrar is authorized to redraft the wording of the guidelines/rules, wherever necessary.

Appointments on compassionate grounds

7. Considered minutes dated 13.08.2018 (**Appendix-III**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the case for appointment on compassionate grounds.

Referring to Item No.7 of the Agenda Item Sh. Prabhjit Singh said why the appointment on compassionate grounds is placed before the Syndicate. The competency of Class C employees lies with the Registrar then what is the purpose of Syndicate in it. He said now the case by case consideration is required. The first case of Mr. Sanjay is Ok and in the second case of Mr. Gurmukh Singh, the Committee recommended him to appoint on the post of Mali whereas he should be appointed on the post of Cleaner as he can perform the work of Cleaner than Mali. He further said the working of Mali and Cleaner is different but the pay scale of both is same. If he cannot do the work of Mali then what is the purpose of appointing him on the post of Mali.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal and Sh. Ashok Goyal said that he may be considered on the post of Cleaner as per the nomenclature of University.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said what Committee said that however, he fulfills the conditions of educational qualifications as well as age limit for appointment as Cleaner/Mali on

Compassionate grounds. It is understood if there is a nomenclature of appointing on the post of Cleaner-cum-Mali then the same can also be considered.

Whereas Sh. Prabhjit Singh said that for the appointment of Mali a test is being conducted.

Dr. S.S. Sangha said it is correct where the person do not know the work of Mali, there he is working as Cleaner, so Cleanerc-cum-Mali designation is correct.

Shri Satish Sharma said that in the colleges of Delhi, they have made a multiple work force. He suggested that they should adopt that system depending upon the qualifications and resources.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this person does not fulfil the qualifications of multiple worker also to which Shri Satish Sharma said that they could give him relaxation as a special case.

Shri Satish Sharma said that he has just suggested, but if they feel that there is some problem, they could examine it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that compassionate appointment means that one should be able to earn his bread and butter and he may not face any problem. The grade of a Cleaner, Mali and Sweeper is same. A Mali has technical qualification, he should know when the flowers are to be pruned. He said that he has sympathy with the person, but he is saying all this in the interest of the University.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that in qualifications of a Mali it is mentioned that the person should be middle pass whereas in the instant case the person is 4th pass only.

The Vice Chancellor said it would be better to appoint him as Cleaner.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that at Sr. No. 3 it is written that the father of the person in question was working as security person on daily wages in Boys Hostel No.6 and his mother expired on 21.10.2016. He asked if the compassionate appointment rule is applicable on a daily wager. The Committee has recommended that he may be appointed as Security Guard (on daily wages basis) on current D.C. rate. He wondered whether the Committee has been constituted to make appointment on compassionate ground or for making daily wage appointments. If he is to be appointed, then he could be appointed directly and not by this Committee on compassionate ground. Why they are recommending it, it is very very serious. Referring to Sr. No. 4 of the list, he said that it is written that she fulfils the condition of educational qualification. As a member of the Syndicate, nobody knows what is her qualification whereas in other cases, the qualifications have been mentioned. Why the qualification is not mentioned here whether she is graduate or postgraduate.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the qualification has been written in the first column to which Shri Prabhjit Singh said it is okay.

Shri Prabhjit Singh while referring to Sr. No. 5, it is written in the office comments that, 'it is pertinent to mention here that there is still no such policy in the University regarding regularization of services of Assistant Professor working on temporary basis. The Committee is saying that she should be appointed for one year. He asked how she could be appointed for one year under compassionate ground. In regulation 5, it has been mentioned that Syndicate shall have the authority to make emergent temporary appointment on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor. But this is not an emergent appointment. He asked if this committee has the power to make appointment for one year on compassionate ground.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Committee has just told as to what kind of appointment could be done.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they made the appointment under regulation 5.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Committee has just told, they have not made the appointment.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that she is already working under regulation 5 for one year and the Vice Chancellor has no power to appoint beyond one year. So, it has no connection with the compassionate appointment.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when her case for appointment came three years back, at that time Mr. Rahul who was Reader in B.D.S. died, it was a very untimely death. Then she applied, but they cannot appoint her on regular basis in Class-I. Then this case was discussed and came at the conclusion that they cannot give her appointment on regular basis on compassionate ground. So it was decided to give her appointment under regulation 5 for three years. Though it was not given as per rules, the Committee decided that she cannot be given regular appointment on compassionate ground, so if they would like to continue her further, as is being done in other cases, it should also be done. So, under regulation 5, the Vice Chancellor can recommend to the Syndicate and the Syndicate can do it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh asked what is the compulsion to them to regularise her as Assistant Professor. If they want to regularise her, they regularise her as Clerk. What is the problem in it. She has demanded a compassionate appointment and the University cannot give her compassionate appointment as Assistant Professor, then they should appoint her on a post for which she is eligible. If she is not interested, it is for her to decide.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they should not then put the word 'compassionate appointment'. She should be regularised otherwise.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they cannot regularise her.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that her appointment has been done and it has not been done on compassionate ground. Her appointment has been done under regulation 5 upto 2019. Her appointment is till the next year. The case has perhaps come here because her case on compassionate ground may be there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when one year or so is left of someone's appointment, then the person may think that it could be gone through from this channel.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that her case on compassionate ground may be there.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said if her case on compassionate ground is not pending, then why it has come to this Committee.

Shri Satish Sharma suggested that if they cannot appoint her in Class-I category, then they could consider her case for her appointment as Demonstrator in the Dental College. So, this is the thing, which they can do. If it would be acceptable to her, she could do that, otherwise it is going to create problem also.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there may not be a post of Demonstrator.

Shri Satish Sharma said that the post must be there as there is no Dental College where there is no such a post. He said that he is not saying that she should be made a Demonstrator, but he is just suggesting something which has arisen out of the situation. They can offer her a post of Demonstrator because there are other constraints.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that she has very good qualification. But if she is ready to work on contract basis, then the Vice Chancellor as per regulation 5, could recommend it and they would do it. But this case has to be placed before the Syndicate next time.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that neither they can do it now nor it could be done on compassionate ground. He further said that this item should be disposed off at the level of the Registrar and the Syndicate has nothing to do in Class-C appointment.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the appointing authority could anyone, but appointing authority cannot make appointments like this. It would have to be brought here and thereafter he would issue the appointment letter. Shri Ashok Goyal further said that he would like to make another observation here. In fact, let they should accept the fact that in the name of appointment on compassionate ground, the word used is 'compassionate, but practically it is compulsion. The compassionate appointment rules are very clear in Government of India and Punjab Government. The rules are clear in their University also. He has said so many times that the appointments on compassionate grounds are made keeping in view that the family of

the diseased is not thrown on the road. If somebody is there already working in the family, then how do they appoint that if they come to their University, it would be a compassion and if someone is appointed in some other University, then it is not compassion. People used to come here by leaving the job from other University and here it becomes a compassionate appointment. In the instant case, there was no provision of compassionate appointment of the kind which the survivor wants. There is another case also in which without any provision using the regulation 5, when they can use regulation 5, can they use the regulation 5 for making such appointments because that is only to meet the emergency situation. Anyway, practical, what they thought, let they should not call it compassionate. Let they should give the appointment, first it was suggested for one year, then for two years and then it is said that it should be at least for three years. The appointment was made on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor at one go for three years. Now why it has been referred to the Compassionate Appointment Committee, is a very big question, how, and under what circumstances the Committee is recommending that let the Vice Chancellor recommend. It was simply to be said that this case is not covered under rules of compassionate ground appointments. Thereafter, the Vice Chancellor could have taken the view whether he wants to bring it for further extension or not. Let they should not talk about compassionate ground appointment at all because her case, now after 2½ years on the death of diseased is not covered in the compassionate appointment. So, as far as regulation 5.1 is concerned, that is for the Vice Chancellor to see at the appropriate time i.e. April, 2019. This item without recording any discussion should be withdrawn. Secondly, he is clearly saying that whichever Committee is appointed, they do not follow the rules of the compassionate appointments. They follow their sentiments. While referring to Sr. No. 6, he said it is very interesting, he has all sympathies with the person who has been detected with a serious disease like cancer.

At this point of time, the Vice Chancellor asked if the case at Sr. No. 5 is to be withdrawn to which Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal nodded in the affirmative.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Registrar should not have mark it to the Committee. Now cancer has been detected to someone and they pray that he recovers from that. The Committee is made for making appointments on compassionate grounds. But the Committee recommended that till the time his husband recovers from that disease, his wife should be given appointment. He could understand if the Committee has recommended that in view of the serious disease he is undergoing, he may be granted special leave with pay. But the Committee has recommended that she may be appointed on daily wages basis. Nobody know what she would be paid as daily wagger. In the case of Cleaners, it is very much common in Uttar Pradesh that the person who is getting 30-35 thousand salary, he used to engage a person on five thousand and get the work done from him. He requested that the Committee which is made for Compassionate appointments should have knowledge about the rules for making such appointments. They should not appoint the persons on sentimental grounds as they are also answerable tomorrow if an application under RTI filed by someone about it and they have to reply to him.

The Vice Chancellor said it means that the case at Sr. No.6 is rejected.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Shri Ashok Goyal is not saying that it is rejected, what he is saying is that this appointment cannot be done on compassionate ground.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the case at Sr. No. 6 has such a serious condition, then they must try to find out the way as to what could be done. Suppose, he is now on leave without pay, instead of bringing the case here under compassionate ground, his wife could be appointed otherwise.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they would actually like to do like this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the case at Sr. 6 should be withdrawn and she could be appointed otherwise and dealt with separately.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that whenever someone sits in the Committee, he gets sentimental.

