

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Sunday, 18<sup>th</sup> November 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. Shri Prabhjit Singh

Professor Ronki Ram

10. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
11. Shri Sanjay Tandon
12. Dr. Satish Kumar
13. Dr. Subhash Sharma
14. Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha
15. Professor Karamjeet Singh ... (Secretary)  
Registrar

Professor Navdeep Goyal, S. Gurloveen Singh Sidhu, DPI (Colleges), Punjab and Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar, Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh, could not attend the meeting.

At the outset, the Vice Chancellor wished a good morning to all the members of the August House.

### **Vice-Chancellor's Statement**

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that-
  - (1) i) Lt Gen K.J. Singh, Maharaja Ranjit Singh Chair Professor, Panjab University has been appointed as Advisor to Chief Minister, Haryana, Sainik Kalyan Vibhag and Ardh-Sainik Kalyan Vibhag;
  - ii) Prof. Sukhbir Kaur, Department of Zoology has received an award from Indian Society for Parasitology for her contributions in this field;
  - iii) Prof. Archana R. Singh, Chairperson, School of Communication Studies, Panjab University has been selected as a Member of the Governing Council and the Academic Council of Film and Television Institute of India (FTII), Pune by Ministry of Information and Broadcasting;
  - iv) Prof. Vijayta D. Chadha, Chairperson, Centre for Nuclear Medicine has been awarded a project by the ICMR amounting Rs. 25 lakh for her work on prostate cancer imaging;
  - v) Prof. Kashmir Singh, Associate Professor, Department of Biotechnology has been awarded a research project on Genome

Editing of Potato by ICAR-NASF New Delhi amounting Rs. 1.65 crore.

2. With a view to generate more revenue for the University, we have plans to start the following new courses:-
  - i) Additional Unit of BA/B.Com LL.B. (Hons) in UILS;
  - ii) Master of Laws under USOL;
  - iii) PG Diploma in Data Analytics in the Deptt. of Statistics, USOL;
  - iv) PG Diploma in Research Methodology in Social Sciences in the Deptt. of Economics & Sociology, USOL;
  - v) PG Diploma in Education Management in the Deptt. of Education, USOL;
  - vi) PG Diploma in Photography, Department of Education, USOL;
  - vii) To re-start MBA (Financial Management) under DCMS, USOL;
  - viii) MBA in People Management under DCMS, USOL.
3. A two day National Vedic Seminar on the theme 'The Tradition of Vedic Studies in Punjab and Social Value' has been held at the campus and Hon'ble Governors of Punjab & Himachal Pradesh have graced the occasion.
4. The following appointments have been made on a temporary basis till further orders:-
  - i) Prof. Sanjay Kaushik as DCDC
  - ii) Prof. Rattan Singh as CVO
  - iii) Dr. Nandita Singh as Dean International Students
5. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu, honourable member of this Syndicate has been elected unopposed as Dean, Faculty of Design and Fine Arts.
6. I got the privilege to interact with the Hon'ble Sh. V.P. Singh Badnore ji, Governor, Punjab and Hon'ble Sh. Acharya Devvrat ji, Governor, Himachal Pradesh and discussed strategies for future development of this pristine university. Besides, they have also assured all possible support for preservation and digitization of manuscripts of Vishveshvaranand Vishwa Bandhu Institute of Sanskrit and Indological Studies, Hoshiarpur.

Dr. Ameer Sultana enquired as to how the MBA in People Management Course proposed to be started under DCMS, USOL is different from Human Resource Management. Secondly, what did they mean by People Management?

The Vice Chancellor said that it is in the formation stage. They have just identified these courses. The structure of the Courses and entire details about the courses are under process. They have to see to it as it is a very valid point.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that People Management seems to be a vague term.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi stated that he welcomed Professor Sanjay Kaushik, who has joined as Dean College Development Council. However, he has a little objection to the language while transferring former Dean, College Development Council, Dr. Parvinder Singh. It was not necessary to use such a language. According to him, the transfer orders should have been simple, i.e., Dr. Sanjay Kaushik has been given the additional charge of Dean, College Development Council. There was no need that to mention that he (Dr. Parvinder Singh) was over burdened. According to him, it casts aspersions not only on the individual concerned but also on the University because if the individual concerned was, they were also wrong as they were their supervisory authority. So, they should delete the language and a simple order should be issued

that Dr. Sanjay Kaushik has been given the additional charge of Dean, College Development Council in place of Dr. Parvinder Singh.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan requested to read out the office orders so that they could also know about the language.

Dr. Amit Joshi enquired whether the issue to which they are referring to is on the agenda.

To this, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is in the Vice Chancellor's statement.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked whether this language has been used in the Vice Chancellor's statement. Secondly, from where the orders have been issued?

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it is immaterial from where the letter has been issued.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is in the public domain.

Dr. Amit Joshi again enquired whether the orders have been displayed on the notice board.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is addressing the Vice Chancellor and requested the members not interrupt him. The orders have been passed by the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor. Could the Vice Chancellor deny it? He requested his colleagues to put their point of view, if any, in a peaceful manner by addressing to the Chair. He has neither interrupted any one nor expects anyone to interrupt him. He would like to explain what Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has said. The issue had appeared in almost all the newspapers of the region, but he did not want to go into the details. In fact, two orders have been issued by the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor – one on 13<sup>th</sup> and second on 14<sup>th</sup>. First they would talk about the orders issued on 13<sup>th</sup> which is states as under:

“There have been observations of the honourable Fellows in the meeting of the Syndicate/Senate held on 14.10.18 & 3.11.2018 respectively, in regard to the huge workload of the office of the Controller of Examinations and the pre-occupation of Dr. Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examinations, who is also holding additional charge of the post of Dean, College Development Council. Since there is a significant workload in both the offices of the Dean College Development Council and Controller of Examinations, the work of the colleges and students is being adversely affected and the university image is suffering.

In view of the above and in the interest of work, henceforth, Professor Sanjay Kaushik, UBS is given the additional charge of the office of the Dean College Development Council, with immediate effect, in addition to his own duties on a temporary basis, till further orders”.

In the second para, the charge of Dean College Development Council has been given to Professor Sanjay Kaushik to which he has no objection. In fact, he welcomed Professor Sanjay Kaushik on his joining as Dean, College Development Council. There is no problem at all that he (Vice-Chancellor) wished to give charge of Dean, College Development Council to Professor Sanjay Kaushik. However, his observation is, though he is not sure whether it is of the others or not, that the first para is totally uncalled for. Suppose, he is raising the issue that the work of Chief of University Security is not proper, could they remove him. Similarly, some of the members of Senate might say that it affects the studies of the students. If the Vice Chancellor wanted to do it, the matter should have been placed before the Syndicate as it is the prerogative of the Syndicate. Even if it has been done by the Vice Chancellor, they have no problem in it, but the Vice Chancellor himself in the last meeting had said that he would not fill up the post of Dean College Development council on regular basis as he could not afford to pay a salary of Rs. 20 lacs. The person, who has worked as Dean College Development

Council (additional charge) for 2½ years and saved a sum of Rs. 50 lacs., should have been relieved gracefully. Since the work is to be taken by the Vice Chancellor and if is not satisfied with the work of anyone, he could give additional charge to someone else. However, no one should be humiliated and his only concern is this. He, therefore, suggested that revised orders should be issued by modifying the first paragraph while referring to the discussion held in today's meeting; otherwise the first paragraph would create problem. Citing an example, he said that if he raised an issue that the work of the Chief of University Security is not proper, they have to remove him and the process would continue. Then the same thing would happen to the regular staff. Then what would the Vice Chancellor do? He, therefore, suggested that since the Vice Chancellor wishes to give the additional charge of Dean College Development Council to Professor Sanjay Kaushik and it is acceptable to them, but the first para of the orders should be modified keeping in view the discussions. In the orders dated 14.11.2018, it is written that the charge of Dean College Development Council has been given to Professor Sanjay Kaushik and they welcome it and they would cooperate the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that without their cooperation, how it would possible to go ahead.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the copy of the orders under consideration is exclusively with Shri Prabhjit Singh, but they did not have it. The point he (Shri Prabhjit Singh) has raised regarding the language used or what is said by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, it is alright. He agrees with all such things that they should not degrade someone or cast aspersions. He also agrees that they could change the language and the Syndicate is empowered to change the language, but his simple question is, why this letter is with one Fellow only. The thing which he (Shri Prabhjit Singh) is quoting is not part of the agenda. If selectively, these letters are being taken up on behalf of some officer of the University, what Dr. R.K. Mahajan said yesterday that the Calendar is supreme, wherein it is written that no officer should approach the authorities directly, it is totally contrary to that. Has that officer submitted to the Vice Chancellor that he has objection on the letter? If he has not submitted anything, why they are discussing on his behalf? Is the Syndicate working on behalf of the ex-Dean College Development Officer? Certain things are brought here as if they are promoting agenda of an Officer. Why it is happening like this? If the issue is on the agenda and the officer concerned has given something in writing to him (Vice-Chancellor), then it is right to discuss the issue.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he (Dr. Joshi) is saying that they are discussing the issue. In the previous meeting of the Syndicate, it was discussed that it is the prerogative of the Syndicate and not of the Vice-Chancellor to give additional charge to someone. It has been quoted that these are the observations of the members of the Syndicate, whereas he had not said anything against him (Dr. Parvinder Singh). In fact, he had praised him. How it has been written that these are the observations of the members of the Syndicate? Similar is the position with regard to the meeting of the Senate, where only a couple of members spoke against Dr. Parvinder Singh. How it becomes the observations of the Senate as neither the other members had spoken against him nor their views were sought. Since this post, i.e., Dean, College Development Council (DCDC), belonged to the Colleges, they should have obtained the views of Principals of the affiliated Colleges with regard to the working of the DCDC. Tomorrow, he would bring in writing from all the Principals of the affiliated Colleges that his work and conduct is satisfactory. Would the Vice-Chancellor give him the additional charge of DCDC again? They had made a mockery of the system, especially when it was decided in the Syndicate that to give the additional charge of a post is the prerogative of the Syndicate. How could they do like this? As they were aware that the meeting of the Syndicate has been scheduled for 18<sup>th</sup> November 2018, how could they do this on 14<sup>th</sup> November?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he is not talking on this point. Such objections would always be there even if they give charge to Padma Bhusan awardee. Even though this

letter has not been brought as an agenda, it is addressed to three persons, viz. Professor Sanjay Kaushik, Dr. Parvinder Singh and the Registrar.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that this is not the issue. Whenever the meeting of the Affiliation Committee is held, the decision(s) taken therein is known to all the Principals within a few minutes. Why they are talking about the secrecy of this letter?