The Vice Chancellor said that the cases at Sr. No. 3, 5, and 6 are withdrawn and the rest are passed.

Shri Satish Sharma, Professor Navdeep Goyal and some other members said that the other cases may also not be discarded and they should be covered in some different way.

RESOLVED: That recommendations of the Committee dated 13.08.2018 to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds at Sr. Nos 1, 2 and 4 be approved and the cases at Sr.No. 3, 5 and 6 be treated as withdrawn.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the person at Sr. No. 2 (Mr. Gurmukh Singh) be appointed as Cleaner instead of Mali.

By-election, for one seat of Senate and to decide the Returning Officer for holding election

8. Considered if:

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

NOTE: 1. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Principal, Govind National College, Narangwal, Ludhiana was elected as ordinary Fellow from the Constituency of Heads of Affiliated Arts Colleges.

- 2. Regulation 1 of Chapter II(B) appearing at page 61 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 reads as under:

“1. Election of Ordinary Fellows under Section 13 of the Panjab University Act shall be held every four years. Hence, in every on such dates as the Chancellor may appoint on this behalf, there shall, if necessary, by an election to fill any vacancy amongst the Ordinary Fellows elected under Section 13(2) of the Act.”

- 3. Regulation 10.1 appearing at page 64 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 reads as under:

“for elections other than those by the Faculties, the Registrar or the Deputy Registrar, as the Syndicate may decide, shall be the Returning Officer.”

- 4. An office note is enclosed.

Shri Prabhjit Singh while initiating the discussion on this item that is it their compulsion. If a seat from the Graduate Constituency falls vacant, would the University hold elections for that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it cannot be held ever for the Graduate Constituency.

Shri Satish Sharma said that he is hundred percent sure that for faculties elections were held many times and he can give them examples. For Principals Constituency, bye-

election was held. So, he personally feel that the Principal should be represented here. The Syndicate has no moral authority to obstruct it and they should proceed with it.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested Shri Satish Sharma not to use such harsh words like 'moral authority' to which Shri Satish Sharma said that moral authority is not a harsh word.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it should be fixed in a time bound manner.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they have 91 members in the Senate. The contribution made by Late Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal cannot be compared with anyone. He appreciated the efforts made by him. He said that they have to keep in mind the expenditure to be incurred in holding the election and the shortage of one member would not make much difference. Suppose, tomorrow a seat from the Graduate Constituency falls vacant, would they hold election for that seat. He further said that if election is not done, there could not be any harm.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that last time the election for one vacant seat from Principal Constituency was held in the University, so it does not involve much expenditure as no TA/DA to the Principals was paid.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that they cannot stop the democratic process. Even in the Parliament, bye-elections are held whenever need arises.

Shri Gurjot Malhi was of the view that if much expenditure is not involved, they should go for holding elections.

Dr. Amit Joshi and Dr. Subhash Sharma also supported the holding of election.

It was informed (by the D.C.D.C.) that last time 68 Principals participated in the election process which was held at University.

Dr. Subhash Sharma enquired as to how much expenditure was incurred?

Dr. R.K. Mahajan informed that no TA/DA was paid to the Principals at that time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they do not understand point which Shri Prabhjit Singh made. What he has said is that, is it necessary to hold the election. The answer to this is either 'yes' or 'no'. If it is 'yes', then they do not have any choice. If it is not necessary, then they have to decide whether they have to hold the election or not. They are just saying, hold the election, but nobody has answered his question.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said he has not said that that the election be not held. He has just raised a question, if any seat gets vacant from the Graduate Constituency, would they hold election for that.

The Vice Chancellor said that Shri Prabhjit Singh has given his opinion only and that should not be contradicted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has not given the opinion. He (Shri Prabhjit Singh) has not said that the election should not be held. He has just asked if it is necessary to hold the election. Shri Prabhjit Singh has asked so that he could form his opinion. In the regulation under Section 13, it has been written 'if necessary' which gives them the freedom whether to hold the election or not. Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has given a very good suggestion that if much money is not involved, the election should be held. So, this has solved the query raised by Shri Prabhjit Singh that if some seat from the Graduate Constituency gets vacant, the election for that would not be held. So, let they should take a decision that since there would not be much expenditure involved in the conduct of election from the Principal Constituency, so the election should be conducted, similarly the election could be held for vacant seats from Faculties. As regards seat, if gets vacant from Graduate Constituency, then they would take a decision whether to hold the election or not.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked as to what is the provision in the P.U. Calendar regarding this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is very serious matter. Last year a person who has come from the Graduate Constituency, was his resignation not taken here? Would they hold election in that case?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if it is a provision in the Calendar, then they have to hold the election.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if someone says that the election has to be held if it is written, then at least he is not in favour of that. They can say that they could hold the election or they may not hold it. So, they would decide that the election for the vacant seat of Principal Constituency should be conducted as much expenditure is not involved and also there is no much inconvenience. But if such a situation arises in the Graduate Constituency, probably, that may not be possible.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if Regulation 10.1 mandates for holding the election in the Graduate Constituency, then how they could refuse it.

The Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Amit Joshi to read page 99 of the agenda papers.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that his question has not been answered. As per the Calendar, the Ordinary Fellows include Teachers, Principals, Graduates etc.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to think in terms of welfare of the University also. If the words, as far as, possible are written in the regulation, keeping in view the interest of the University, they should take the decision. Personally speaking, he said, that it is for the first time that the faculties are to be changed. He has been given to understand that a letter has been received yesterday in this regard by someone. The last date for opting the change in faculties is 5th of November, 2018. Why the date has been fixed as 5th November, he does not know about it. He would like to know when the meeting of the Syndicate would be held in November.

Shri Satish Sharma pointed out that normally the date for change of faculties is kept till December.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the change in faculties is to be decided by the Syndicate and not by the Senate. Keeping in view the convenience of the office to process the change of faculty applications and sometimes the meeting of the Senate is scheduled early and also electoral college gets changed, the date for change of faculty should be kept accordingly. Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to when the meeting of November Syndicate has been scheduled.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that still there is one month time and it does not make any difference by extending the date.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the reason forwarded by Shri Ashok Goyal is correct as the applications remain sealed..

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the date for receiving the requests for change in faculties be extended and the same be re-fixed one day before the meeting of the November, 2018 Syndicate. This was endorsed by Professor Keshav Malhotra, Shri Satish Sharma, Professor Navdeep Goyal and few other members.

This was agreed to.

Principal Anita Kaushal said that the meeting of the Senate has been fixed for 27.10.2018 and pointed out that it is a fasting day on account of Karva Chauth and requested that the date be changed.

The Vice Chancellor informed that the date has already been changed to 3rd November, 2018.

While the members were discussing to fix the date for November Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor said that he would decide after taking into account all things and his schedule.

Resuming discussion on the item, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the date for holding election has to be fixed by the Chancellor. But they have to keep in mind that this date cannot be in the year 2018. He said that any date which is to be fixed, it could be in year 2019.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the schedule for holding election has to be following as mentioned in the P.U. Calendar. He further said that even otherwise it is not possible to hold the election in the year 2018 as the process is lengthy one.

RESOLVED: That

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

Evaluation of the applications of students from Law courses for attending classes/transfer from one institution to the other

9. Considered minutes dated 18.09.2018 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to evaluate the applications of students (**as per annexure-IV**) from Law courses for attending classes/transfer from one institution to the other within Panjab University System of Institutions.

NOTE: The students have been permitted to attend the classes provisionally, subject to final approval of the Syndicate, as the classes have already been started.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they have done these cases last time and approved the cases received till 23.9.2018 and for further cases a Committee has to be constituted, but now these have come again.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Committees have not been formed.

Dr. Amit Joshi again said that they have resolved it in the last Syndicate and a Committee has to be constituted.

The Vice Chancellor said that there was a small technical fault.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Committee has recommended some cases and rejected the others without any reason. For example, at page 104 of the agenda, Sr. No. 4, it has been written 'allowed subject to verification of medical certificate' He said that the Committee has allowed even before the verification of the medical certificate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said if the certificate was not verified, then his case would not be approved to which Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he has already started attending the classes.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he must have started attending the classes only after verification. If he has started the classes without verification, it is wrong.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that in some cases the Committee has allowed and in some cases it has allowed subject to verification. If something is done on security reason, then they should see whether one has security threat or not. If someone is shifted to Chandigarh owing to the fact that his father or mother is an IPS Officer, it is wrong. At Sr. No. 18, the father of the candidate is an IPS Officer. How do they know that the candidate has security threat. Has he been provided Security Guards?

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they had resolved that they would not accept any other reason except medical reasons. If they start considering the cases on security ground, then they would receive more cases like this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and some other members endorsed it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the IPS officers put pressure on the Committee members as also the Syndicate members to get their work done. So, personally he does not agree with it. He pointed out that in some cases the requests have not been accepted on security basis whereas in some other cases it has been accepted. He does not know how the Committee has done it. While referring to Sr. No. 34, he said that the father of the candidate is Sub Inspector, Incharge CIA Staff, Barnala. His son has been allowed on security reasons.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should not read the names. If they do not want to approve any cases, they can do so.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi wanted to ask to what are the medical reasons. How it would make a difference if a candidate remains at some other place.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that in some of their Regional Centre, there are no hospitals. They had resolved that if someone brings medical certificate from Sector -16 or Sector-32 hospital that could be considered. If someone is suffering from irritable bowel syndrome, how that student would live there. He cannot take his meals.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he is not against anyone. Suppose, they are transferring a person who is residing at Ferozepur, can he be treated only at Jalandhar.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they are transferring anyone. A student would remain a student of that institute where he is enrolled. If he is in PURC Ludhiana, he would remain a student of that Centre. They are just giving permission to the student to attend classes. They have approved the medical ground for his/her transfer, the other have come, it is a separate issue. Now as he has already mentioned them about a disease. In that disease there are very strict instructions to take his meals. This cannot be managed in a P.G. or mess. Such a student could manage all these things at home.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he means to say that the disease which one is suffering from cannot be treated at a particular place. Then they must get a certificate from the student to that effect.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said what has been done in these cases, there is lot of subjectivity. The persons who have some approach, they manage to get the things done.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Committee which has recommended these cases have very senior members. While referring to Sr. No. 19, he said that he has been allowed due to security reasons, but the persons at Sr. No. 22 have not been allowed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Committee did not allow the person at Sr. 22 because he is not a student of affiliated college of Panjab University as he is from Devi Dayal College of Law, Barwala. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they not approve the cases on the ground of security threat.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that basically this is migration. If they read the migration rules, it is very clearly written that in the first year there could not be any migration.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this is not migration as he would remain a student of that Institute.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it would be a financial loss to the University. In the rules it is clear that only the failed candidate of first year could go to the other college, but the student is taking admission in other colleges and the University is not aware of it. The University issues only one roll number and registration number, then how a candidate can take admission in other college. It is written clearly in migration rules.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it would be a new admission and not migration.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the parity which is not there that if a candidate who has compartment can migrate from a Regional Centre, he is allowed, but a candidate from the affiliated college who has compartment cannot is not allowed. He requested that either a Committee should be formed to look into issue or it should be discussed here as it is must.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they should read the migration rules and act accordingly as it is causing great loss to the University.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the issue of attending classes had also come in the Syndicate. In order to make it objective, they have resolved by saying that only cases of medical ground would be allowed and all the other grounds should be discarded. So they should stick to it. Second, he also agrees to what Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has said that as regards the medical grounds, the things may get complicated. On the medical ground, they should make the things objective.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that only chronic diseases should be taken into consideration.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it would be easy for the Committee if they make it objective. Since they live in the society, so undue pressures would be there. So, everything should be object and there should not be anything subjective. Medical ground should also be made objective.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said it is not fair that if they did not get admission here, they start attending the classes here.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that when they took admission, they might be suffering from that disease at that time also. So, with the existing disease, why he has gone there. Actually, what the candidates think that they should get admission at some other place with lower marks and then shift to Panjab University.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they should not deal with all the serious cases such as spinal problem etc. equally.

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

Shri Prabhjit Singh wanted to know with whose permission the students started attending the classes when it was not permitted by the Competent authority. He is unable to understand as to what is happening. They are doing worse than the CMJ University. They should be told, who is the competent authority. If they have started the classes, then why these cases have been brought here. They should withdraw the item. These are professional courses, so there would be a problem of internal assessment. How the internal assessment would be given by Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, when the student is studying here. This is a very serious matter whereas they are taking it casually.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that in the meeting of Syndicate dated 23rd September, they decided, in principle, that the cases which are cleared by this date stand approved and they will constitute a committee. So, no candidate is attending the class without permission. After that the D.U.I. has given the intimation.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he wants to see the letter which has been issued by any authority to intimate the students. He said that the students are attending the classes even before their approval.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they can check, the students are not attending the classes. This is absolutely wrong. He said he is hundred percent sure that they are not attending the classes. The email is sent only after having confirmation from here. The procedure is alright and they have to take the decision as per the procedure.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that they should not take any decision again what they have already decided.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they can exclude the cases which are on the ground of security. As regards medical cases, they should consider the medical certificate issued by the PGI.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the last meeting it was not decided that all the cases which have been received till date are approved. Rather it was discussed that when it was not within the purview of the Committee to consider first semester students, how they have done that. Now since they have already done that and the applications which have been received till date, they cannot discriminate them, their cases would also be considered. It was not done, first they did for the first semester that how it was done. Now it is being told that with the cases of medical ground, the cases on security ground have also been added. If they decide today that it should be done today, but they would not do it in future. Then what is the fault of those future cases? The Committee which has to be formed, they want to put it under chains, but this Committee has been given consists of VIP, it may be allowed to act, the way it likes. So, he wanted to say that all the cases of 2018 should be reviewed. There should not be any pick and choose. They cannot be discriminatory. He would like to tell as to what is happening in the University. He does not know whether it is in his (Vice Chancellor) knowledge

or not, if it is in his knowledge, it may not be in that form in which he would like to bring it to his knowledge.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that there is an orphanage where the parents of girls are not there and the said Orphanage is being operated by Women. There is a trust where 90 girls have been accommodate, they education to these girls by spending money from there, they try that these girls should excel in the field of education and become PCS and IAS Officers. One of girls of the Orphanage studies in Rayat and Bahra University, and Rayat and Bahra University charges Rs.10,000/- as fee from them instead of Rs.40,000/- and that amount of Rs.10,000/- is being paid by the Orphanage. One such student of Orphanage applied for migration in Panjab University and in University, the migration fee is Rs.50,000/- She cannot pay the Migration fees and there in no provision Panjab University to waive off the Migration Fees. The orphanage cannot pay more than Rs.10,000/-, Nobody thinks about the situation of the girl and that girl collects Rs.10,000/- each from five persons and deposited in the University and now she applied if it is possible to please consider her case for refund of the same. That case was brought to his notice only a day before the Syndicate and in that Panjab University says there is no rule and regulation relating to it.

He said that in the situation where every member is convinced that there is no rule in Panjab University that should be brought before the Syndicate and whatever the Vice Chancellor deemed fit he may decide. If that cannot be done then all the 15 members should contribute Rs.4000/- for the same. These cases of migration are not to be allowed just like on the basis of security reasons, international players, this should be avoided. The suggestion that other than medical cases be considered, should summarily be rejected as this is not the purview of that Committee. If these cases are to be examined, then all the cases of 2017 and 2018 be examined. The other Committee which is to be constituted should keep in mind all the observations in mind and the interest of the University and needy students and decide in the matter so that the position of the University should not be spoiled. If this list is sent to the Bar Council then what is the reply of the University. What is the sanctity of the sanctioned seats ? The case of Orphanage which has been intimated to the House be dealt in what manner, that will be informed to the House and Vice Chancellor. Since I joined Senate, this rule I had never told as from this rule in genuine people will get undue benefits. This rule will be intimated by him to the Vice Chancellor as it will not require the approval of the Syndicate only the Vice Chancellor can do. Other than medical cases should be summarily rejected and it should be looked into whether are students are attending the classes or not if they are attending then under what authority they are attending, the same should be clarified and in future it should be made sure that until and unless the competent authority sanctions, no action will be taken. If these cases are now rejected and students are attending classes and fee have been paid then in that what is to be done in the matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that for future is it required to form a Committee.

The members of the House said that it is the Vice Chancellor who constitutes the Committee and do the needful. The House authorized the Vice Chancellor to constitute the Committee at his level only.

RESOLVED: That the cases of only those students who have applied on medical grounds for attending classes/transfer from one institution to the other within Panjab University System of Institutions be approved.

Introduction of Certificate Courses in Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies and Development

10. Considered recommendation (Item No.VII) dated 26.06.2018 of the Academic Council that the following courses in the Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies and Development, be introduced from the session 2018.

1. Certificate Course in Governance & Leadership in Human Resource Management
2. Certificate Course in Governance & Leadership in Political Parties and Electoral Process

The Vice Chancellor said that there are two observations which he want to convey is that credit and fee structure is not defined in it, if the House authorizes the same is to be done.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that is syllabus has already been approved.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said the credit score can be defined but she want to inform that the certificate courses of basically in Masters of Governance and leadership and the course of Semester I and II is bifurcated in Summer and Winter and no separate teacher is appointed for the same. Out of 4 subjects of Masters Course, a student opts for two subjects which is a part of Certificate Course and the student is paying Rs.8000/- including examination fee and there is no additional expenditure on the part of University. She said that two batches of this course have already been passed.

The members objected that why this matter is brought before the Syndicate when the courses have already been started.

Dr. Ameer Sultana informed that this course was started from the academic session 2017-18 and passed by the Academic Council and she is not aware why this has been put before the Syndicate now.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked the Registrar whether the Certificate Course should come to the Syndicate for approval.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said this course was approved by the Academic Council and now it was brought to Syndicate but this recommendation was put up in the meeting of 26th June, 2018 whereas Madam Ameer Sultana ji has informed that the courses have already been started in 2017. What was done in the meeting of 26th June, 2018. If Dr. Sultana ji will not inform the House that the courses are being run from 2017 then at present the House will be in impression that new courses were passed in the meeting of 14th October, 2018 whereas this has already been done.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that both the Masters and Certificate courses are running simultaneously in the Department. In Master courses admissions were done in the session 2017-18 and the first batch has reached to 3rd Semester. She was not a member of the Syndicate and she is not aware when it was approved in the Syndicate.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that facts of the case should be got examined the placed before the House. This should be got examined that under whose authority this course was started in the year 2017 or in anticipation approval of Syndicate this course was started and then the same be placed before the Syndicate for consideration then if deems fit post facto approval will be done.