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he would like to make a small clarification that this letter has not been given to him by any of the Officers/officials, but he has got it from the Press. However, he did not know who has given it to the Press.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it was for the first time that he is hearing that an office order has been made available to the Press. In fact, office orders never go to the Press.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the issue, which is being discussed by his friends, the arguments given by both the persons are correct from the point of view they are talking. However, his question is – should they discuss this matter for so long. The issue is that if this particular matter is avoidable or avoided, it would have been better. He had gone through the letter carefully and did not find even a single line or word, which is giving any detrimental point of view about the former DCDC. It says that since he is holding additional charges of three positions, there might be some areas left unattended because of the huge workload. His request to both of his friends is that they should shake hands and move forward; otherwise, tomorrow the letter would appear in the newspapers. However, at the moment the same is within the House. In fact, they should learn to forgive & forget and move forward. It is a small matter. However, in future, they should be vigilant about such things.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that since his name figure there, he should be told as to what was his observation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him clarify that he has no ill-will against anyone. At the same time, he has given appreciation letter to former DCDC. They should try to curtail the discussion, but if they have any grievance(s), he would listen to them as he has a soft corner for them. The appreciation letter has been issued under the signatures of the Vice-Chancellor. Secondly, he has a very high opinion about his senior colleagues. He requested the members to take it in their stride and move forward.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan pleaded that the letter under consideration should be withdrawn, otherwise he would not allow the Syndicate to proceed ahead.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi suggested that the first para should be deleted.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan requested the Vice Chancellor to allow the members to express their views, which was also endorsed by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if the issue is only of expressing the views, he should also be express his views. Nobody has the right to humiliate a person and they have to delete the first paragraph.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that even if something has happened wrong, the same should not be made public, rather the issue should be settled amongst themselves. He suggested that the administration should develop a strong system.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that in case they want to punish someone, they should first hold the enquiry against him and if found guilty, only then one should be punished. They should not cast aspersions on anyone as it is against principle of natural justice to condemn a person without giving him an opportunity to hear him.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is not only to condemning a person, but they are condemning the system which had been running for the last three years. Dr. Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examinations (COE) is not the only person who has been given the additional charge. In fact many teachers of the University have given the additional charge of different positions. Even if the work of some of them is not upto the mark, they praise them at the time of their relinquishing the charge and not degrade them. He, therefore, suggested that the first paragraph of the orders should be deleted and revised orders should be issued keeping in view the discussion.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he simply wanted to submit that for the time being, let they forget that any individual is being discussed. Somebody might be in his favour and some against. While discussing, let they not keep the biased feeling in mind. They have to go strictly by what the the service jurisprudence says. Now whether they have got the power to violate the law of the land, that is to be seen. Let they should forget to whom this letter has been addressed. He fully agrees with Dr. Amit Joshi that this issue is not a part of the agenda, but his respectful submission is that this letter should have been a part of the Vice Chancellor's statement. First of all, this letter has not been brought as part of the agenda. Secondly, if the officer concerned did not represent, let they assume that the officer did not represent at all, that meant this letter has attained finality, which contained passing of some strictures by the Vice Chancellor, who is not his employer as his employer is the Senate. If he does not represent, that means he has accepted it. But, what Shri Malhi has said that these lines should not have been written to which he did not agree. Rather he would go a step further that these lines could not have been written. If somebody has brought this letter to the notice of the Syndicate, especially in view of the fact that the Vice Chancellor has informed that he has appreciated him for the work which he has done. That meant the Vice Chancellor has issued two letters which are contrary each other. On the one hand they are saying that the image of the University has maligned and on the other hand it is being said that he has kudos. In the light of this, the simple solution to this is that this letter does not need to be withdrawn, rather a letter could be issued in supersession of this letter that such and such lines be treated as deleted. Actually, when this matter was started to be discussed, he thought that Shri Malhi is going to introduce Professor Sanjay Kaushik, to whom he does not know. Maybe, he is trying to bring a proposal for appreciating the services of Dr. Parvinder Singh who has worked DCDC for the last 2½ years. Since the letter of appreciation has already been written to Dr. Parvinder Singh by the Vice Chancellor, now the Syndicate could also appreciate his work as DCDC. To delete or not to delete the lines, would not serve any purpose. So, why unnecessarily they are keeping these lines on record. So, this is his proposal which should be accepted.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the movement of officers from one place to the other is the part of the system. But they should keep in mind that no unnecessary problem is created because it would become a precedent. Earlier, the office of the DCDC was in the Administrative Block, but recently the same has been shifted to the College Bhawan which creates inconvenience to the Principals and teachers of the colleges. The DCDC office and the Examination Branch is an integral part of the college system. He, therefore, requested, that the office of the DCDC be again brought to the Administrative Block. That would be comfortable for all of them and even to the concerned authorities.

The Vice Chancellor replied in affirmative.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he did not want to go to the issue whether the lines are to be deleted or not. Since the letter of appreciation has already been issued under the signatures of the Vice Chancellor, there is no need to issue appreciation letter on behalf of the Syndicate. He is still of the view that letter should not be taken up for consideration selectively like this as it gives the impression that such things have been planted and the persons speak selectively on behalf of someone, which gives a bad image to the functioning of the University.

Referring to Para 2 of the Vice Chancellor's statement, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it has been stated that 'with a view to generate more revenue for the University, we have plans to start these new courses'. These are the courses which have neither been designed nor worked out. It clearly showed that the University is interested only in generating the revenue and not academic excellence. His simple submission is that it is good, but the words "to generate more revenue" should be deleted for the time being and this would be brought to the respective bodies after due deliberations at various levels.

Referring to Para 4 of the Vice-Chancellor's Statement "The following appointments have been made on a temporary basis till further orders", i.e., appointment of Prof. Sanjay Kaushik as DCDC, Prof. Rattan Singh as CVO and Dr. Nandita Singh as Dean International Students. He thought that they must welcome these appointments and ensure that the functioning of the DCDC office is supported by all and it works to the satisfaction of all the affiliated Colleges. So far as appointment of Prof. Rattan Singh as CVO is concerned, it is right, he thought that the Vice-Chancellor should have shared in the Syndicate, if not through his statement in writing, for changing the DCDC and the reasons for the need of change, though he knew something unofficially, which was misunderstood by somebody. So far as 3<sup>rd</sup> appointment of Dr. Nandita Singh as Dean International Students is concerned, that probably has not come in the right and proper form because this appointment is to be made by the Senate on the recommendation of the Syndicate and the Vice-Chancellor. As such, this item should have come in this way, i.e., "That Dr. Nandita Singh has been appointed Dean International Students in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate and Senate, under Regulation so and so" as it is part of the statutory provisions. With these suggestions, he said that they should appreciate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra, referring to the appointment of Professor Rattan Singh, suggested that they should also appreciate the work of Professor Suveera Gill as she has also done a very good work.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whosoever has worked for this University, he/she should be appreciated.

Shri Prabhjit Singh suggested that, in fact, the appreciation letter should be from the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, individually, he has already issued the appreciation letter. Now, the appreciation letter(s) would be issued, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that they should be informed as to why the need to change the CVO was felt.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, Professor Suveera Gill had submitted her resignation as her appointment was coterminous with that of the former Vice-Chancellor. He was told that this is a full-time post. He had requested her to continue as CVO for the time being. When the time matured, he issued these orders.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Lt Gen K.J. Singh, Maharaja Ranjit Singh Chair Professor, Panjab University on having been appointed as Advisor to Chief Minister, Haryana, Sainik Kalyan Vibhag and Ardh-Sainik Kalyan Vibhag;

- ii) Prof. Sukhbir Kaur, Department of Zoology on having been awarded for her contributions in the field of Parasitology from the Indian Society for Parasitology;
  - iii) Prof. Archana R. Singh, Chairperson, School of Communication Studies, Panjab University on having been selected as a Member of the Governing Council and the Academic Council of Film and Television Institute of India (FTII), Pune by Ministry of Information and Broadcasting;
  - iv) Prof. Vijayta D. Chadha, Chairperson, Centre for Nuclear Medicine on having been awarded a project by the ICMR amounting Rs. 25 lakh for her work on prostate cancer imaging;
  - v) Prof. Kashmir Singh, Associate Professor, Department of Biotechnology on having been awarded a research project on Genome Editing of Potato by ICAR-NASF New Delhi amounting Rs. 1.65 crore..
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (2) be noted with stipulation that the words "with a view to generate more revenue for the University", be treated as deleted;
  3. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. Nos. (3), (4), (5), and (6) be noted.
  4. revised orders pertaining to giving charge of the post of Dean College Development Council to Professor Sanjay Kaushik and relieving of Dr. Parvinder Singh, from the charge of DCDC, be issued keeping in view the discussion held in this meeting, especially by deleting the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of the orders; and
  5. appreciation of the Syndicate be conveyed to the Dr. Parvinder Singh, Former DCDC and Dr. Suveera Gill, Former CVO, for the good work done by them.

**2.** Considered the following recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 13.11.2018 (Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16, 18 and 19):

**Item 1**

It be noted that the minutes of the meeting of Board of Finance dated 16.07.2018 were got confirmed through circulation vide email dated 18.7.2018. After confirmation, the same had been notified vide No. 4290-4301/FDO dated 24.7.2018/ 25.7.2018.

**Item 2**

That the Action taken report on the following items considered and approved in the meeting of Board of Finance dated 16.07.2018, be noted:

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Decision of BOF</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
<b>1.</b>	Revised Estimates 2018-2019	Approved	The revised estimates have been notified to all Departments/branches for compliance.



Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18<sup>th</sup> November 2018

2.	Audited Balance Sheet for the Financial Year 2017-2018	The financial statements which stand audited by the local audit department cannot be considered for approval or disapproval. The Board of Finance can only recommend it to the Syndicate/Senate for onward submission to the office of CAG.  After discussion, it was resolved that let the final observation of the Local Audit Department with respect to the comments of University be received, then the financial statement shall be put up before the Board of Finance for onward submission to the office of CAG.	The audited balance sheet with the final comments of the audit has been submitted to the CAG vide No. 4762/ FDO dated 29.8.2018. <b>(appended as a separate document).</b>
10.	Sanction of Rs. 707000/- for issuance of Commemorative Postage Stamp on Professor Ram Chand Paul	Approved	Stamp is to be released on 28.2.2019

Items 3 to 9 and 11 to 14 were not taken up in the meeting of the Board of Finance dated 16.07.2018.

**Action taken report on other aspects**

Status of Construction of Multipurpose Auditorium	Members desired to put up the complete status of the project	Status report of the XEN is enclosed as <b>Appendix-A (Page-1)</b>
Status of Audit paras	Members desired that a meeting of FDO and Special Secretary Finance U.T. Chandigarh may be convened to settle outstanding paras	A meeting was held on 14.9.2018, in which on the basis of replies submitted by Panjab University, 36 Nos. of audit paras have been settled <b>Appendix -B (Page 2 to 5)</b>

**NOTE:** After deliberations, members expressed satisfaction over the Action Taken Report with following observations:

1. A report may be presented in the next meeting of BoF with respect to the previous decisions of BoF where the final action is pending.
2. Regarding sanction of Rs. 7,07,000/- for issuance of commemorative postal stamp, it was desired that a clarification be issued to all the members of the Senate (through e-mail) regarding usage of such expenditure in the light of discussion which had taken place in the last meeting of Senate.

3. With regard to completion of ongoing project of Multipurpose Auditorium, members desired that a mechanism be put in place to ensure timely completion of this prestigious project. Keeping in view the space constraint being faced in the existing Senate Hall, it may also be explored if one of the small halls in such auditorium with seating capacity upto 130 can be designed in a manner so as to use it for the meetings of the Senate.
4. Further efforts be made in coordination with Special Secretary, Finance, U.T, Chandigarh to clear the pending audit paras and an updated status of outstanding paras may be provided.

### Item 3

That the Budget Estimates 2019-20 duly recommended by the Budget Estimate Committee as per **Appendix – I & II**, be approved.

The summarized position of Revised Budget is as follows:

#### Revenue Receipts:

(Rupees in lacs)

Sr. No	Heads of Income	Actuals		Revised	Estimates	% increase/decrease of BE over RE
		2017-18	01.04.18 to 30.10.18			
<b>(A)</b>	<b>REVENUE RECEIPTS</b>					
<b>I</b>	Fee of Examinations	14958.24	7897.02	15354.25	15530.00	<b>1.14%</b>
<b>II</b>	Partially Self-Financed Departments	5319.06	3678.82	5990.98	6550.00	<b>9.33%</b>
<b>III</b>	University Teaching Departments (Traditional)	907.41	631.06	973.82	1450.00	<b>48.90%</b>
<b>IV</b>	Registration Certificate/CET fee Etc.	2127.37	1808.94	2161.05	2210.10	<b>2.27%</b>
<b>V</b>	University School of Open Learning	1456.13	1187.94	1648.06	1950.00	<b>18.32%</b>
<b>VI</b>	Income from Hostels	1231.91	646.96	1349.00	1429.94	<b>6.00%</b>
<b>VII</b>	Income from Sports Fee (PUSC)	420.66	227.30	435.00	440.00	<b>1.15%</b>
<b>VIII</b>	Pub. Bureau, Lib. Fee & Research Journals	25.15	15.03	31.05	40.00	<b>28.82%</b>
<b>IX</b>	Other Income (i.e. Interest, Affiliation fee, Late fee, Sale of Admission forms, Rent of Guest Houses & Sale of Scraps etc.)	790.37	428.34	876.50	900.00	<b>2.68%</b>
<b>X</b>	Non-recurring receipts such as Lapsed Securities, Rotational Entrance Test, prior period Income etc.	1039.09	454.76	500.00	250.00	<b>-50.00%</b>

	<b>Total (Revenue Receipts)</b>	<b>28275.39</b>	<b>16976.17</b>	<b>29319.71</b>	<b>30750.04</b>	<b>4.88%</b>
<b>(B)</b>	<b>ANNUAL MAINTENANCE GRANTS</b>					
	(a) UGC/MHRD	20780.00	11000.00	22027.00	23348.62	<b>6.00%</b>
	(b) Govt. of Punjab	2700.00	3539.07	3462.00	3633.72	<b>4.96%</b>
	<b>Total (Annual Maintenance Grants)</b>	<b>23480.00</b>	<b>14539.07</b>	<b>25489.00</b>	<b>26982.34</b>	<b>5.86%</b>
	<b>Grand Total (A+B)</b>	<b>51755.39</b>	<b>31515.24</b>	<b>54808.71</b>	<b>57732.38</b>	<b>5.33%</b>

**NOTE:** The estimated income includes additional revenue to the tune of Rs.9-10 crore, which has been projected in view of various measures proposed by the University, such as enhancement in the enrolment of students in USOL, initiation of MOOCs courses, enhancement of seats in certain courses, admission of Foreign/NRI students and fee structure of Foreign/NRI students, rationalization of fee structure of existing courses, if required. The above projections shall be reviewed at the time of formation of Revised Estimates 2019-20.