Sh. Sanjay Tandon expressed that he has some different view once the University has the information already available on the desk, then why this was not taken on record and on the basis of that ratify this, unnecessarily this becomes the part of the Agenda. Firstly the agenda should be reduced. The second point which he wants to reiterate is that such kind of matters are to be resolved without the approval of Syndicate. Is there any need to bring them to Syndicate. Panjab University should apply the mind on the new academic areas and take part in progressive and visionary work. If each and every item will become the part of the Agenda then it will be very difficult. Time and again he objected that Establishment Wing of the University is not able to deliver what is required to be done at their end. Cases like promotion of Professors, Lecturers D.A. and their demotions and positions comes to Syndicate and 15 people debate on it and there are different likings and disliking on particular person, which should not come here. Once the case of promotion is brought for discussion and if same type of cases are to be dealt with in future, the same may be allowed on the same pattern as per previous cases. The next thing he wishes to put forth is that as this course is political and he wishes to start scholarship on behalf of my father for this course. Somebody from the Department may be directed to contact me for suggestion relating to scholarship/sponsorship for the same.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the consideration of this case should not be delayed. It may be approved as the courses have already been started and these should not be put forward in Agenda again and again.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the view point of Sh. Sanjay Tandon is correct but there are many issues which cannot be ignored. As per Panjab University Calendar these issues have to be taken to Syndicate but the Agenda should be cut short and clear cut recommendations should be placed. He said there is no conclusion or outcome on the deliberations.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that these courses should be approved as the same has already functional.

Dr. Amit Joshi intervened and said that how can he say that these courses are running and requires no approval.

Sh. Sanjay Tandon said that suppose Sh. Ashok Goyal is not available in this meeting, then what will be the situation. He has seen in many meetings that all the Agenda was read out in a manner whereas Sh. Ashok Goyal placed the history of the Agenda just like an encyclopedia and then the whole topic changes. The history of the Courses of Department should be written on sheet and put before the Syndicate. Why do the Syndicate depend on one person that he will tell on the issue. Previously there was a case relating to some affiliation of some College and everything was decided and ready to approve then Sh. Ashok Goyal Ji raised his hand all the situation got changed as half of the information was not available with the House. Why the information is not provided by the Department. It is the job of the Administration to bring the facts to House and not by the House. The facts brought by the Office require discussion and decision in the matter. He said that Vice Chancellor should take a strict action on it that agenda should be prepared according to the pattern that all the key points should be included on the main sheet along with its enclosures. It should be not be left open for debate in the House. In every Company Board Meeting a proposed resolution is given, if thought fit, it may be passed for resolution.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that to pass this item just because Dr. Ameer Sultana brought the facts to the House is not appropriate. The facts should be brought for approval otherwise it will be quoted as precedent that this does not require the approval of the Syndicate. Therefore, the same should be placed again before the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor instructed that comprehensive details of the case be put up before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

RESOLVED: That the item be brought again to the Syndicate again with comprehensive details to take an appropriate decision.

Item C-11 and C-12 were taken up together for discussion.

Extension in submission of M.E. (Manufacturing Tech.) by Shri Rajesh Kumar Madhia.

11. Considered request dated 05.04.2018 (**Appendix-V**) of Dean, Academics and International Affairs, National Institute of Technical Teachers Training and Research (NITTTR), Sector 26 that Shri Rajesh Kumar Madhia a candidate of M.E. Engg. (Manufacturing Tech.) Modular Batch 2008, be given extension for one year i.e. upto 31.03.2019, for submission of his thesis.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 15) (**Appendix-V**) considered the issue regarding grant of extension to Shri Rajesh Kumar Madhia, for submission of his thesis and resolved that Shri Rajesh Kumar Madhia a candidate of M.E. Engg. (Manufacturing Tech.) Modular Batch 2008, be given extension for submission of his thesis till 31st March, 2018, as he could not submit it due to kidney transplant related problems and the decision be conveyed to the candidate immediately.

2. Request dated 28.03.2018 of Shri Rajesh Kumar Madhia is enclosed (**Appendix-V**).

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

Extension in submission of M.E. Mechanical Engg. (Manufacturing Technology)(Modular) by Shri Raj Kumar

12. Considered request dated 14.05.2018 (**Appendix-VI**) of Dean, Academics and International Affairs, National Institute of Technical Teachers Training and Research (NITTTR), Sector 26, Chandigarh, that Shri Raj Kumar a student of M.E. Mechanical Engineering (Manufacturing Technology) (Modular) Batch 2006, be given extension for Ten years i.e. upto 31.05.2019, for submission of his dissertation, as he could not submit his thesis due to critical bad health of his mother and wife:

NOTE: 1. Regulation 7.3 (a) appearing at page 435 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 reads as under:

“the thesis shall be submitted by the candidate at any time during the third semester of the course provide that the has appeared in all the theory papers up to the second semester examination. The result of the thesis shall, however, be declared after the candidate passes in all the 10 theory papers. The thesis will be examined and placed in either A, B, C or D Grades. A-Excellent, merit distinction, B-Good, C-Satisfactory and D-Rejected.

In case the candidate's thesis is rejected in (Grade D), or he is unable to complete the thesis in the third semester he will be allowed 2 years more at the maximum for submission of thesis or its revision.

Provided further that the extension beyond the above limit but not exceeding two year may be allowed by the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Principal/Head of the Department, as the case may be”.

2. Shri Raj Kumar, a candidate of M.E. Engg. (Manufacturing Tech.) Modular Batch 2006.
3. Request dated 09.05.2017 and 19.03.2018 of Shri Raj Kumar, alongwith photocopy of Medical treatment of his mother/wife is enclosed.
4. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-VI**).

Sh. Prabhjit Singh while considering the issue regarding grant of extension, said that he was given extension upto March, 2018, now the case is submitted that he may be given extension upto March, 2019.

Sh. Ashok Goyal informed that when the extension was given at that time it was decided that it should not be beyond March, 2018 then why this case has come up in the meeting. Why the extension of 10 years is to be considered.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh said that it is very strange what is happening here. This case should be rejected at the level of D.U.I and Vice Chancellor.

Sh. Rakesh Mahajan said that the extension was not given but it was said that by this date thesis should be submitted.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh said that his application is to be taken into account where he has submitted that due to personal reason, he want extension but why the extension is to be given to him if he does not want to study.

Sh. Ashok Goyal replied on the observations made by Sh. Sanjay Tandon that these items are not required to be put up in the Syndicate, is that if the rules do not permit to allow, then the same is placed before the Syndicate for decision.

Dr. Amit Joshi and Sh. Sanjay Tandon have said that why this was placed before the Syndicate when the Syndicate has no power to do it.

The Vice Chancellor said that both the parts of Item No.11 and 12 is to be considered.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh in the case of Item No.11, it requires the approval from the University whereas in Item No.12, the Dean Academics, NITTR, Sector 26 recommending the extension. They should be asked under which regulation they are recommending the extension of ten years.

Sh. Sanjay Tandon, Sh. Prabhjit Singh and Sh. Ashok Goyal suggested that both the items 11 and 12 be rejected.

RESOLVED: That

- (i) the request dated 05.04.2018 of Dean, Academics and International Affairs, National Institute of Technical Teachers Training and Research (NITTTR), Sector 26 for grant of extension for one year i.e. upto 31.03.2019 for submission of thesis by Shri Rajesh Kumar Madhia, M.E. Engg. (Manufacturing Tech.) Modular Batch 2008 student, be **not** accepted
- (ii) the request dated 14.05.2018 of Dean, Academics and International Affairs, National Institute of Technical Teachers Training and Research (NITTTR), Sector 26, Chandigarh, for grant of extension for Ten years i.e. upto 31.05.2019 for submission of dissertation by Shri Raj Kumar a student of M.E. Mechanical Engineering (Manufacturing Technology) (Modular) Batch 2006, be **not** accepted.

Regarding revocation of penalty of withholding of three increments imposed upon Shri Ashutosh Sharma, Sr. Assistant, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur **13.** Considered if-

- (i) the penalty of withholding of three increments imposed upon Shri Ashutosh Sharma, Senior Assistant, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, be revoked as he was acquitted from all the charges levelled against him by the Court of Ms. Nazmeen Singh, PCS, Judicial Magistrate 1st Class Chandigarh.
- (ii) the period of suspension w.e.f. 04.07.2012 to 26.08.2014 be treated as on duty.

- NOTE:** 1. Sh. Ashutosh Sharma, Senior Assistant, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, was placed under suspension w.e.f. 04.07.2012 in case of misappropriation / fraud of funds of Rs.,3,31,937/- vide order No. 13043/Estt. dated 04.07.2012.
2. The enquiry was conducted by Prof. R.K. Gupta as Enquiry Officer and Sh. B.B. Talwar, A.R. (Accounts) as Presenting Officer.
3. Shri Ashutosh Sharma was reinstated vide order No. 18008-16/Estt. dated 27.08.2014 without prejudice and subject to outcome of the enquiry and police / court case pending against him, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 12.07.2014 (Para-9).
4. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.06.2017 (Para 33) had considered the enquiry Report dated 23.11.2015 submitted by Professor R.K. Gupta, Enquiry Officer and resolved that:-

- (i) enquiry report dated 23.11.2015, submitted by Professor R.K. Gupta, Enquiry Officer, USOL, P.U. in respect of circumstances in which a sum of Rs.3,31,937/- payable to Ms. Aruna Sud, Deputy Librarian (Retd.), Hoshiarpur was credited in the account of Shri Ashutosh Sharma, Sr. Assistant, Regional Centre Hoshiarpur, be accepted.
- (ii) major penalty of “removal from service of the University which does not disqualify from future employment” be imposed upon the delinquent official Shri Ashutosh Sharma, Sr. Assistant, Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.

Pursuant to the above decision, Sh. Ashutosh Sharma was issued show cause notice vide No. 11428-29/Estt. dated 01.08.2017, as to why the penalty proposed by the Syndicate, i.e. “removal from service of University which does not disqualify from future employment” under Rule 3 B (v) at page 114 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-III, 2016.

5. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 18) considered the reply dated 10.08.2017 of Shri Ashutosh

in response to the above said show cause notice and it was resolved that the representation of Sh. Ashutosh be not accepted.

6. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 10.12.2017 (Para 29) considered the mercy request dated 28.09.2017 of Shri Ashutosh and resolved that mercy request dated 28.09.2017 of Shri Ashutosh, Sr. Assistant, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, be accepted and the major penalty imposed on him be converted to minor penalty and punishment of stoppage of 3 increments be imposed.

Accordingly, the penalty of withholding of 3 increments i.e. 2015, 2016 & 2017 with cumulative effect was imposed on Sh. Ashutosh Sharma vide Office Order No.4607-10/Estt. dated 12.04.2018.

7. A copy of the orders dated 12.01.2018 passed by the Court of Ms. Nazmeen Singh, PCS, Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Chandigarh on Police Challan Registration No.1746/2014 is enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).
8. Request dated 01.06.2018 of Shri Ashutosh Sharma, for re-consideration of the decision of the Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 (Para duly forwarded by the Director, Panjab University, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, is enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).
9. A copy of Legal opinion dated 23.05.2018 of Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate is enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).
10. Rule No. 31 at Page-93 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-III, 2016, which is read as under: -

“An employee on reinstatement, after dismissal, removal or suspension, may be allowed the following payment by the authority competent to order reinstatement:

- (a) If he is honourably acquitted: Full pay and, by an order to be separately recorded, any allowances drawn immediately before removal, dismissal or suspension. The whole period of absence will be treated as on duty.
- (b) If not honourably acquitted: Such proportion of pay and allowances as

the reinstating authority may prescribe provided that such proportion shall not be less than the subsistence and other allowances admissible during suspension. The period of absence will not be treated on duty unless the reinstating authority so directs.

Note: 1. The reinstating authority may, if the employee so desires, convert the period of suspension into one of leave of any kind due and admissible to him in a case falling under (b);

2. The grant of pay and allowances under this rule does not cancel any acting arrangement that may have been made during the period of an employee's suspension, removal, dismissal or reduction."

In this case the Syndicate is the competent authority.

11. An office note is enclosed **(Appendix-VII)**.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan while discussing on this item which relates to the penalty of withholding of three increments imposed upon Sh. Ashutosh Sharma, Senior Assistant, PUSGRC, Hoshiarpur said that Sh. Ashutosh had refunded the money and court had acquitted him.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that on which ground Court had acquitted and someone may be deputed to study and submit the recommendations.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh said that the charges of embezzlement was against the Assistant relating to Cheques from Accounts Branch and an enquiry Committee was constituted and the Committee convicted him and on the recommendations of the Committee, Syndicate being the competent authority, withheld his increments and he moved to Court against the decision of the Syndicate and his charges could not be proved in the Court and the Court had evicted him and now he pleaded to Panjab University that Court had evicted him and his period of absence be treated as suspension period and his three increments which had been withhold may be released.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said when the Court had evicted him then his penalty may be resolved.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that as per the statement of Court, the Court had evicted him due to lack of evidence and lack of proper investigation. One thing he would like to be clear that acquittal of the Court and the decision of the Syndicate is not interlinked. If the employee is acquitted from the Court the employee can still be punished departmentally if the Departmental charges are proved. The level of proof required is that it should be the preposterous of probability, if the probability is higher than what he did it, it can be proved guilty in the Departmental Enquiry whereas in the Court of Law the proof required is of much higher standard, it is a proof beyond reasonable doubt. He can still be convicted under the preposterous of probability and there is no need to obey the Court unless he has honourably acquitted where everything is found in his favour and alive. While concluding he said that lack of evidence means we did not meet the standards of proof required in the Court.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that what Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said is absolutely correct. For this the legal opinion by Sh. Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate was obtained which is that *"The Hon'ble Courts and the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has already taken the view that if the suspension and in some cases the departmental proceedings was based on complaint and allegations by employer, against the employee, then on acquittal, the competent authority is under legal duty to consider the acquittal judgement and then pass an appropriate orders"*.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi while replying said that he is agreed on it but the committee or the person who did the departmental enquiry be asked to look into it to put their recommendations that the Court had acquitted him from the charges and his case may be considered for release of three increments then the House will agree to it. He showed his consent on the legal opinion quoted by Dr. Subhash Sharma but not straight way, it should be passed with recommendations of the Enquiry Committee.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said he is agreed entirely with what Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said departmental enquiry and proceedings in the Courts has no connection. It is not obligatory on the part of Panjab University but in this case where Sh. Girish Agnihotri submitted his legal opinion and the complainant is also the University and on the basis of that complaint the criminal case was lodged. While lodging the criminal complaint on one side, the Panjab University initiated the departmental proceedings or enquiry and since Panjab University is not bound to wait for the outcome of the Court, and after the departmental enquiry, the charges proved and the Syndicate stopped his three increments. But simultaneously the Panjab University had filed the criminal complaint in which the person has been acquitted. Now has there been a case where someone else was the complainant say for the case of moral turpitude, murder or where he has done some other frauds and the authority has removed him and the complainant is not the University then in that case the statement of Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi is correct whereas in both the cases it is the employer who has prosecuted departmentally. The legal opinion given by Sh. Girish Agnihotri is that *"The Hon'ble Courts and the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has already taken the view that if the suspension and in some cases the departmental proceedings was based on complaint and allegations by employer, against the employee, then on acquittal, the competent authority is under legal duty to consider the acquittal judgement and then pass an appropriate orders"*. So dealing with the case when the amount was shown in the account of actual beneficiary so after enquiring from the bank the University filed a complaint with Police also and in the mean time the departmental enquiry was initiated. As per legal opinion of Sh. Girish Agnihotri, the University is bound to acquit him as the Court has acquitted due to lack of evidence. He said as per the view of Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi if they have departmentally initiated the enquiry and separately a case was going on in the Court on the basis of private complaint, then they are not bound to obey.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he is not outrightly rejecting it. The legal opinion says that someone from the office of Registrar put forward that they are considering this and placed before the House that this is what the Departmental proceedings has recommended and this is the judgment of Court and then give his recommendations on it as the departmental proceedings are not available with the House. He said that he is not against the employee but he does not know what are the charges and what are the evidence. It should be placed before the Syndicate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this case should be brought before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that there may be some more charges in the charge sheet to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that there cannot be more charges.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was already considered in the Syndicate. At that time also they have felt like this and they awarded him the minimum punishment mentioned under the head, 'Major Penalties.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, is it the minimum punishment?

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that it is minimum punishment in the Major Penalties. He said that major punishment was recommended in this case. Even at that time it was felt that there is some evidence problem, so the big punishment was not given. It was also

discussed that they should not decide on the issue as yet because the Court may acquit him. It was also discussed that if the Court acquits him then the University would also acquit him.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that since he has been acquitted by the Court, so he requested that his three increments be restored. As regards the other part i.e. suspension period. To consider this suspension period as duty period, it is something different. Whatever he has been given it is okay, but since he has not worked during the suspension period that has could be looked into because if they consider it as duty period, then he has to be paid for that also.

Dr. Amit Joshi while referring to page 192 of the agenda said that he would definitely ask for the salary for that period because it has been written in the Calendar that :

“An employee on reinstatement, after dismissal, removal or suspension, may be allowed the following payment by the authority competent to order reinstatement:

- (a) If he is honourably acquitted: Full pay and, by an order to be separately recorded, any allowances drawn immediately before removal, dismissal or suspension. The whole period of absence will be treated as on duty.”

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that such items should not come on the agenda. A complaint was made and the trial court acquitted him and now after acquittal by the Court and the University would take the follow up action. Everybody would speak in this case.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is an administrative matter, if they want to do it, they should do it, otherwise it has another substitute for it. They should file an appeal against this judgement.

The Vice Chancellor said that now they should finish this matter.

A pandemonium prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi wanted to know the charges levelled against him.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the charges are those which have been framed by the Court to which Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that then he should read the charges.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the charges are written and he should read it from there. Dr. Mahajan, however, said that there is nothing in the charges, he has already read it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that everything has been written here. He said that a cheque of six lacs. was deposited in a wrong account. However, he could not brief about the case as the members started speaking in between.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should go forward.

On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the item is accepted which was also endorsed by the Vice Chancellor.

RESOLVED: That

- (i) the penalty of withholding of three increments imposed upon Shri Ashutosh Sharma, Senior Assistant, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, as he was acquitted by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Chandigarh from all the charges levelled against him **be revoked.**
- (ii) the period of suspension w.e.f. 04.07.2012 to 26.08.2014 be treated as on duty.

Routine and formal matters

14. The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(vi)** on the agenda was read out viz. –

(i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Mrs. Naveender P.K. Singh as Part Time Assistant Professor in the Department of Law, w.e.f. the date she starts work for the academic session 2018-2019 against the vacant position of the Department, on the same term and conditions according to which she has worked previously.

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed Dr. Rakesh Khullar, Medical Officer (on contract), Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, PU, to continue to work as Medical Officer on contract (beyond the age of 65 years) w.e.f. 18.09.2018 with one day break on 17.09.2018 till such time the post of Medical Officer is filled in on regular basis through advertisement on the previous terms and conditions.

NOTE: Dr. Rakesh Khullar, Additional Chief Medical Officer, BGJ Institute of Health, was appointed as Medical Officer w.e.f. 22.07.1994. He attained the age of 60 years on 30.09.2013 but he was granted extension in service for two years beyond the age of 60 years under Regulation 17.4 at page 133 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007.