**B) Revenue Expenditure:**

**(Rupees in lacs)**

<b>Sr. No</b>	<b>Heads of Expenditure</b>	<b>Actuals 2017-18</b>	<b>01.4.2018 to 25.10.2018</b>	<b>Revised Estimate 2018-19</b>	<b>Estimate 2019-20</b>	<b>% increase/decrease of BE over RE</b>
<b>1</b>	Salaries	*32457.31	19010.87	^34069.41	^36152.63	<b>6.11%</b>
<b>2</b>	i) Retirement Benefit (Leave-encashment/ Gratuity etc.)	*2969.81	876.18	1766.50	2038.44	<b>15.39%</b>
	ii) Provision for Pension	7388.07	4672.29	¥8009.64	8344.72	<b>4.18%</b>
<b>3</b>	Medical Assistance/ medicines	454.58	282.87	509.00	509.00	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>4</b>	LTC/HTC	165.85	27.68	70.00	91.50	<b>30.71%</b>
<b>5</b>	Books & Journals,	419.02	262.31	1062.59	992.59	<b>-6.59%</b>
<b>6</b>	Teaching & Research Aids and Other outreach activities	240.08	57.41	348.02	318.93	<b>-8.36%</b>
<b>7</b>	Scholarships/Fellowship/ Subsidy/ Contribution etc.	292.09	94.99	473.06	459.51	<b>-2.86%</b>
<b>8</b>	New Academic Programme, NAAC Fee, Registration Fee etc.	7.35	5.10	52.24	24.13	<b>-53.81%</b>
<b>9</b>	Conducting Examinations (except Salary Components)	3469.74	1381.29	3768.65	3856.45	<b>2.33%</b>

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18<sup>th</sup> November 2018

<b>10</b>	Office & Other General Administration expenditure	606.62	239.26	806.31	834.26	<b>3.47%</b>
<b>11</b>	Electricity & Water Charges	929.55	532.87	1187.21	1190.73	<b>0.30%</b>
<b>12</b>	Running, Repair & Maintenance of equipments and vehicles etc.	187.54	83.61	285.72	322.33	<b>12.81%</b>
<b>13</b>	Annual Repair, Maintenance & Minor Improvements (Civil, Electrical, Public health etc.)	553.75	316.62	₹942.27	1084.70	<b>15.12%</b>
<b>14</b>	Refund of fee & Other Non-recurring expenditure <sup>β</sup>	-236.60	67.85	29.61	27.00	<b>-8.81%</b>
<b>15</b>	Hostel Expenditure (excluding Salaries of regular employees)	755.05	347.72	925.53	971.09	<b>4.92%</b>
<b>16</b>	Expenditure on Sports Activities (PUSC)	472.59	89.02	531.50	559.90	<b>5.34%</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51132.40</b>	<b>28347.94</b>	<b>54837.26</b>	<b>57777.91</b>	<b>5.36%</b>

\* The actual expenditure of 2017-18 also includes the accrued expenditure including the provision for gratuity & leave encashment with respect to teachers who have been allowed to continue beyond the age of 60 years as per the interim direction of Hon'ble High Court. The actual disbursement shall be made against the liabilities as reflected in the Balance Sheet.

^ Salary provision includes estimated liability for filling up of 27 teaching positions (Assistant Professors), 1 Dean College Development Council, 1 Chief Security Officer and Deputy Registrar as approved by the MHRD.

¥ The provision for pension has been projected keeping in view various factors such as expected enhancement in the rate of DA, addition of new pensioners, number of pensioners attaining the age of 70 years, 75 years, 80 years and so on, as on reaching such age limit(s), there are quantum jump(s) in the amount of pension on account of grant of old age pension.

£ The provision under this head has been enhanced to meet the emergent need of repair for various old buildings.

**B** The expenditure under the head "Refund of Fee" varies unevenly depending upon the actual number of fee refund cases. Because of adjustment of provision created in 2016-17, the expenditure of 2017-18 turn out to be negative. Till financial year 2016-17 the refund of fee was reflected as expenditure. However from financial year 2017-18 the refund of fee has been reflected as reduction in income.

**NOTE:** The total revenue expenditure shall be restricted to the extent of actual income of a given financial year.

**Item 5**

That the enhancement of emoluments of Medical Officers be approved as follows:

Sr. No	Category of posts	Last revision/fixation	Emoluments	
			Current	Proposed
1.	Medical Officers (full time) on contract basis	Revised vide BOF/Syndicate/Senate dated 27.05.2014/17.08.2014/28.09.2014	Rs. 45000/-	Rs.62738/-
2.	Medical Specialists (2 hours duty)		Rs. 20000/-	Rs 27883/-
3.	Visiting Consultant (4 hours duty)		Rs. 25000/-	Rs.34854/-
4.	Part Time Specialists in various fields i.e. Gynae, Radiology & Eye etc.(2 hours duty)		Rs. 20000/-	Rs.27883/-
5.	Dr. B.S. Lal (continuing on re-employed basis)	April, 2012 (at the time of attaining the superannuation)	Rs. 51851/-	Rs.72289/-

(Mrs. Garima Singh, Special Secretary Finance, Govt. of Punjab recorded her dissent)

**NOTE:** 1. The Chief Medical Officer (CMO) initiated a note highlighting the need to revise the emoluments of Medical Officers. The note of CMO is attached **Appendix-V (Page 24)**.

2. A Committee was constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the matter. The Committee proposed an increase of 39.42% for enhancement in emoluments of Medical Officers (Full time on contract basis), considering the minimum pay of a Medical Officer in the pay band of Rs. 15600-39100 + GP 5400 **Appendix - VI (Page 25 to 26)** as follows:

Basic Pay	: Rs. 15600/-
GP	: Rs. 5400/-
NPA (@ 25% of BP + GP)	: Rs. 5250/-
DA (@ 139% of BP +GP+NPA):	Rs. 36488/-
<b>Total</b>	<b>: Rs. 62738/-</b>

Present emoluments : Rs. 45000/-

Percentage increase required: 39.42% i.e.  $\left[ \frac{62738-45000 \times 100}{45000} \right]$

The Committee recommended the increase in emoluments of all the other doctors (falling under various categories) in the same proportions i.e. 39.42%.

3. The above agenda item was placed before the Board of Finance in its meeting dated 16.7.2018 vide Agenda Item No. 5. However, the same could not be discussed in the said meeting. The comments of MHRD which were received in respect to the above item are reproduced here below:

*“This may be met out of internal revenue of the University and no claims by the University will be entertained by UGC/MHRD”.*

**Financial Liability : Rs. 12,62,196/- p.a. (approx.)**



the said meeting. The comments of MHRD which were received in respect to the above item are reproduced here below:

*“MHRD is of a view that University may have to appeal against the decision of Hon’ble High Court. This proposal should be discussed in the FC meeting and appropriate decision be taken. No funds can be given for this purpose from the funds of UGC/ MHRD”.*

5. The financial liability complied by Establishment Branch is as follows:

**Library Assistants (29)**

01.01.2018 to 31.03.2018: Rs.2,91,850/- (approx.)  
2018-19 (01.04.2018 : Rs.13,35,160/-p.a. (approx.)  
to 31.03.2019)

**Junior Engineers (03)**

01.01.2018 to 31.03.2018 : Rs.34,020/- (approx.)  
2018-19 (01.04.2018 : Rs.1,60,560/-p.a. (approx.)  
to 31.03.2019)

**Item 8**

That the following Teaching & Non-Teaching positions be sanctioned for newly established Panjab University Constituent Colleges at Dharamkot and Ferozpur from the session 2018-19, the entire funding of which is being/shall be met by the Govt. of Punjab:

<b>Faculty/Non-Faculty Positions</b>				
<b>Category</b>	<b>Details/ Designation/ Subject</b>	<b>PUC Dharamkot Moga</b>	<b>PUC Ferozpur Mokham Khan Wala</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Teaching</b>	<b>Principal</b> (Rs.37400-67000 + GP 10000)	1	1	<b>2</b>
	<b>Assistant Professors</b> (Rs.15600 -39100 + GP 6000/7000/8000)	7	7	<b>14</b>
	<b>Sub-Total (Teaching)</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Non-Teaching</b>	<b>Superintendent</b> (Rs.15600-39100 + GP 5400)	1	1	<b>2</b>
	<b>Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operator</b> (Rs.10300-34800 + GP 3200/3600)	1	1	<b>2</b>
	<b>Library Assistant</b> (Rs.10300-34800 + GP 4400)	1	1	<b>2</b>
	Outsource of Services for each college i.e. Security, Sanitation/ Cleanliness and Horticulture etc. <b>Security Guards</b> (4 each), <b>Peons</b> (3 each) <b>Mali</b> (3 each) & <b>Cleaner</b> (3 each)			
<b>Sub-Total (Non-Teaching)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	
<b>Grand Total (Teaching + Non-Teaching)</b>				<b>22</b>

**NOTE: 1.** The Syndicate and Senate in its meetings dated 19.08.2016 and 03.09.2016 respectively approved to

run these colleges as P.U. Constituent Colleges w.e.f. the session 2016-2017.

2. The above issue was placed before the Board of Finance in its meeting held on 15.11.2016, Agenda Item No.1 but the same was deferred as the Govt. of Punjab was yet to sanction the additional grant for these colleges.
3. It has been agreed that the full liability of these two constituent colleges shall be borne by the Punjab Government in the same manner as in the case of other four Constituent colleges. No liabilities shall be passed on to Central Government on this account. The teaching and non-teaching positions should be filled strictly as per the UGC/ State Government norms.
4. The Govt. of Punjab has allocated additional grant of Rs.2.00 crores for those two Constituent colleges in addition to the grant of Rs. 6.00 crores sanctioned earlier for four constituent colleges.
5. The above agenda item was placed before the Board of Finance in its meeting dated 16.7.2018 vide Agenda Item No. 11. However, the same could not be discussed in the said meeting. The comments of MHRD which were received in respect to the above item are reproduced here below:

*“MHRD has no objection on this proposal if the financial expenditure is fully met by the Govt. of Punjab as indicated by the University in the agenda. In the resolution, it is clearly indicated that these teaching and non teaching positions will be fully funded by Govt. of Punjab at present and in future also. In no case UGC/ MHRD will take these positions for funding and this shall be solo responsibility of the University/ Govt. of Punjab.”*

*Financial Liability : Rs.105.52 lacs p.a. approx. (for each College)*

#### **Item 10**

That the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor regarding revision in monthly Sumptuary expenses for the following senior functionaries of the University out of the budget Head “General Administration” sub Head “Sumptuary Expenses” w.e.f the financial year 2019-2020 be approved:

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Existing limit</b>	<b>Rates last revised (BOF)</b>	<b>Proposed Revision</b>
Vice-Chancellor	Rs.15000/- p.m.	5.9.2014	Rs. 20000/-
DUI	Rs. 7500/- p.m.	11.2.2013	Rs. 9000/-
Registrar	Rs. 7000/- p.m.	11.2.2013	Rs. 8500/-
COE	Rs. 6000/- p.m.	15.2.2016	Rs. 6500/-
Dean Research	Rs. 3000/- p.m.	11.2.2013	Rs. 3500/-
DCDC	Rs. 3000/- p.m.	11.2.2013	Rs. 3500/-
FDO	Rs. 3000/- p.m.	15.2.2016	Rs. 3500/-
Chief Vigilance Officer	Rs. 3000/-p.m.	15.2.2016	Rs. 3500/-



Chief of University Security	Rs. 700/- p.m.	11.2.2013	Rs. 1000/-
Deputy Registrars (Administrative Offices)	Rs. 700/- p.m.	11.2.2013	Rs. 1000/-
Manager Press	Rs. 700/- p.m.	11.2.2013	Rs. 1000/-
Senior Law Officer	Rs. 1000/- p.m.	27.5.2014	Rs. 1200/-

**Financial Liability : Rs. 1,39,200 /- p.a. approx**

### Item 13

That the Pay Scale of following Draftsman Cadre posts existing in the Panjab University be re-revised in terms of Punjab Govt. notification No.7/33/2011-3 FP1/593 dated 30.12.2016 Appendix -X (Page 31 to 32) issued by the Department of Finance, w.e.f. 01.01.2017 as under:

Name of the Post	Existing						Proposed		
	Pay scales as on 1.1.2006			Pay scales applicable w.e.f. 1.12.2011			Pay scales re-revised w.e.f. 1.1.2017		
	Pay Band	Grade Pay	Initial Pay	Pay Band	Grade Pay	Initial Pay	Pay Band	Grade Pay	Initial Pay
<b>Works Department (Drawing Section)</b>									
Head Draftsman-1	10300-34800	4200	16290	....	....	....	10300-34800	5000	18450
Draftsman-1	10300-34800	3800 (in PU GP 4200)	14590	10300-34800	4200	16290	10300-34800	4600	18030
<b>Architect Unit</b>									
Sr. Draftsman- (Architectural)/Architectural Assistant)-1*	10300-34800	4400/5000	17420/18450	....	....	....	10300-34800	5400/5400	20300/21000
Draftsman/ Architectural Head Draftsman-1	10300-34800	4200/4400	16290/17420	....	....	....	10300-34800	5000/5400	18450/20300
<b>Construction Unit</b>									
Draftsmen/ Architectural Sr.Draftsman-3	10300-34800	4200	16290	....	....	....	10300-34800	5000	18450

The scale of post of Sr. Draftsman (Architectural) P.U. is equivalent to that of circle Head Draftsman in Panjab Government.