He was re-employed on contract basis after his retirement on 30.09.2015 with one day break on 01.10.2015 for a period of six months on the fixed emoluments on the basis of half of salary last paid (excluding HRA, CCA & any other special allowance) as in the case of Dr. Lal. His term of appointment was extended upto the age of 65 years i.e. upto 16.09.2018.

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Professor Karamjeet Singh, UBS, to take over the additional charge of the post of the Registrar as a temporary measure from Col. Guljit Singh Chadha (Retd.) w.e.f. 30.09.2018 (A.N.), till further orders.

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, as per authorization given by the Academic Council dated 26.06.2018 (Item No. XXXVII) (**Appendix-VIII**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes dated 30.08.2018 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Skill Development Board regarding outline of tests, syllabi and courses of reading of various newly introduced B.Voc. courses as mentioned in the office note dated 13.09.2018 (**Appendix-VIII**) for the examination of 2018-19 along with the timeline and action person of each activity submitted by the Director, UIHMT.

NOTE: The Rules and Regulation have already been ratified by the Senate in its meeting dated 17.12.2016 (Para XXIV R(i)) (**Appendix-VIII**).

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology dated 24.09.2018 (**Appendix-IX**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved that onetime special chance, be given to final year students of BE 7th and 8th semesters (2017-18 session) of all the departments falling under Faculty of Engineering & Technology for appearing in Examination in September/October, 2018 and to year back students. The year back students be also allowed to attend the classes provisionally. This one time measure should not be taken as a precedent.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the last date of admission to various courses, (where no last date of admission is fixed by the governing body like AICTE etc.) in various teaching Departments of Panjab University, upto 10.09.2018, subject to availability of seats in the respect departments.

NOTE: A copy of the legal opinion of Senior Law Officer dated 31.08.2018 and orders dated 31.08.2018 issued by the DUI is enclosed (**Appendix-X**).

While referring to sub-item R-(ii), Dr. Amit Joshi said that they cannot go beyond the age of 65 years. In this case age of 65 years has also been crossed, they can extend the services upto the age of 100 years and University has to make the provision of the same in the Calendar. He said that appointment of Doctor on regular post be made. Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that regular appointment will be done. Adding to this Dr. Amit Joshi said there is politics in it no appointment on regular basis will be made by the University. He further raised that the issue of appointment of Dean College Development Council was discussed in the month of March but till date . no action has been done. He pointed out that there is lot of disorder in the administrative system of Panjab University relating to appointment of Dean College Development Council. He enquired that why Dean College Development Council is not appointed till date?

In response to it, Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that the same is to be done by the Vice-Chancellor.

On the extension of Dr. Rakesh Khullar, Additional Chief Medical Officer, BGJ Institute of Health Dr. Amit Joshi said that his dissent be recorded.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that in the Health Centre there is need of extension to be given to Dr. Rakesh Khullar as there is shortage of Doctors in the Health Centre. Moreover, the salary of Doctor appointed on regular basis will be much higher than that of Doctor whose services are to be extended.

Dr. Amit Joshi raised the issue that extension is to be given for a certain period and not till the time that post is filled up on a regular basis.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is dire need of Doctors in Health Centre so the case of extension of Dr. Rakesh Khullar be considered.

Dr. Amit Joshi further said that there is also shortage of teachers and the services of teachers should also be direly needed and extension in their service is also required to be done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the extension cases of Dr. B.S. Lal, Dr. Mrs. Arora and Dr. Khanna was also considered and accepted earlier. Dr. Keshav Malhotra said that Dr. Rakesh Khullar is very competent Doctor and he has maintained good relations with teachers and students and he is very hard working and has created and adopted new and innovative methods to diagnose the problems/diseases.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that this blanket extension is wrong thing and it has become precedent for future, she said that there is no doubt on his competency as she knew Dr. Khullar since very long time. She said that University has already extended the term of previous Doctors, but this is not right and University should not commit such type of mistakes again. If this type of blanket approval is to be given to Doctors then this should also be applied while dealing with the case of teachers. She said that if teachers are allowed extension in service then they are debarred from the administrative powers where as administrative powers are given to the Doctors, which is not justified and two things are clubbed together which is a part of hidden Agenda. She said that this blanket extension till the regular post is filled should not be given to the Doctors rather one year extension is to be given in such cases. This extension is to be made time barred and not beyond the age of 65 years.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the University has to take work from the Doctor and till date when the appointment on regular post is to be made, advertisement is to be published, screening is to be done, the services of Doctor is essentially required to manage the day to day functioning of Health Centre. He said that till the above said process is completed the services of Dr. Rakesh Khullar can be continued. There should not be such a position that the person is retired and on his post no regular appointment is done as work will suffer.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the date of advertisement for recruitment of Doctors should be fixed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that for advertisement for the recruitment of Doctors on regular basis, the approval of U.G.C. and MHRD is to be taken which is a very lengthy process.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the if the Panjab University starts doing extension in service to the senior Doctors, then the young generation will be at a loss they will not enter in the Government Sector at the same time he further said that if the Doctor is retired without giving extension then there will be shortage of Doctors in the Health Centre and patients will suffer and work of Health Centre will be in a slow moving situation. He further submitted that he has been requesting in all the previous Syndicate meetings that those posts which have been approved by MHRD, for which the members of the Syndicate fought with the Chandigarh Administration and got passed in the Board of Finance to approve the posts of Registrar, Dean College Development Council and 27 other posts from MHRD. The same have been got approved from the MHRD since more than last 6 months. It has been more than a year has passed the advertisement for the same is not published. While discussing on the issue on the appointment of Dean College Development Council, he said that this case also comes and discussed in every meeting that Controller of Examinations and DCDC is under work pressure and post is not being filled. He said that the top positions of the Panjab University either of the Registrar, the Controller of Examinations and Dean College Development Council be filled on permanent basis as the Panjab University cannot function without these important positions. He said that Panjab University cannot function by giving charge of these top positions and in future it will be considered that the charge of Vice-Chancellor can also be given to someone else. He said that it has become practice in Panjab University that Registrar and DCDC is not filled on regular basis and additional charge is given. He said that post of Dean College Development Council is advertised, people have applied, scrutiny of applications has been done, now this is just a matter of 15 days to fill up the post of Dean College Development Council, the last date of receiving the applications for the post was 3rd July, 2018. He further said that the interview can be conducted and selection may be done. He said that the House should unanimously resolve that on all the 27 posts and posts of Registrar and DCDC, selection may be done immediately without any further delay.

Dr. Amit Joshi while seconding the statement of Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he is conveying this since the month of February/March. It is disrespect of Syndicate that interviews have not been conducted on fixed date and time. He said in future also no interviews will be conducted on fixed and scheduled date. He said that from the month of February and March he has been informing the House that examinations are coming and one person is over burdened and in the Affiliation Committee there is lot of confusion on the files whether the same is available with the office of DCDC or with the Controller of Examinations.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he is also the member of the Affiliation Committee, the condition is not bad as pointed out by Dr. Amit Joshi. He said that Controller of Examinations is the person who is handling the additional charge of Dean College Development Council so efficiently than no other person can do. He said that one should not blame anyone like this, if there is any complaint then proves it in the House along with the affidavit. This type of attitude will not be tolerated.

The Vice-Chancellor intervened and said that they should address the Chair.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the extension in service to Dr. Rakesh Khullar be allowed upto 31st December, 2018 and not till the regular post is filled.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi to give his comments on the matter.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he is very much disturbed what Subhash Sharma had said that if the posts are sanctioned, then why there is delay in filling up. He further said that date of extension be fixed and in the meanwhile the process of filling up the positions on regular posts be initiated. But that item should not be ignored as it is very important to fill up the posts. He further asked the Registrar how much time it will take for the advertisement to be published. Then Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that only those posts which have already been approved can be advertised and the services of Dr. Rakesh Khullar be extended for one year.

Dr. Keshav Malhotra said that the University has its own requirements, as the University teachers are in minority in Syndicate. He further said Dr. Rakesh Khullar is a very competent Doctor who has updated knowledge, good interaction with students and is very courteous he should be given extension on the same pattern as given to Dr. Lal, Dr. Arora and Dr. Khanna on the same terms and conditions.

Dr. Amit Joshi told that Dr. K.K. Talwar, Former Director of PGIMER and Former Chief of Medical Council of India has also retired and accepted his retirement gracefully. Everybody retires but one should accept the same gracefully. He said that he is not challenging the competency of the Doctor but this is in violation of the Statutory rules.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this is a demotivating step in the direction. If the same has not been there in the past then he will be the first person to reject the said extension. He said that what extension has been granted to the earlier three Doctors, the same may be allowed to this Doctor also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the term of appointment of Dr. Rakesh Khullar may be extended for one year.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that this time if the term is extended for one year it will be partial decision as in the previous cases, the term is extended till the regular post is filled. If the term is extended upto one year and till such time regular post is not filled then what will be further course of action. He said that his term of appointment may be extended till the regular post is filled may be in a period of 4 months, 6 months or 8 months.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there should be a stop of extension beyond the age of 65 years.

Dr. Keshav Malhotra said that Prime Minister Modi Ji directed that Doctors be given extension upto 70 years as there is shortage of Doctors.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal that University have to request the Doctors to continue till the regular post is filled as the salary of newly appointed Doctor is on the higher side than the existing Doctor.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that there should not be mud-slinging in the House on the competency of the Doctor. He said that being the Chairperson of the House, the Vice-Chancellor can take relevant decision in the matter.