- NOTE:**
1. Panjab University follows pay scales of Punjab Government.
  2. Punjab Government has re-revised the pay scale of Draftsman/ Head Draftsman/ Circle Head Draftsman/Chief Draftsman as per Appendix 'A' with condition that these pay scales would be 'interim' in nature and would require ratification by the next Pay Commission i.e. 6th Punjab Pay Commission constituted by the Government of Punjab.
  3. The above matter was placed in the meeting of the Board of Finance dated 01.08.2017 vide Agenda Item No.6 wherein it was

apprehended that the scales of draftsmen of engineering wing is different from Architectural wing and thus it was resolved that a clarification be sought from the Punjab Government in this regard.

4. In view of the above decision, the University sought clarification vide letter No.10414/Estt. dated 23.08.2018 from Govt. of Punjab. The Punjab Govt. supplied the copy of Notification No.7/33/2011-3FPI/593 dated 30.12.2016. The notification of Punjab Govt. does not differentiate in the scales of draftsman of Engineering Wing & Architect Wing.

**Financial liability : Rs.2.53 lac p.a. (approx.)**

#### **Item 14**

That the proposal of setting up of 66 KVA electricity sub-station in Panjab University Campus, Sector-14, having capital cost of Rs.22.90 crore and annual recurring operational & Maintenance cost of Rs. 2.21 crores be approved and prescribed procedure shall be followed for procurement, installation and commissioning.

**NOTE:1.** The current electricity load of Sector-14 Campus of Panjab University is more than 5 mega watt. As per the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commissions Guidelines the University is required to set up its own 66 KVA Substation. In the absence of such substation no new electricity connection or extension of load is being allowed by the electricity Department of U.T., Chandigarh.

2. Panjab University, being one of the Premier Research University of the country, has been recognized by various research funding bodies of the country for grant of research support under various research funding schemes. To pursue the research agenda of the University, the faculty members have been pursuing various research projects and schemes, which are more than 200 in numbers. Most of these research projects require various sophisticated equipments, which are being procured out of the grants released by the research funding bodies.

Needless to mention that to make these equipments functional, the University has to seek extension in power load from the Electricity Department of U.T. Administration, Chandigarh. However, the electricity Department of U.T. Administration, Chandigarh has refused to grant any further extension of load in Sector-14 Campus due to the reason as explained above.

3. In this regard, the University has approached Power Grid Corporation of India (Public Sector Undertaking of Government of India) to set up the proposed 66 KVA substation. Necessary spade work in this regard has already been undertaken by the University and a detailed report for setting up of 66 KVA substation has been formulated **Appendix-XI (Page 33 to 38)**. The total expenditure involved for setting up of 66 KVA substation is as follows:

Estimated One time capital Rs22.90 crores  
Cost

Annual operation and Rs.2.21 cost crores  
maintenance

4. Presently an amount of Rs.21.25 crore is available out of special grant of Rs. 80.00 crores (sanctioned in 2009-10) including interest earned thereon.
5. The University vide letter dated 19.09.2017 has proposed to transfer the available amount to U.T. Chandigarh with request to take up this project on behalf of Panjab University **Appendix-XII (Page 39 to 40)**. However, in one of the meeting with the then Vice Chancellor, it was conveyed that this project cannot be undertaken by the U.T. Administration and it was advised that this project be undertaken by the University at its own level.

#### Item 16

1. That the revised pay scale as per 7<sup>th</sup> CPC in pursuance of UGC notification dated 02/11/2017 and 8/11/2017, be implemented and additional grant /budget allocation from MHRD/UGC, be sought for the above implementation as below:
  - One time additional grant of Rs. 77.87 crore for payment of arrears of pay revision for the period 1.1.2016 to 31.3.2019.
  - Addition in annual recurring 'Salary Grant' of Rs. 30.52 crore over and above the amount of Rs. 233.49 crore which stands determined for 2019-20 as per the formula of 6% annual growth.
2. A communication be made to Punjab Govt. for implementation of revised pay scales for non-teaching staff and pensioners as early as possible.

**NOTE:** The above issue was put up before the Board of Finance in its meeting dated 28.11.2017 wherein it was observed by the representative of the Government of Punjab as well as UGC that pay scale as per 7<sup>th</sup> CPC for teachers and other cadres drawing pay in UGC scale should be implemented only after the notification of the same by the Government of Punjab.

In the above context, a committee was constituted by the Vice-Chancellor which deliberated the above issue and recommended that the adoption and implementation of 7<sup>th</sup> CPC for teaching faculty and all other cadres drawing pay in UGC scale may not be linked with the Government of Punjab as the grant for the same is being released directly by the UGC. The copy of the minutes of the meeting of the committee is enclosed as **Appendix-XXIV (Page-74 to 76)**.

**Item 18**

That the following decision of the Vice-Chancellor be ratified:

- (i) For sanctioning honorarium @2500/- p.m. to the wardens working in Sarvadaman Chowla Hall (International Hostel), Amrita Shergil Girls Hostel, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, Boys Hostel Swami Sarvanand Giri P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur and Girls Hostel, Swami Sarvanand Giri, P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur w.e.f July, 2017.

**NOTE: 1.** The Proposed payment of honorarium to all the four wardens shall be made out of the Budget Head "**Honorarium to the Warden @ 2500/- p.m. fixed**".

2. The above agenda item was placed before the Board of Finance in its meeting dated 16.7.2018 vide Agenda Item No. 13. However, the same could not be discussed in the said meeting. The comments of MHRD which were received in respect to the above item are reproduced here below:

*"University in the first instance must have to take the exercise for the payment of honorarium in other central universities and state university and prepare a comparative statement and then take a considered view. These funds cannot be met from the UGC/MHRD grants".*

3. Besides above 4 hostels, there are 19 hostels for which BOF has already approved the rate of honorarium @ Rs. 2500 p.m. to the respective Hostel wardens.

- (ii) To note the following action which was taken in pursuance of the notification of Govt. of Punjab:

Release of arrears of Interim Relief w.e.f 1.1.2017 to 30.9.2017 in terms of circular of Punjab Government issued vide No. 6/1/1995-1FP1/86 dated 16.2.2017, the office orders of which have been circulated vide No.1835-2034/A dated 8.5.2018 **Appendix- XXVI (Page 79 to 80).**

- (iii) To note the adoption of following circular of Punjab Government No. 23/6/2016-4 FP. 2/01 dated 1.1.2008 w.r.t Assured Career Progression (ACP) Scheme of 4, 9 and 14. **Appendix- XXVII (Page 81 to 82).**

- (iv) The Board of Finance noted the following decision of the Syndicate:

To enhance the subsidies for organizing Youth and Heritage Festivals being organized by Department of Youth Welfare and increase in daily allowances & accommodation for students/ Honorarium for Judges, Experts and Resource Persons w.e.f. financial year 2018-2019:

<b>Festival</b>	<b>Existing subsidy (in Rs.)</b>	<b>Proposed subsidy (in Rs.)</b>
Zonal Youth Festival	180000	200000
Inter Zonal Youth Festival	800000	900000
Zonal Heritage festival	80000	100000
Inter Zonal Heritage festival	350000	400000

Proposed expenditure for Daily allowances/ accommodation for students during Youth campus, tours, Workshops, Inter University and other functions

<b>Allowance</b>	<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Daily Allowance	Rs. 190/- per day	Rs. 200/- per day
Hiring for accommodation	Rs. 75/- per day	Rs. 100/- per day
Sundry Expenses	Rs. 25/- per day	Rs. 30/- per day

<b>Proposed honorarium for judges/ Experts/ Resource person</b>		
<b>Allowance</b>	<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
For one session	Rs. 500/- per day for 6 to 7 hour and if the session	Rs. 1000/- for one session
Maximum	continued beyond 7 hours excess Rs. 500/- will be paid	Rs. 1500/- for more than one session

**NOTE:** The subsidy is being provided for conducting Zonal Youth and Heritage Festivals at the affiliated colleges. It is being met out of fee collected from the students and hence does not involve additional financial liability. The last enhancement for conducting these festivals were approved by BOF vide Agenda Item No. 4 dated 1.8.2016.

#### **Item 19**

It be noted that the Vice-Chancellor has been authorized to take decisions on the following issues on behalf of the BoF:

**(i) Enhancement in the amount of subsidy for Inter Zonal Youth Festival/Zonal Heritage festival.**

It was informed to the members that for the current academic session, the Inter Zonal Youth Festival/Zonal Heritage festival was organized in Dashmesh Girls College, Badal which falls in a border belt. Because of the location of the College, this time the full contingent of participants (more than 1000) stayed in such college for all the days of the festival. Whereas in the past when such events used to be organized in a college located in Urban area, the participants used to return back to their respective places. Because of this reason the expenditure for conduct of such event has enhanced from the sanctioned amount of Rs.13 lakhs to Rs. 25 lakhs.

It was proposed that a suitable enhancement in the amount of subsidy may be approved keeping in view the special circumstances as explained above. It was also discussed that the additional expenditure is not going to burden the University budget as such expenditure shall be met out of the Youth Welfare fee collected from the colleges.

**(ii) Additional Allowance/incentive to Security Staff for extraneous duties.**

Members were informed that a large number of security staff posts are lying vacant in the University. Because of which the existing staff have to perform double duties quite often and that too on continuous basis. In order to compensate such staff, there is a need to devise a mechanism to grant some reasonable allowance/incentive to such staff.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that recently we have extended the working timings of Laboratories and libraries and we are planning to extend it further to utilize the existing infrastructure optimally. In such a scenario the Security subject becomes very vital and important to safeguard the interest of the students and University.

The representative of Govt. of Punjab stated that such policy may be framed in consonance with the applicable norms of the Government and concerned department be consulted in this regard.

**(iii) Facility of Video Conferencing at the Constituent Colleges and Regional Centres.**

The Vice-Chancellor stated that in order to have an effective communication with all the constituent colleges and regional centres which are remotely located and also to put in place a better coordination amongst such centres/ colleges and campus, there is need to provide a facility of video conferencing in such colleges/centres. It was also discussed that estimated expenditure on one college would be around Rs.3 lakhs.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that he would like to congratulate the Vice-Chancellor, Finance & Development Officer and his entire team for preparing a good Budget after putting a lot of efforts. First of all, he felt happy that when the PUTA Executive went to meet him (Vice-Chancellor) for the first time, his statement was that he would make his best efforts to implement the recommendations of the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, and he (Vice-Chancellor) has fulfilled his promise. For this, he on his behalf and on behalf of the entire teaching community would like to thank the Vice-Chancellor and the members of the Syndicate and Senate, who are the members of the Board of Finance. The members of the Board of Finance were able to convince and impress upon the Government representatives with logic to get their approval in the implementation of the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. He requested the Vice-Chancellor, on his behalf and on behalf of the teaching community, to send a proposal to the UGC in this regard, and this could only be done by him. Had he (Professor Raj Kumar) been not the Vice-Chancellor, it would neither have been approved by the Board of Finance, nor did they have any expectations. Now, the teaching community has very high expectations from him. He also thanked Shri Sanjay Tandon as without his help it would not have been possible.