Sh. Sanjay Tandon said that at this time of discussion coming out with the Hon'ble members with regard to personal likings and dislikings of a particular person, on the table then the genuineness of the discussion of the matter gets vitiated. He said that the wrongs and rights of a particular person should not be discussed on the table, it should be discussed on the basis of the decision taken as an University Employee. The common purpose of the House is to publish an advertisement and fill the posts as quickly as possible.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh said that whether it is the post of Dean College Development Council and the post of Registrar whosoever, has been given additional charge, they are performing their duties according to their capability. Instead of praising their capability and appreciating that they are working on dual charge, the House is criticizing on one and other issue, which is a very demoralizing situation.

While referring to sub-item R(iii), relating to additional charge of Registrar to Prof. Karamjeet Singh, Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that the item has already been approved. It was also seconded by Shri Prabhjit Singh

Sh. Sanjay Tandon said that one point he wanted to throw light personally in the matter that he felt very bad when he read in the paper about the decision of additional charge. At least that decision should have been informed to some people before it went to the public and they get the information from the newspapers and officials asked them to inform about the decision regarding additional charge whether it is done or not. He said that as a member of the Syndicate this was very awkward situation to face, he is not talking about the name of the person who has been given additional charge, he is not objecting but, he just want to convey that the said information should also be sent to them in advance so that they can be aware of it.

While referring to sub-item R(iv), Dr. S.S. Sangha said the last date was fixed as 20th October, 2018 but it should be extended to accommodate the compartment students whose results have been declared on 6th or 8th October. The last date may please be extended upto 25th October so that students may not suffer.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he already told in the previous meeting that the said date may be extended as there are lot of students who come under this category.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh, arising out of this there are lot of College students who cannot take admission till the last date of admission due to any reason and their applications of the students have already been received in the office, on this issue, the House authorized the Vice-Chancellor to allow them where there are vacant seats in the Colleges. He quoted the example of a College where there are 1300 seats and only 800 students admitted in it and the remaining seats are vacant which is huge loss of funds to the University and students are also facing problems of wasting their one year also. The main problem a College is facing that regular teachers do not have the work load, therefore the Vice-Chancellor is requested to allow to fill the vacant seats.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there are huge number of seats are lying vacant in Undergraduate classes.

The Vice-Chancellor asked what should be the last date for admission.

Dr. Amit Joshi, Prof. Ameer Sultana and Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that the last date should be fixed as 25th October, 2018.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi to offer his comments.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he just went to give only one suggestion is that as Sh. Prabhjeet Singh said "members of the House authorized Vice-Chancellor to take decision in the case" is not the right wording, rather they should say that the House propose to authorize the Vice-Chancellor.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that only those applications of students which have already been received may be considered.

Controller of Examinations informed that House that there are two issues first is that the last date of receipt of registration return which was 30th September, which was extended upto 8th October and the other is that the last date of receipt of Examination forms is 15th October.

Prof. Ameer Sultana, Professor Anita Kaushal and Dr. Subhash suggested the Vice-Chancellor that the last date be extended upto 25th October, 2018 for the applications that have already been received with late fee for all courses.

Controller of Examinations informed the House that earlier the last date was 29th September and later on it was extended upto 8th October and the date of receipt of fees was extended upto 15th October, 2018.

The House after discussion suggested that 20 or 25th October may be decided as the last date of admission with late fees for all the courses.

While referring to sub-item R(v), Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that the special chance be allowed to all the Professional Courses including law Courses provided the regulation do not debar. Dr. Amit Joshi said that why this line that this is one time chance is being written whereas the same has become precedent.

While referring to sub-item R(vi), the House approved that the last date of admission to various teaching Departments of Panjab University be extended upto 10.09.2018 subject to availability of seats in the respective Departments with late fees.

RESOLVED: That

1. the information contained in Items **R-(i) to R-(iii) and R-(vi)**, be ratified;
2. the information contained in item **R-(iv)** be ratified with the addition that the last date for admission to B.Voc. Course as also for the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University be extended to 25th October 2018. with permission of the Vice-Chancellor;
3. the information contained in item **R-(v)** be ratified and one-time special chance be also extended to all professional courses of the University provided the Regulations of concerned courses do not debar for giving such chance.

Routine and formal matters 15. The information contained in Items **I-(i) to I-(viii)** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

(i) The Vice-Chancellor as authorised by the Syndicate at its meeting held on 23.09.2018 has approved that Dr. Muneeshwar Joshi, Secretary to Vice-Chancellor be paid a fixed lumpsum contractual emoluments of Rs.1,30,000/- per month with effect from the date of his joining (i.e. 13.09.2018 A.N.).

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following benefits to Col. Guljit Singh Chadha (Retd.), Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on completion of his term on 30.09.2018:-

[Encashment of Earned Leave, as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

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

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, as per authorisation given by the Syndicate, in its meeting dated 27.08.2018 (Para 4) (**Appendix-XII**) has approved the recommendations of the Committee dated 11.09.2018 (**Appendix-XII**) and permitted to introduce the M.A. Education- Two Year (Semester System) course in USOL, under the UGC-DEB stipulated lines w.e.f. Academic session 2018-2019.

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

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Devkali W/o Late Shri Ram Varan, Lineman-cum-Groundman, Directorate of Sports, P.U., Chandigarh who expired on 30.04.2018, while in service:

1. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 141 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
3. Encashment of Earned Leave up to the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 98 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2016.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Urmila Wd/o Late Shri Chet Ram, Beldar, Construction Office, P.U., Chandigarh who expired on 27.02.2018, while in service:

1. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 141 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
3. Encashment of Earned Leave up to the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 98 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2016.

(vi) In pursuance of orders dated 30.07.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 18544 of 2018 (Vijay Prabha and Anr. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) tagged with LPA 1505 of 2016, wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit to continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is pending before the Hon'ble High Court, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

(i) Dr. Ramnik Aurora, Assistant Professor, Department of French, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.09.2018 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No. 18544 of 2018 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing on attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by her. The payment to her shall be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per performa.

(ii) she be allowed to retain the residential

accommodation (s) allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(vii) In pursuance of orders dated 21.08.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 20531 of 2018 (Dr. (Ms.) Prabha Vig & Ors. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) tagged with LPA 1505 of 2016, wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 28.09.2018, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. (Ms.) Prabha Vig, Associate Professor, Department of Life Long Learning & Extension, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.09.2018 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No. 20531 of 2018 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing on attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by her. The payment to her shall be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) she be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Sunil Kumar School of Communication Studies,P.U.	12.11.1979	30.11.2018	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.

2.	Shri Kewal Singh Junior Technician (G-IV) Central Animal House, P.U.	20.10.1983	31.10.2018	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
----	--	------------	------------	---

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

Referring to item I-(i) of Information relating to Dr. Muneeshwar Joshi, Secretary to Vice-Chancellor, Sh. Prabhjeet Singh said that the Official Car may be allocated to him being on the responsible and important post in the Panjab University . If full fledged Car is not authorized then at least One Car for picking and dropping should be allowed to him.

Sh.Gurjot Singh Malhi said that whatever the perks and benefits to the previous incumbent to be allowed to him. He was intimated that previous salary was protected.

Sh. Prabhjeet Singh said that all the University Officials be allowed facility of Car according to their designation as per previous practice.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if the previous practice then the same may be continued.

Sh. Sanjay Tandon said that the issue relating to allocation of University Cars to the University Officials be dealt with at the level of Vice-Chancellor and these should not be placed before the Syndicate.

All the members of the House were of the view that all the admissible perks and facilities be allowed to him. Interrupting the same Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that this is not a joking situation, the terms and conditions of contractual appointment may be followed while allowing the perks and facilities to him.

Referring to item I-(ii) of the information relating to sanctioning of benefits to Col. Guljit Singh Chadha (Retd.), Registrar, Panjab University on completion of his terms on 30.09.2018, Sh. Ashok Goyal said that there is not much information with the Syndicate relating to it, only a small note is enclosed indicating therein the date of birth, date of appointment and date of term ended. He said that what a superannuated contractual employee is entitled for after the completion of the term on the basis of re-employment, that should be sanctioned as per University rules. It was to his knowledge that this was the first case of its kind which has come and the University Office seems to have dealt with this case in a very very casual manner. As per rule nobody can be entitled for encashment of leave beyond 300 days irrespective of the fact that at how many places he has served. If he has got 300 days encashment of leave from his earlier place then he will not get it. But if he get less than 300 days then whatever the remainder days leave he will be paid. He will be paid 122 days for leave encashment as he had already been paid for 178 days from his earlier employment. It is only for the reason that the members of the Syndicate do not want to cut a sorry figure in front of the audit objection raised by RAO, if any it is very unfortunate that this case has been put up in the Syndicate as the rules relating to this are very much clear. As the University rules for the re-employed persons have not been framed, in that situation the same is to be applicable only prospectively and not in a retrospective manner. 33 days leave per year has been earned by him and as per his view, he had earned total of 132 days leave to his credit, he has not availed even a single day earned leave, 10 days leave he has availed on account of leave travel concession thus total of 122 days leave encashment is due.

Dr. Keshav Malhotra and Sh. Ashok Goyal asked whether the payment has been made or not.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired the same from the F.D.O. and he told perhaps the payment has been made.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked the F.D.O. whenever the item comes in Syndicate for approval, the facts about the details of the payment be known to F.D.O. The same may be followed in future.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per his knowledge, the payment cannot be released as this is the basic thing for the audit to check.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Items I-(i) to I-(viii)** be noted.