Shri Prabhjit Singh, **referring to Sub-Item 7** (page 6), stated that the item is "That the following recommendation of the Committee dated 01.12.2017 Appendix-VIII (Page 28) constituted by the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) duly approved by the Vice-Chancellor be approved". The recommendation is that the Library Assistants be paid consolidated salary of Rs.20,900/- p.m., but this position is not correct because

the Office did not provide full facts neither to the JCM nor to the Board of Finance owing to which the decision is not correct. Therefore, he would like to discuss Item 7 and Item 17 together. So far as Item 7 relating to Library Assistants is concerned, they were not appointed in the year 2013-14. It is a very serious matter. The members, who are members of the Syndicate and Senate for the last so many years, might be remembering that he had moved a Resolution during the tenure of Professor R.C. Sobti, former Vice-Chancellor. The Resolution was "Those, who are working against the budgeted posts irrespective of whether they were Library Assistants, Clerks and Peons, should be given basic pay plus D.A. on the pattern of Union Territory (UT) of Chandigarh as they are following UT in the case of non-teaching staff, especially daily wagers. Though they are given the pay-scales of Punjab, in the case of release of D.A., etc., they followed UT. The afore-said Resolution was considered by the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor and thereafter was approved by the Syndicate and Senate. The decision of the Syndicate and Senate was that the persons, who are working against budgeted posts, should be given basic pay plus D.A. Thereafter, they were paid accordingly and the practice continued for several years. There is always pressure of the employees concerned to regularize their services, and the vacant posts were advertised and selection made, and some were selected from within the system and some from outside. The persons, who were already working, were drawing higher salary as they were appointed against the higher posts, i.e., Assistant Librarian. Those, who were not got selected, were thrown out by the University, that too, after the service of 8 to 10 years. Thereafter, they filed a writ petition (No.11783 of 2013) in the Punjab & Haryana High Court and the title of the writ petition is "Hema Sharma & others Vs. Panjab University". The then Registrar, Professor A.K. Bhandari filed an affidavit in the High Court and para 5 of the affidavit says that "after the receipt of representation of Library Assistants, who are relieved from the service, a Committee was formed by the Registrar to look into the matter". The Committee in its meeting had recommended that these persons be appointed as Library Assistants on contract basis. Meaning thereby, they were appointed after discontinuing their previous service. The petitioners had filed a writ, but the University did not find any answer to the writ petition and the University took a U-turn and appointed them afresh. While doing so, their previous service and pay was abolish. He is 100% sure that full documents were not made available to the Committee, and they were appointed in the year 2013-14 a fixed salary of Rs.20,900/- p.m. They would be astonished to know that even though they are well qualified, they are still getting only Rs.20,900/- p.m. The persons, including clerks, who were appointed later on, have surpassed them. Thereafter, several writ petitions have been filed. He did not know as to why full facts were/are not being provided to the Committees. Even if they wanted to save money, it could be done just by saving Rs.10-20 lacs. In fact, they are humiliating such persons. An information has been given in the Board of Finance that there is a writ petition of 2012, which is still pending, and the same was listed for hearing on 12<sup>th</sup> November. What has happened to it, they did not know, even though the meeting of Board of Finance was held after 12<sup>th</sup>. In Para 3, it has been written that the above recommendations of the Board were placed before the Court in the one of the hearings on 8.2.2018, and now the case is listed for 12.11.2018. The meeting of the Board of Finance was held after 12.11.2018, but the status of case has not been disclosed.

**Referring to Sub-Item 17**, Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that they should go through the decision of the Board of Finance, which is "After detailed discussion, the members recommended 'in principle' to allow initial of the pay-scale including DA to various categories of employees appointed on contract basis as and when the concerned incumbent completes 10 years of service. The members further resolved that before putting it up to the Syndicate/Senate for final approval, the same may be got legally examined keeping in view the terms and conditions of their initial appointment". However, his recommendation is that, the persons, who were already in service and getting higher pay, but their services were terminated. Later on, they were appointed again on lower pay, i.e., Rs.20,900/- p.m., which is totally wrong. They should have been appointed on the pay, which they were already drawing, and they joined. Since they did not have any other option, they filed a writ petition, which is still pending. On

what basis, the then Committee recommended the fixed salary of Rs.20,900/- p.m. arrived at? In fact, it was calculated on the basis of basic pay plus Dearness Allowance which was prevalent at that time. Since the DA is revised after every six months, the same should have been revised in their case as well. In fact, their DA should have been revised from time to time as is being done in the case of other daily wagers, who are working against the budgeted posts. Now, in Item 7, the decision of the Board of Finance is that the emoluments of these persons be enhanced by 3%. From where the figure 3% has arrived at? Why not 13% or 1%. According to him, 3% has been taken from the annual increment, whereas annual increment not to given to them and only the rate of D.A. is to be increased. Since the calculation of DA becomes more, they have decided to give them the rate of annual increment, which is totally wrong. Similarly, it has been resolved in item 17 that is "After detailed discussion, the members recommended 'in principle' to allow initial of the pay-scale including DA to various categories of employees appointed on contract basis as and when the concerned incumbent completes 10 years of service". They are recommending DA to these persons after completion of 10 years service, whereas they are not giving DA to the persons under item 7, i.e., Library Assistants who are working in the University for the last more than 10 years. Though both the items (Items 7 & 17) of Board of Finance are of similar nature, in one they are recommending payment of DA and in another they are not. Why such a thing is happening?

Dr. Satish Sharma said that it is a very serious lapse on the part of University Administration. It should be looked into very carefully and sympathetically because this is a grave injustice to some of the persons, who did not have their representation in the Syndicate and Senate. However, he is thankful to Shri Prabhjit Singh for taking up this issue and they all express their concern to it. He suggested that the matter should be resolved within a stipulated period and should not be lingered on any more as they had already suffered a lot.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that, in fact, a Committee of the Syndics was appointed wherein it had been decided that the persons, who were appointed in the year 2008 should be given the minimum of the pay scale plus DA. Only 5-6 Assistant Librarian are there who are not being paid DA whereas all the others are paid DA, despite the fact that they had been appointed before 2008. He pointed out that this decision has not been appended anywhere. The decision on the basis of which the others are being paid DA would be made available to the Registrar/FDO by him shortly.

Dr. Ameer Sultana, referring to Sub-Item 7, stated that they have made several appointments on contract/temporary basis in P.U. Constituent Colleges (which are part and parcel of University) wherein they are giving full salary to the incumbents. As such, there are so much discrepancies in the University itself. When they give less salary to the persons, it affects the efficiency of the persons concerned. He (Shri Prabhjit Singh) is right that at certain places clerks and even peons are getting more salary than the Library Assistants despite the fact that they are working in the University against permanent posts and the University is receiving their salaries from the UGC, which is the serious lapse on the part of the University. Library Assistants is not only the one category, there are certain other categories of the employees, who have been appointed on contract/daily wage basis, but are not being paid DA. This needed to be looked into. She said that she had the detailed information about this, and if they wanted she would provide the same to them.

Dr. Anita Kaushal said that she endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Ameer Sultana.

The Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Ameer Sultana to provide the detailed information.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the Library Assistants, who are working in the Constituent Colleges, are getting a salary of Rs.40,000/-. He requested to the Vice Chancellor to look into the matter.



Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Hon'ble members have referred to Item 17 of the Board of Finance. He requested the Vice Chancellor to see as to what has been resolved by the Board of Finance. The Board has resolved that "After detailed discussion, the members recommended 'in principle' to allow initial of the pay-scale including DA to various categories of employees appointed on contract basis as and when the concerned incumbent completes 10 years of service. The members further resolved that before putting it up to the Syndicate/Senate for final approval, the same may be got legally examined keeping in view the terms and conditions of their initial appointment". As such, as per the resolved part, this item should have come to the syndicate only after getting it legally examined. Referring to the item, which has been discussed by Shri Prabhjit Singh and certain members, he said that he would like to supplement by referring to Item 12 of the Board of Finance, which is almost of the similar nature. The item is to consider the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor for converting the pay scale of Laboratory Technician/Laboratory Assistant (Para Medical Staff posted in Panjab University Health Centre and Dental Institute) from Rs.5910-20200 + Grade Pay 2400 to 10300-34800 + Grade Pay 3200 in order to bring parity in the pay scale of such cadre. And in the Note, it has been written that "In Panjab University there are total 20 sanctioned positions of Laboratory Technician/Assistants. Out of such sanctioned posts, only 5 positions are filled on regular basis". The note is about the Laboratory Technician/Assistants, whereas there are some Laboratory Assistants also. He just wanted to share with them, as he had told them earlier also, that unless and until he discussed the issue with the concerned officials, he never discussed the issue in the Syndicate and Senate. However, when the desired results did not come out, especially when it related to the poorest of poor category, then probably one is compelled to take the same up. In this University, there is a system in which the contractual employees, who are getting thousands of rupees more than the regular employees, and that too, those contractual employees, who had also applied for regular appointment along with the outsiders, but were not selected; however, they continued on contract basis. Their pay-scales have been revised, but those who have been selected on regular basis in the meantime, they have been denied this benefit on the plea that they have been appointed on regular basis. He did not know who revised those pay-scales and where from it was approved. It was said that the Vice Chancellor had done so. So when it comes to the people they want to say that the Vice Chancellor has done this and probably the orders have been issued after getting the same ratified by the Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate. However, Dr. Satish Sharma has rightly pointed out that those who had no representatives in the University, they are the suffered lot. He would like to inform them that an office order was issued on 18.2.2013, which related to six persons and out of them four are working as Lab Attendant on contract basis and two are working on regular basis. Though the office order related to all six persons, it was implemented only in the case of four persons, who are working on contract basis, and in the case of two persons who are working on regular basis the same has not implemented simply on the plea that they are working on regular basis. First of all, the orders were issued keeping in view a particular category to be benefitted. Thereafter, the office implemented the orders by selecting out of that orders as well where they would implement and where not. If such is the situation, they need to streamline the system by making policy matters instead of issuing orders in instalments. Referring to Item 12, he pointed out that the resolution part is "In view of the comments of the MHRD/UGC, it was agreed to recommend that the above proposals (i.e., agenda items 9, 11 and 12) may be forwarded to the UGC for examination and approval". What about those cases where in similar cases, the Vice Chancellor has already passed the orders that their salary is increased from Rs.10300/- to Rs.20900/- p.m. From where it has been done, from where it has been got approved, and from where the payment is being made, is yet to be known. As such, he simply say that keeping in view the observations of the Hon'ble members and also the serious discrepancies, which are there in the P.U. Constituent Colleges, to which he would say discrimination between two similarly placed employees, the issue needed to be looked into by taking into confidence the people, who in fact, had the knowledge about it. For that, he requested that a Committee should be formed. However, by

approving this item as it is on the plea that this is the recommendation of the Board of Finance, they would be doing a grave injustice to all such people. On Item 12 of the Board of Finance, it is that the financial liability is only of Rs.70,000/- p.a., and the resolution is that it be sent to the UGC for approval. Where lacs of rupees per annum are involved, there they are recommending. Simply because these people, who are placed at the lowest level, i.e., Rs.5,910/-, the recommendation is that the approval be obtained from the UGC, and in the case of others where the liability is of lacs of rupees, they are approving themselves. It is true that the office should provide full information to the Committee concerned, Board of Finance, Syndicate, Senate, etc. Two of the regular employees, who have represented to the office also, they have been advised in the month of August only that their case would be considered as and when similar cases arrive, but the cases which are being referred to by them, are not being taken into consideration. Therefore, the office should have placed the full facts of the cases before the Board of Finance, including that they had already approved certain similar cases. But here it is simply written that in order to bring parity in the pay-scale of such cadres, which meant, they had given it somewhere.

It was clarified that the office neither concealed any fact intentionally nor provided half information with any motive. So far as the issue of Library Assistants is concerned, the statement(s) of Hon'ble member(s) is/are not fully correct. In fact, earlier these Library Assistants were not appointed through proper channel; rather, they were appointed through Walk-in-Interview. The decision taken by the Syndicate and Senate that their pay-scale would be on the pattern of U.T. Administration was objected to by the Audit and the Establishment Branch was asked to clarify as it was mentioned in the U.T's. circular that it would only be applicable on those, who were working against the sanctioned posts and appointments of the persons concerned are made through proper channel. Though the salary was fixed at Rs.20,900/-, when the Audit raised the objection at the time of enhancement that the afore-mentioned two conditions should be got certified from the Establishment Branch. The Establishment replied that these persons are working against the sanctioned posts, but the appointments have not been made by making proper advertisement. Thereafter, the Audit did not admit these cases because their previous appointment was on a fixed salary of Rs.13,000/- p.m. They were to be given a salary of Rs.12,000/- to Rs.13,000/- even if their appointment is made after proper advertisement. Even if they took it on technical grounds, it is the Government norm that the grade, on which one is appointed, could not be revised by them as the same would amount to a backdoor entry on the plea that first they make an advertisement of the post on lower scale and later on, revise the pay-scale of the incumbent(s). Hence, these persons did not cover under any legal angle, and this information was provided to the JCM. Now, it has been decided that full discussion should not be recorded and only the operative part should be mentioned in the minutes of the meetings of the Committees. That was why, these things have not been recorded, but the whole information was provided to the JCM. When these persons were in service on contract/temporary basis, an advertisement for making regular appointment against these posts was made, and they applied and appeared in the interview, but were not selected. Thereafter, they did not have any post of Library Assistant. Certain candidates from the outside and certain from the inside were got selected. Some of the candidates from inside were not got selected as the outsiders were superior to them. Since they (University) did not have posts of Library Assistant, they (University) did not have any other alternative, but to relieve them. Thereafter, the persons concerned represented to the University. Though these persons did not have any legal right as the University did not have vacant position(s) of Library Assistants, the University by taking a sympathetic view appointed them afresh against certain higher posts (Assistant Librarian), which were lying vacant at that time, even though they were not qualified for the same. Even today, some of them are not qualified for the post of Assistant Librarian. It is true that these persons have not been given any increment after 2013. Then the matter was discussed in the meeting of the JCM because they were not entitled for the salary on the pattern of U.T. The JCM felt that though they are not entitled for salary on the pattern of U.T., something should be given to them as the rates of DC also increases every year. As such, it was decided that

an annual increase of 3% should be allowed to them, which would amount to 12% or 15% as it is to be given from 2013 onwards. This is the entire background of the case and it was known to all the members of the JCM.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is true, but his query is that when they were not appointed against the higher post, were they getting higher salary.