General Discussion

1. Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that in the previous meeting held in the month of June and July, there were cases of contractual employees where persons are working since more than 10 years and the Competent authority has not passed their appointments, their salary is stopped, for this the House authorized the Vice-Chancellor to deal with these cases.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that again Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi would object to the authorization to be given to the Vice-Chancellor.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi replied that the House should propose to authorize the Vice-Chancellor to take decision.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal further said that the House proposed to authorize the Vice-Chancellor to take decision in the matter relating to release of salaries in the contractual appointments. He asked the other members if the proposal is approved or not to which the members gave their consent.

2. Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he wants to bring to the notice that there are many positions in Panjab University where the approval of Syndicate is required even for giving additional charge. He said his request is that at present if there is requirement of giving additional charge of any position in Panjab University by the Vice-Chancellor then on the behalf of the Syndicate, the Vice-Chancellor may be authorized to do so in future.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi asked Dr. Subhash Sharma, what type of charge is to be given? Dr. Subhash Sharma replied to him just like the charge of Registrar whereas Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the charge of Registrar has already been given. Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if there are vacant positions in the Panjab University that may be brought to the notice of the Syndicate immediately so that the charge can be given on additional basis.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh said that he wants to make it clear to Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi that, for example, if the post of Dean in any faculty is vacant, there is no biodata and they also do not know the working capacity of a person, whether he is suitable for them or not. What is the problem if they propose to authorise the Vice-Chancellor to take decision on behalf of the Syndicate.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said in that case what is the benefit of this rule that Syndicate is competent to approve the additional charge of the positions of Panjab University.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that the decision regarding giving charge on additional basis be taken by the Vice Chancellor till the meeting of the Syndicate.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he is against giving a blanket cover, he is not against the Vice Chancellor or anybody but in principle he showed his dissent on it. There is a purpose for which a rule is made, if the purpose exists, the rule exists then the unbounded powers should not be given. What can be done now is that if the posts are vacant that is to be informed to the Syndicate and Syndicate can authorize the Vice Chancellor to appoint on the same but if the House said that Vice Chancellor is authorized to appoint on all the posts in all the times to come, then it is not agreed by him.

Sh. Sanjay Tandon said that on that point what Prof. Navdeep Goyal had told that till the next meeting of Syndicate, the additional charge be allowed by the Vice Chancellor means that in between if the Vice Chancellor finds that some decision/appointment is to be made and he finds a suitable candidate for that, he may do so later on, even if the Syndicate desires then it can be revised accordingly.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi intervened to say that it is below the dignity of the Vice Chancellor .

Sh. Sanjay Tandon informed that just like Chief Minister takes the decision on behalf of the Cabinet and later on Cabinet approves the same and the Cabinet does not let down the head, i.e., the Chief Minister.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that Vice Chancellor can take decision on behalf of Syndicate and later on Syndicate can ratify the same if required.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal that he only suggested that Vice Chancellor can take decision till further meeting of the Syndicate.

Sh. Ashok Goyal replied that it is not good if the decision taken by the Vice Chancellor be changed by the Syndicate then it is a disrespect to the Chair of the Vice Chancellor otherwise the Syndicate should have so much of confidence in the Vice Chancellor that what decision he has taken is fully acceptable without letting down the Vice Chancellor .

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that his point was that to name of the position of the Panjab University Officer which is to be given additional charge be specified for example Dean College Development Council.

Sh. Ashok Goyal replied that the charge of DCDC had been given by the Syndicate. What is to be done now that the Vice Chancellor should bring the matter to the Syndicate and let the Syndicate decide the matter.

Sh. Gurjot Singh Malhi said that either the name of the post be specified or bring the matter to the Syndicate to decide.

Sh. Sanjay Tandon pointed out that keeping in view the process of running the Organisation the Vice Chancellor should take a call on issues and he agreed to what Prof. Navdeep Goyal had said that the House will not let the face of the Vice Chancellor down and they will stand behind the Vice-Chancellor. Even if the members of the House have different views, the House would not let down the Vice Chancellor in front of public. One thing which he wants to add along with this is that instead of holding these meetings on Sundays it should be done on Saturdays . It is his proposal to hold these meetings on Saturdays.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that both Saturdays and Sundays are not suitable to all the members of the Syndicate. In that situation the work is to be done turn wise some times on Saturday and sometimes on Sundays by other members of the Syndicate according to their convenience and availability.

Dr. Amit Joshi said this is the work of the Panjab University and the Vice Chancellor is the best judge who have to co-ordinate with all the officers and officials and the Vice Chancellor have to deal with all the complaints received in the office. He said that there are many Deans whose tenure has also been completed and they are continuing as Dean. He said that he is not aware but he was informed that the term of Dean Almuni is 5 years but he is continuing more than that.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal replied that the term of Dean Alumni will be till May, 2019.

Dr. Amit Joshi pointed out that the work of Deans should be rationalized according to the suitability of the Vice Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor is the best person to decide about the work and the suitability of the person, so the Vice-Chancellor should decide accordingly. So Vice-Chancellor take a decision and bring it to the next Syndicate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he has one small issue which is that in the Agenda item of the meeting of the 27th July at C-63 item where Survey Committee visited the College in May, the report of the Survey Committee has already come. He requested that after going through the report of the Survey Committee, the Inspection Committee may be sent to the College and ask the Controller of Examinations to make note of it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said being the member of the Affiliation Committee, he has one point to submit while not challenging the capability of anyone, that the office of DCDC is over-burdened.

The Vice Chancellor asked what should be done in the matter.

Dr. Amit Joshi further replied, it is on the Vice Chancellor to take decision what should be done in the matter.

Dr. Keshav Malhotra and Sh. Rakesh Mahajan said that the best solution is to conduct the interviews for the post of DCDC so that problems may be solved.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is not certain when will be interviews for the post Dean College Development Council would be held.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that three months have passed and the interview has not been held so far.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that examinations are coming nearer and due to this the examinations works are suffering.

Shri Prabhjit Singh while strongly rejecting it said that they should not give charge to someone else after taking the same from one who is already handling it. However, they should hold interview to appoint a regular person as early as possible.

Dr. Amit Joshi further said it has also been resolved in the Syndicate that until the post is filled up the charge of additional seat will remain with the same. There is nothing in it and it is only prerogative of the Vice-Chancellor.

Sh. Sanjay Tandon and Dr. Amit Joshi said that Vice-Chancellor should decide in this case.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that there are two important issues which need to be discussed

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is no provision mentioned that the charge cannot be handed over to another person before appointment of regular person. It is purely a prerogative of Vice-Chancellor .

Sh. R.K. Mahajan said that advertisement for the post of Dean College Development Council has been done, scrutiny has been done only interviews are to be conducted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as the members are raising the issues of regular appointment against various post he appreciated the feelings of the House but requested for a little more time as the Panjab University is under financial crunch. It is not possible to give Rs.24 to 30 Lacs by appointing a regular person against the post. He requested for sometime to fill those posts on regular basis.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that meanwhile a charge can be given to any person to smoothen the work of Controller of Examinations office and Vice-Chancellor acceded to it.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that he can suggest a mode for increasing income to which Vice-Chancellor replied he need more time to overcome the financial crunch.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not appropriate to discuss the financial issues at this point of time.

Professor. Keshav Malhotra said the present system of additional charge of Dean College Development Council should continue.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh said that the present system of additional charge of Dean College Development Council should continue as decided by the Syndicate. Handing over the additional charge to some other person would create controversies. The people from the University would claim the Dean College Development Council post and Colleges would also demand the Dean College Development Council post even Colleges would say that post can be given to any Principal as this post belong to Colleges. The University should not be at controversy. He said that Vice-Chancellor may take decision looking at the financial implication.

Sh. Sanjay Tandon said that it is the Vice-Chancellor who has to decide to whom the charge of Dean College Development Council be assigned, as it has been done in the case of Registrar. The University cannot run on a vacant seat similarly if the Vice-Chancellor feels

that there is a load on a particular seat he may share the charge with some other person and most of members of the House authorised the Vice-Chancellor for the same.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the issue of Colleges needs urgent attention, if the same is not discussed he would prefer to resign. He said that U.G.C. vide public notice dated 5th September, 2018 had given clarification regarding methodology for calculating API score during leave period of teachers. He requested that a letter of this clarification be circulated to all affiliated College of Panjab University to which the Vice-Chancellor agreed.

Professor. Keshav Malhotra requested a copy of the same.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu raising the second issue said that new regulations for appointment of Assistant Professors have been issued by the U.G.C. therefore, a Committee may be constituted to adopt those regulations as they are required for making appointments of new teachers to which Prof. Navdeep Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they are already adopted and Committee is also formed.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu requested to issue a letter to all affiliated Colleges with regard to said regulations.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the benefit of three days lectures be given to the students who donate blood. This should be over and above 10% of the lectures to be condoned by the Chairperson of the Department.

This was agreed to.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the letter to all affiliated Colleges be issued with regard to Paternity leave. He said Dean College Development Council be asked to circulate the same at the earliest.

Dr. S.S. Sangha said that students of sports category having compartment in the final year of graduation do not get admissions in the Post Graduate courses under Panjab University and these students do not get chance to play in the Nationals as they are not admitted students. Therefore, the rules of admissions may kindly be revisited

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that in the previous Syndicate it was resolved that a lounge be made available to the members of the Senate and Syndicate who are visiting Panjab University so that they can sit and do their official work. The new renovated Senate Lounge adjoining this Syndicate room be earmarked for the purpose.

Sh Ashok Goyal said that this was made for the members of the Syndicate and Senate only and we are requesting our own thing to be given, which is already allocated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into that.

Dr. Subhash Sharma requested to spend some funds for the renovation of the Senate Lounge and make it wifi and comfortable place just like Airports.

(Karamjeet Singh)
Registrar

(Confirmed)

(Raj Kumar)
VICE-CHANCELLOR