It was clarified that 'No' they were not getting higher salary.

Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that even when the new appointments were not made after advertisement, these persons were getting DA and DP and their salary was being charged against the posts of Deputy Librarian. How could they reduce the salary? If their salary was being drawn against the post of Library Assistant, then it is alright. Even nowadays 29 posts of Library Assistants are not there. When the recruitment on regular basis was made, 16-17 persons were appointed out of 5-6 were from the University itself, and at that time also the number of persons working was more than the total number of sanctioned posts. Thus, the salary of some of the persons was drawn against the post of Assistant Librarian and Deputy Librarian, and these persons were given DA & DP. Now also, the University has taken a U-turn and appointed them. They have been informed that the persons concerned were appointed on sympathy ground. In fact, the University should have filed its reply in the Court; rather than appointing them on sympathetic ground. Until they are continuing in service, they should be given DA & DP. His only question is why did they reduce their salary? The University did not defend the case in the Court and tactfully got the writ petition disposed off saying that they are ready to appoint them, though they appointed them afresh, on a reduced salary. Why did they reduce the salary?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that what he is understanding, as he had the vast experience of administration and has seen a number of such cases, that they were drawing the salary of Deputy Librarian, whereas the clarification given is that their salary was charged against the post of Deputy Librarian. To say that they were drawing the salary of Deputy Librarian, they were mistaken. In fact, they were adjusted against the post of Deputy Librarian and not that they were drawing the salary of Deputy Librarian.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that Shri Prabhjit Singh is right as earlier their salary was high, but when they were appointed on sympathetic ground, their salary was reduced. Actually, they had played a double game by appointing them afresh, but on reduced salary, which is against the principle of natural justice.

Dr. Satish Sharma enquired whether they had informed the Court that they would appoint these persons again, but on less salary. An assurance should have been given that they would re-examine and do the needful. Now, they are justifying a wrong thing.

It was clarified that the case is scheduled for hearing in the Court on 16<sup>th</sup> and perhaps, some orders have been passed, but the same are not yet known. At that time, it was thought as if the Court was also inclined to give them minimum of the pay-scale. If they proposed that the persons be given more than what was specified in the advertisement, the nodal agencies, e.g., UGC, MHRD, etc. would not approve that.

Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that he is not satisfied with the given reply. On the one side, they are giving DA & DP to the persons, who have been appointed on daily wage basis, and that too, through a backdoor entry. They should not isolate these persons. In fact, they are treating each category of employees, i.e., Clerks, Library Assistants, Peons, in a different manner.

Dr. Satish Sharma said that, in every system, the Government appoints Anomaly Committee. Anomaly Committees are there even in the Punjab Government

as well as Central Government. The Anomaly Committee is appointed so that whenever such a problem is faced, the matter could be referred to it.

It was clarified that to say that DA and DP has been given to everyone, is not correct. To give DA and DP was a policy decision and it was given only to those persons, who were appointed before December 2008. Thereafter, at least 250 Clerks have been appointed, but they have not been given DA and DP. To the statement made by Shri Prabhjit Singh relating to Item 17, it was clarified that Library Assistants are also covered under Item 17. In fact, Item 17 of the Board of Finance has not been placed before the Syndicate as an agenda item. The Hon'ble members are referring to this Item from the Minutes of Board of Finance. The decision of the Board of Finance regarding payment of DA to the persons after completion of 10 years' service, covers even the Library Assistants. Under Item 17, a policy decision has been taken, which is meant for all employees, and if it is approved and implemented it would be for all, including Library Assistants. Shri Sanjay Tandon Ji has helped them a lot in the meeting of the Board of Finance and got them segregated; otherwise, the Board has even referred the item relating to financial burden of even Rs.70,000/- to the UGC/MHRD for approval. So far as Item 17 is concerned, the recommendation of the Board of Finance would be got legally examined, and if the same are found legally in order, the matter would be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Sanjay Tandon stated that there are two separate issues. One is the placement of minutes of the Board of Finance for information, and the other is – whatever is resolved there, is being placed before the Syndicate for consideration and approval. As such, both the issues are separate. The point raised by Shri Ashok Goyal is correct. There were a number of points, which the representatives of Punjab had raised. They (the members of Board of Finance) said that from the finance point of view, they approve this, but let that be given the legal position. After the legal position/opinion, the matter be placed before the Syndicate. To that extent, this matter is delayed. They are reading the minutes, and accordingly take action. One point on this matter, he would like to bring to their notice that there is an extra information, which Shri Prabhjit Singh has brought on record, and this information should also have been there. This is just his contention that this was not there.

It was clarified that the information was available in the Appendix which was attached to the agenda.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that this information was not squarely discussed over there, and possibly was not brought to the notice of the members because if there is a legal point, and on the legality point sometimes, the person(s) concerned are not able to comprehend as what is lying under those cases. On this point, it was their duty to underline that there is a point, which could affect the decision. If some legal lacuna is lying somewhere, and later on the same is brought to their notice, it might create a problem for them. Since Shri Ashok Goyal usually speaks in the end and brings out certain legalities to their notice, and many a times, they had reversed their decisions just because the legal lacuna was not known to any of them. He had notice these kinds of things many a times. He suggested that on such issues, the office should highlight the legalities involved.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he again wanted to correct himself that they started discussing the item, which is not on the agenda. They should have limited themselves to Items, which are on the agenda. In fact, Items 12 and 17 are not on their agenda. Simply because they had got excess to Items 12 and 17, these are not the part of the agenda. Though they are not considering and approving these items, if something is pending before the Board of Finance for years together and is not being resolved on the part of the Board of Finance, the same would not come to the Syndicate and Senate as well. The people, who are aggrieved for so many years, would keep on suffering. Why, because the Board of Finance has said, 'No, No', it could not be done as discrepancies, legalities, and policy decisions on the part of the UGC, MHRD, etc. are

involved. He is simply saying, especially in regard to Item 12, that when they took the Item to the Board of Finance for revising the pay-scale, did they mentioned in the papers somewhere that this pay-scale is already being paid to those, who are working on contract basis. The same set of people with same kinds of duties, who are working on contract basis, are getting the pay-scale, which has been proposed to the Board of Finance for regular employees. For regular employees, they say that they should approach the UGC, but under what authority they have revised the pay-scale of the contract employees.

It was told that the office is not aware as to which matter the Hon'ble Member is referring to. The matters relating to Establishment are sent by the Establishment and they take action accordingly. However, the Establishment did not provide them full facts.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, for the information of the House, he would like to read a letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> February 2013 (relating to Item 12) which is as "This has reference to your endorsement No. so and so and dated so and so. The Vice Chancellor has ordered that the following persons engaged to work on contract basis for the academic session 2012-13 drawing their salary at the minimum pay-scale, i.e., Rs.5910 plus DA and DP in the Institute of Dental Science be paid their salary at the minimum pay of Rs.10,300/- at par with the daily wage Clerks working in the University. This did not have the mandate of the Board of Finance, the Syndicate or even the Senate. As such, for those people this order has been issued. By chance a representation was made and six people were covered under it. By the time the orders were issued by the Vice Chancellor, two of them were already appointed on regular basis, but the Vice Chancellor issued the orders for all the six. Out of those six, two who were appointed on regular basis, were excluded from the orders. As regular employees, they were drawing Rs.5910/- only, but those who were not selected, they started drawing Rs.10,300/-, and the orders have been issued by the Assistant Registrar (Estt.). He fully agreed that these orders are not in the knowledge of the Finance & Development Officer. What he is saying is and now he is asking, had this letter been not shown to them by the affected person(s), they (University) tell them how could it come to their knowledge. In fact, it would never come to their knowledge. Sometimes, the affected people approach and request that see how much highhandedness is being meted out to them, not intentionally. He is right that he might be facing so many administrative problems and administrative limitations, but the end result is that somebody, who is better placed, is suffering and somebody, who is placed at lower level, is being rewarded. For that, he thought that everybody, i.e., Syndicate, Senate, etc. needed to work in that direction. He added that he had already submitted this in the office, and that too, in the last year. He had submitted the copy of the representation as well. He (Officer) had discussed the matter with him (Shri Goyal) on phone also and he had told how is it possible and it is happening in this University? He knew as to what administrative problem might have come, and the problem might be that when a person has become regular after being selected after advertisement in the lower scale, his/her scale could not be changed. He (Shri Goyal) had told him the solution to the problem as well, but he has come to know only today (in the morning). He did not know as to how many persons are they. However, these people knew as to which meeting is scheduled on what date, and today their case could be discussed in the Syndicate. They would be surprised that he got late simply because the man was standing on the road to meet him. He told him is their case not been settled so far. The matter had been sent to the Establishment Branch by the Accounts Branch and the Establishment might have told that there is no such provision. So his simple suggestion is, as said by Dr. Satish Sharma, that a Committee should be appointed to solve the problem.

Shri Prabhjit Singh informed that a Committee had already been appointed and the same is available at page 77 of the Board of Finance. He also read out the term of reference of the Committee "Minutes of the meeting of the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor to look into the matter from all angles of legal issue, cut-off date, etc. of the daily wagers who are working on DC rates after December 2008. This meeting was

held and was attended by Prof Ronki Ram, Professor Rattan Singh, who has now been appointed as CVO and Dr. Manoj Kumar Sharma. If they go through the list, they would find that first the charge is given by cadre-wise, and thereafter, the cadre-wise list of daily wagers has been given in the Annexure. He read out the recommendations of the Committee "After deliberation, the Committee observed that the daily wage employees drawing DC rates are performing the same nature of duties as are being performed by other daily wage employees drawing Basic Pay + GP + D.A. Therefore, in the interest of justice, they are to be given equal pay for equal work. The recommendations of the Committee are already there. The Chairman of the above-said Committee had telephonically discussed the above matter with the FDO, who had suggested to place the matter before the Board of Finance for approval being financial matter. Thereafter, the Committee recommended that the daily wage employees mentioned on pre-page may be given Basic Pay + GP + DA at par with other daily wage employees according to availability of vacant positions". He enquired from where they had brought in "10 Years". The Committee has talked only about the vacant sanctioned posts, from where 10 years have come.

It was clarified that, in fact, the Board of Finance was not agreeing and the condition of 10 years has been imposed by the Board itself.

To this, Shri Prabhjit Singh remarked that the Board of Finance is not above the Syndicate and Senate. The recommendation(s) of the Board of Finance is/are not binding on them. The Board of Finance is not Judge of High Court and whatever told by it, would have to be done. The recommendation made by the Committee is that they are performing the same duties. If the Board of Finance has recommended the imposition of ten years' condition, they would reduce it to two years. Meaning thereby, it has not logic.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee, comprising Shri Prabhjit Singh (Chairman), Dr. Ameer Sultana and Finance & Development Officer, could be constituted which would look into the whole issue.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is agreeable to them because it is their moral duty to obey the orders of the Vice Chancellor and also to see that injustice is done to anybody. He added that they could not reduce the salary of persons, who were earlier getting Basic plus DA & DP.

On an enquiry by Shri Ashok Goyal as to what decision has been taken by them, the Vice Chancellor said that they are appointing a Committee, comprising Shri Prabhjit Singh (Chairman), Dr. Ameer Sultana and Finance & Development Officer, which would look into the whole issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that since the letters are available with Shri Ashok Goyal, he should also be made a member of the Committee proposed to be constituted.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if they wanted to constitute a Committee, there is no problem, and they would do it. However, the recommendation(s) of the Committee would again go to the Board of Finance, but the recommendations of this Committee have already been placed before the Board of Finance.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that his request to the Vice Chancellor is for what the Committee is being proposed to be constituted.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Committee would not serve the purpose. What the Committee would do. In fact, the Committee has already done it.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that what Dr. Satish Sharma has suggested is a different matter, as he was talking about the Anomaly Committee, which covers everything. The Anomaly Committee includes everything, i.e., regular employees,

contract employees, daily wage employees. However, Shri Prabhjit Singh is talking about the regularization of services of those contract/daily wage employees, who have completed 10 years of service against the vacant positions. Where from those 10 years have come, why these should be ten years, and why not six months. In fact, the matter related to regularization policy. The Anomaly Committee is to see the discrimination. Shri Prabhjit Singh is referring to regularization policy. Regularization Policy could not be framed unless and until the same has got the legal mandate, for which the Board of Finance has recommended that it should be got legally examined. The Committee, if at all, is to be constituted, the recommendations of the same should be such which could stand before the test in the Court of Law. The only problem, which is being faced by the University, is as and when the Regularization Policy is framed, those who are left out or those who are not even working in the University, go to the Court and say it is a backdoor entry. For that, they have to bring the recommendation(s) of the Committee, as it is, whether it imposed the condition of 10 years or not. He thought that the 10 years' condition has come because the members of the Board of Finance felt that certain persons are working in the University for more than 10 years.

It was clarified that the representatives of UGC and MHRD have clearly said "NO".

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that that what he was going to say. When this condition of 10 years' has been proposed, they simply suggested that this should also be got legally examined. When they would get it legally examined, which order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India is there, which would say that 'Yes' the persons, who are working for the last 10 years or more, their services be regularized because this has been hanging fire for the last so many years. In fact, Shri Anupam Gupta had been giving legal opinion(s), not once, but so many times, because according to him, it could not be done. They have done this exercise once and it was a one-time exception, and that too, on the basis of judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India (Uma Devi & others Vs. State of Karnataka). However, in today's date, unless and until they are able to frame policy, which is not challenged and overruled by the Court, probably they could not do it. He asked Shri Prabhjit Singh whether he agreed to it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh replied in affirmative.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee, comprising Shri Prabhjit Singh and others should look into the regularization and got it legally examined. However, the Anomaly Committee, which was suggested by Dr. Satish Sharma, should be in the form of a Standing Committee, so that if any problem comes, a solution is found out.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Right", they would act on these lines.

Shri Sanjay Tandon stated that one thing must be added in it. Several members have spoken that there are a lot of disparities in terms of pay. Sometimes even a contractual employee is getting more than the regular employee and overall whatever the pay-scale is. They should be able to see what kind of person is getting what so that they are able to be actually guided. It is a kind of Fact-Finding Committee to point out that these are the facts. And the recommendation should be that, if it is to be done, they could do it like this. However, in it, name of any person should not be mentioned, only the group of people should be there because when they go on names, they become subjective and their focus is diverted from the real issue. Who would be benefitted and who not, should not be their concern? Systematically, if everything is needed to be corrected, they should do it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that on some items, certain clarifications were to be sought from the UGC and MHRD. Whenever a proposal in respect of Teaching and Non-teaching is made, the representatives of the concerned Association should be involved.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should also be kept in mind that the University did not have money, where from the money would be paid.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that their concern in Item 7 was that DA and DP should be given to the Library Assistants, which they were earlier getting, and there are 7-8 persons only. He further said that Shri Ashok Goyal ji is right. There is no need for constituting a Committee. He reiterated that there are 7-8 persons only out of 29, who were getting DA and DP. The issue is only for giving DA and DP to 7-8 persons.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee should also examine the case from the point of view of rules, regulations, legal angle as well as the UGC/MHRD guidelines. They should not decide the case hurriedly.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he has a suggestion to give. If they really wanted to do the work, the background paper(s) with all details should be prepared by the office. In fact, what is happening in the University is, practically the Committees had become the substitutes to the office. The Committees start working right from the beginning, which should not be encouraged. The Committee should work on the input given by the office and, if it is felt that there is some gap, it could ask the office to fill the gap.

At this stage, it was suggested that the Assistant Registrar (Estt.) should be appointed Convener of the Committee proposed to be constituted.

Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested that the Officer concerned, who usually issued such orders should be kept in the Committee.

**The Vice Chancellor said that, in fact, the Committee would be constituted comprising of Shri Prabhjit Singh (Chairman), Dr. Ameer Sultana, Finance & Development Officer, and one legal person for looking into the issue from the legal point of view. The Assistant Registrar (Estt.) would be the Convener of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee had the right to invite any person, which he deemed fit, to the meeting of the Committee.**

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what the term of reference of the Committee is. However, he is sure that it is not the Anomaly Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said, 'Yes', it is not the Anomaly Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the Anomaly Committee should be constituted separately.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Committee proposed to be constituted is only for this particular case.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he would also like to say something on the issue. If they appointed a Committee only for 7-8 persons, they would have to invite objections within the stipulated date as there might be many more such cases in various departments. They could not give it just to 7-8 people just because their issue has been raised here and others should not get the justice. Irrespective of whether it is Anomaly Committee or the Committee for this particular case, whatever Committee is set up they have to issue a circular inviting objection(s) from all the Association, Unions, etc. saying that they are going to look into this case; otherwise, it did not make any sense.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the Committee does some work. Though the issue(s) raised by Shri Malhi is/are perfectly alright, let the Committee does some work first. The Committee would itself point out that such and such issues are coming out.



Shri Ashok Goyal said that so far as the issue of payment of DA and DP is concerned, it seemed to him that the Court has already passed orders in their favour. If the Court has passed, then what the Committee would do.

**RESOLVED** : That the recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 13.11.2018 (Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16, 18 and 19), be endorsed to the Senate for approval.

**3.** Considered the requests of the Fellows for change of their assignment to the Faculties, under proviso (ii) to Regulation 2.1 at page 46 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** The requests received were opened on the floor of the House.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him update them. They have received 38 requests for change in assignment to the Faculties. If they allow, they would open these envelopes and provide them the list of Fellows, who have requested for change in their assignment to the Faculties.

Shri Prabhjit Singh suggested that the envelopes should be opened and a list should be prepared and given to the members before the end of the meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is like that that when they open something and decide as to what is to be done. He just wanted to say that the change of Faculties, which are in accordance with the Regulations, and the Regulation(s) is/are very clear as to when they ask for change of Faculties. However, before opening, they should be clear as to what would be the criteria for change in assignment of Faculties. Meaning thereby, who are eligible to change in assignment of Faculties and who are not.

Dr. Satish Sharma said that Shri Ashok Goyal might be right as he would have come fully prepared, but from 1988 onwards and till constitution of the last Senate, there was no rider on anybody. Everybody could opt two major and two minor Faculties.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has got what he is saying. What he says is that whatever papers were received, they approved them. He agreed with him. Only last time, they diverted from the previous practice. In fact, he is mixing the two issues, i.e., assignment of Fellows to the Faculties and change of assignment of faculties to the Fellows which is different from each other.

Dr. Satish Sharma stated that he would like to share with them that he had got the opportunity to be the member of the Syndicate or the Senate continuously since 1988. But in 2015 some alteration was made which was probably not known to too many people. Why it had been done, he did not hold anyone responsible. But before that the position was that after the elections/nomination, a *pro forma* was sent to all the members for opting the faculties. They used to opt two major faculties and two minor faculties. The Senate had a term of four years and there is a provision for change of faculties after expiry of two years, as the change was allowed as per the options. But, what happened during the last time when the request for change of faculties were received, is best known to Shri Ashok Goyal as with the passage of time he had stopped taking much interest on this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he appreciates Dr. Satish Sharma. Actually, it is his fault that he could not express well and could not make them understand what he actually wanted to say. He did not want to touch this subject at all. He agreed that what was done last year was not in good taste at all and in consonance with the practices which had been followed right from the very beginning. He is simply saying

that whosoever has applied for change, from which to which faculties, he is not discussing that. He is only discussing who is entitled for change and who is not. On being asked as to who is entitled for change, he said that the person who has completed two years of the assignment. When a couple of members tried to intervene, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had already clarified that he is not touching the subject of assignment of Fellows to the faculties in the beginning of the term. He is simply saying that there is a particular time after which one can apply for change of a Faculty. So far as D.P.Is are concerned, no D.P.I. has ever changed the assignment of Faculties as none of them had completed the term of two years. So, he is not talking about that. There was a case in the year 2015, which was filed in the Punjab & Haryana High Court, and the citation of the case is Dr.Keshav Malhotra Vs Panjab University. It was he (Dr. Keshav Malhotra), who had filed the case and that judgement of the High Court, in fact, had attained the finality and has become rule of law to be followed by the University. In the light of interpretation of Regulation 2.1 made by the High Court, they should take a decision who is entitled and who is not, before opening the requests for change of Faculties.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested Shri Ashok Goyal to tell as to who is eligible and who is not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is for the office to tell. He has no objection to any decision. He requested the Registrar to tell them as to what decision they had arrived at after examining the matter.

At this stage, the following portion of the judgement of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court was read out:

“The sum and substance of the aforesaid discussion leads to an irresistible conclusion that Regulation 2.1 of the Calendar has three parts, namely, a Senator can opt for a Faculty for the whole term of four years, he can opt for Faculty for two years for two major and two minor Faculties and for the remaining two years he has to take a decision on the expiry of the 1<sup>st</sup> part of two years and not at any time thereafter.”

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, the issue before the High Court at that time was whether one could change the Faculty on the expiry of two years or any time after the expiry of two years. In the year 2015, the term of Senate was ending in 2016 i.e. in 2015 when only one year was left, some people requested for change of assignment to the Faculties to which they had objected that 'no', they are not allowed. They had the option to change in the year 2014 only and the University had issued a circular and whosoever had completed 2 years in 2014, could change and they changed. Now, if somebody has completed 2 years, only he/she could change, but with majority the Syndicate approved. Professor Keshav Malhotra and five other members of the Senate filed a writ petition in the High Court and the High Court gave the interpretation of their Regulation 2.1. But, what had been read out was a portion of the argument. In the preceding paras the judge has written that in the beginning they have assigned the Faculties and the word used is 'lock in period' of two years. He said that the operative part is not only the last para. Operative part is that what the Judge has said. The Judge has said that they can change the Faculty after the completion of two years and two years does not mean that any time after the completion of two years. According to the Judge, the lock-in period of two years is must and after having spent two years in a Faculty, one can change. Secondly, it is not the assignment of to a Senate member, rather it is two years term of Senate and another two years term of Senate as the total term of Senate is four years. So, the Judge has said the lock-in period of two years is in accordance with the Regulations of the University. One can change the faculty only on the completion of two years and not at any time after the completion of two years. The difference is only between 'on' and 'after'. Earlier in 2012, it was done that one can change his Faculty any time after two years which was their stand. At that time it was resolved 'no' it has to be on the expiry of two years. One cannot change any time after the expiry of two years. At that time, they were the aggrieved party and a writ petition

was filed in the Punjab & Haryana High Court by Shri Malwinder Singh Kang Vs. Panjab University in which their (Shri Ashok Goyal) stand was any time after the completion of expiry of two years and their (University) stand was on the expiry of two years. In 2015, their stand was, in the light of the judgement of the High Court that it is on the expiry and the University's stand was, 'no' it is anytime after the expiry of two years. They could themselves see, how the stand changes. Thereafter, they again went to the High Court giving the reference of the earlier decision of the High Court. Then the University, as stated by Dr. Satish Sharma, gave the data in the High Court starting from 1996 and not from 1988 saying that both precedents are there, sometime they were allowing and sometimes not. The only thing which the University could not explain that how were they going back from their own affidavit which they filed in 2012 stating that 'no' they could not change the Faculty any time after three years. Now they are submitting another affidavit stating that it can be done. So, the University cannot be allowed to go back from its own stand. This is one aspect, they said, it is on the expiry of two years. Now it is on the expiry of two years from the assignment of the Faculty which is also written in the Regulation. Citing an example, he said that he was assigned to the on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2016 and somebody else was assigned to the Faculty on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2017. How both can be placed at par. So, the one who has been assigned the Faculty in 2017, he could opt for change of Faculties on the expiry of lock-in period of two years i.e. 1<sup>st</sup> November, 2019, but the one who has been assigned in 2016, he can be allowed to change in 2018. This is what the order of the Court says.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that he would like to clarify it. Two M.L.As., who are nominated from the Punjab Vidhan Sabha, are not nominated for the whole term of four years. They are always nominated from the start of the term of the Senate. The day that term would end, they would automatically cease to be its members or they cease to be the M.L.As. So, that is the point involved in it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the spirit of the Court order is that one should serve the faculty at least for a period two years. Now there have been instances where the ex-officio members have not opted for the faculty at all. They were just offered. They are members of the Senate. They are sent letters to opt the faculty in view of the members of the faculty, but they have not opted for these faculties, If they have not opted for the faculty, then they cannot vote. They cannot say that since they are members of the Senate, they should be allowed to vote. Reason being that the voting is to be done by the Electoral College consisting of the faculty and not of the Senate.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that a Fellow may; however, ask for change on the expiry of two years of the assignment. The legal opinion which they received in 2015 says that a Fellow has to take a decision on the first part of expiry of two years. The question is the date of counting of two years i.e. should it be from the start of the term of the Senate or from the start of the assignment of the Faculty. To his mind, from the judgement, the issue is not clear.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that earlier also there was a rule to change the faculty from the date of assignment of Faculty. This is a policy decision.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that if there is any legal issue, then they should see to it carefully.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as stated by Dr. Satish Kumar, they have always been allowed to change the faculty on the completion of two years, though they had been doing it in the third year also, but not after the Syndicate election. He read out the judgement (page 25) delivered in this regard which says that, "thus it is amply clear as to why two years' period has been given as a lock-in period for such Senators in a particular Faculty". It is the order of the Judge not the pleadings of the parties. Thereafter, the Judge says "now the question arises as to whether the word 'on the expiry' would mean at any time after two years or immediately at the time of expiry of two years the option to be given for change of Faculty"? So, both the things he has cleared and because they had challenged only the change of faculty in the third year, so

in the last para he has said that only. But in the earlier part he has said that the lock in period of two years has to be served because it is only from the assignment of the faculty. They had been doing it earlier also in the same fashion.

**This was agreed to by the members.**

The Registrar said that he would like to say something about the faculties. A total of 38 members applied for change of faculty out of which the applications of two members were rejected as they were not eligible as per the decision taken by them. He informed that one member has applied for assignment of faculties for the first time, so that they have to allow him.

**RESOLVED:** That the following Fellows be allowed to change their assignment to the Faculties as mentioned against their names, under proviso (ii) to Regulation 2.1 at page 46 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the Fellow	Date of assignment of Faculty / Faculties (First time)	Present Faculty/ Faculties	Faculties (After Change) To
1.	Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan Ph.D. (Sanskrit) # B 1/57, New Jawala Nagar Maqsudan, Jalandhar City-144002, Punjab	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Languages 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts	1. Languages <b>2. Arts</b> 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts
2.	Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar, PCS Director Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh U.T. Secretariat, Room No. 312 3 <sup>rd</sup> floor, Sector 9 Chandigarh-160017		NIL	1. Science 2. Law 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Dairying Animal Husbandry & Agriculture
3.	Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu Assistant Professor D.A.V. College Sector-10, Chandigarh	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Science 2. Languages 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education	1. Science <b>2. Medical Sciences</b> 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education
4.	Dr. K.K. Sharma Associate Professor A.S. College, District Khanna Ludhiana, Punjab	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Science 2. Languages 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology	1. Science <b>2. Medical Sciences</b> 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. <b>Education</b>
5.	Shri Prabhjit Singh B.A. # 3015, Phase-VII Mohali	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Science 2. Arts 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce	1. Science 2. <b>Medical Sciences</b> 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce

Sr. No.	Name of the Fellow	Date of assignment of Faculty / Faculties (First time)	Present Faculty/ Faculties	Faculties (After Change) To
6.	Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu M.A., M.Phil, Ph.D. Principal Panjab University Constituent College Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib, Punjab	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Science 2. Languages 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce	1. Science <b>2. Medical Sciences</b> 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce
7.	Ms. Surinder Kaur Associate Professor Gopi Chand Arya Mahila College Abohar, Punjab (Mobile: 94172-53128)	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Science 2. Languages 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education	1. Science <b>2. Medical Sciences</b> 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education
8.	Dr. Amit Joshi Head PG Department of Biotechnology & Bioinformatics, SGGS College, Sector-26 Chandigarh-160019	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Science 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education 4. Dairying Animal Husbandry & Agriculture	1. Medical Sciences 2. Science 3. Education 4. Dairying Animal Husbandry & Agriculture
9.	Dr. Gurmit Singh Associate Professor Malwa Central College of Education for Women Ludhiana, Punjab	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Languages 2. Science 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts	<b>1. Medical Sciences</b> <b>2. Arts</b> 3. Education <b>4. Business Management &amp; Commerce</b>
10.	Shri Varinder Singh B.A., M.B.A. (Executive) # E1-95, PU Campus Sector 14, Chandigarh (Mobile: 99158-00012)	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Languages 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology	<b>1. Medical Sciences</b> <b>2. Science</b> <b>3. Education</b> <b>4. Dairying Animal Husbandry &amp; Agriculture</b>
11.	Dr. Ajay Ranga (B.A. Law), LL.B., LL.M., Ph.D. Assistant Professor in Law University Institute of Legal Studies Panjab University, Chandigarh	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Law 2. Languages 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology	<b>1. Medical Sciences</b> <b>2. Arts</b> <b>3. Education</b> <b>4. Dairying Animal Husbandry &amp; Agriculture</b>
12.	Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha M.Sc. (Botany), Ph.D.	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22)	1. Languages 2. Science 3. Education	1. <b>Medical Sciences</b> 2. Science

Sr. No.	Name of the Fellow	Date of assignment of Faculty / Faculties (First time)	Present Faculty/ Faculties	Faculties (After Change) To
	(Education) Principal Dasmesh Girls College of Education VPO Badal, Teh. Malout (Sri Muktsar Sahib)- 152113	Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	4. Design & Fine Arts	3. Education 4. <b>Dairying Animal Husbandry &amp; Agriculture</b>
13.	S. Gurloleen Singh Sidhu, IAS Director, Higher Education Punjab, P.S.E.B. Complex, E-Block, 7 <sup>th</sup> Floor S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali (Punjab)		<b>Nil</b>	1. Laws 2. Languages 3. Education 4. Dairying, Animal Husbandry & Agriculture
14.	Dr. Baljinder Singh # 55, Sector 24-A, Chandigarh	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22)  Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Science 2. Medical Sciences 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Dairying, Animal Husbandry & Agriculture	1. Medical Sciences 2. Science <b>3. Education</b> 4. Business Management & Commerce
15.	Dr. Balbir Chand Josan Principal Lodge D.A.V. College, Sector 10, Chandigarh	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22)  Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Arts 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce	<b>1. Science</b> 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce
16.	Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu Assistant Professor Sri Guru Gobind Singh College Sector 26, Chandigarh- 160019	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22)  Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Science 2. Law 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts	<b>1. Arts</b> <b>2. Medical Sciences</b> 3. Education <b>4. Business Management &amp; Commerce</b>
17.	Shri Sandeep Singh M.A. (History & Punjabi), M.Ed. VPO Sikri, Teh. Dasuya Distt. Hoshiarpur- 146113 Punjab	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22)  Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Science 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts	<b>1. Arts</b> 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education <b>4. Business Management &amp; Commerce</b>

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Fellow</b>	<b>Date of assignment of Faculty / Faculties (First time)</b>	<b>Present Faculty/ Faculties</b>	<b>Faculties (After Change) To</b>
18.	Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D. Associate Professor Kenway College of Education Hanumangarh Road Abohar -152116	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Medical Sciences 2. Science 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts	<b>1. Arts</b> 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education <b>4. Business Management &amp; Commerce</b>
19.	Dr. Sarabjit Kaur Principal Guru Ram Dass B.Ed. College Jalalabad (West), Fazilka, Punjab	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Medical Sciences 2. Science 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts	<b>1. Arts</b> 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education <b>4. Business Management &amp; Commerce</b>
20.	Dr. Neeru Malik M.A. Physical Education (Silver Medalist), NIS (Gold Medalist), NDDY, UGC, NET, Ph.D. Inter National qualified Technical Official by ITTF, Assistant Professor Dev Samaj College of Education, Sector 36-B, Chandigarh	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Languages 2. Science 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Education	<b>1. Arts</b> 2. Languages 3. Education <b>4. Design &amp; Fine Arts</b>
21.	Dr. N.R. Sharma Principal Panjab University constituent College Guru Har Sahai, Ferozepur Punjab	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Medical Sciences 2. Science 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts	<b>1. Arts</b> <b>2. Languages</b> 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts
22.	Dr. Jagdish Chander Assistant Professor D.A.V. College Sector-10, Chandigarh	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Arts 2. Science 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce	1. Arts <b>2. Medical Sciences</b> 3. Business Management & Commerce <b>4. Design &amp; Fine Arts</b>
24.	Ms. Inderjit Kaur Principal Ramgarhia Girls College, Miller Ganj Ludhiana-141012, Punjab	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Arts 2. Languages 3. Design & Fine Arts 4. Business Management & Commerce	<b>1. Science</b> <b>2. Medical Sciences</b> <b>3. Education</b> 4. Business Management & Commerce

Sr. No.	Name of the Fellow	Date of assignment of Faculty / Faculties (First time)	Present Faculty/ Faculties	Faculties (After Change) To
25.	Dr. Harjodh Singh M.A. (Punjabi), Ph.D. (Punjabi) # P-12, Punjabi University Campus Patiala, Punjab	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Languages 2. Law 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts	<b>1. Science</b> 2. Law 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts
26.	Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, IPS (Retd.) Advisor to CEO, Vistara Jeevan Bharti Tower, Delhi # 84, Sector 10, Chandigarh	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Science 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology	1. Science 2. Law 3. Engineering & Technology 4. <b>Dairying Animal Husbandry &amp; Agriculture</b>
27.	Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa Alias Dayal Partap Singh Ph.D. # 229, Sector 16-A Chandigarh-160016 (Tel. No. Res. 0172-	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Law 2. Arts 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce	1. Law <b>2. Science</b> 3. Education <b>4. Design &amp; Fine Arts</b>
28.	Ms. Anu Chatrath M.Sc., LL.B. # 2055, Sector 15-C Chandigarh	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Law 2. Science 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology	1. Law 2. Science 3. Engineering & Technology <b>4. Dairying Animal Husbandry &amp; Agriculture</b>
29.	Professor Emanuel Nahar Department of Political Science & Director B.R. Ambedkar Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh (# E-1/92, Sector-14, P.U., Chandigarh)	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Arts 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology	<b>1. Science</b> 2. Law <b>3. Education</b> 4. Engineering & Technology
30.	Justice Harbans Lal (Retd.) # 503, Lane No. 9 Junction No. 1 The Foot Hill Co-operative residential Colony IAS/PCS officers colony New Chandigarh Village Mullanpur, Distt. Mohali (Punjab)	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Arts 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education	1. Law 2. <b>Science</b> 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce



Sr. No.	Name of the Fellow	Date of assignment of Faculty / Faculties (First time)	Present Faculty/ Faculties	Faculties (After Change) To
31.	Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu Principal Guru Nanak National College Doraha Ludhiana-141421, Punjab	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Science 2. Law 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Dairying, Animal Husbandry & Agriculture	1. Science <b>2. Medical Sciences</b> 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Dairying, Animal Husbandry & Agriculture
32.	Shri Raghbir Dyal M.Sc., M.Phil. Near Dr. Madan Mohan Hospital Bathinda Road, Bye Pass Chowk Sri Muktsar Sahib-152026 Punjab	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Medical Sciences 2. Science 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education	1. Medical Sciences <b>2. Languages</b> 3. Business Management & Commerce <b>4. Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
33.	Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill M.A., Ph.D. Professor Department of Sociology Panjab University, Chandigarh	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Medical Sciences 2. Arts 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology	1. Medical Sciences <b>2. Languages</b> 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology
34.	Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal H.No. 64, Sector 28-A Chandigarh-160002	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Law 2. Science 3. Education 4. Engineering & Technology	1. Law <b>2. Medical Sciences</b> 3. Education <b>4. Business Management &amp; Commerce</b>
35.	Shri Tarlochan Singh, Former MP F-9, Kailash Colony New Delhi	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Languages 2. Arts 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education	1. Languages <b>2. Medical Sciences</b> 3. Business Management & Commerce <b>4. Engineering &amp; Technology</b>
36.	Shri Rashpal Malhotra Executive Vice-Chairman Centre for Research in Rural & Industrial Development 19 A Madhya Marg, Chandigarh	Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 22) Senate dated 17.12.2016 (XII)	1. Arts 2. Languages 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education	<b>1. Medical Sciences</b> 2. Languages 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education

- 4.** Considered that Dr. A.K. Bhati (Re-employed) Professor, Department of Physics, be re-employed upto 16.09.2018 instead of 02.09.2018, i.e., attaining his age of 65 years, as already approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 04.01/16.01.2014 (Para 64 R-ii) (**Appendix-I**). Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-I**) was also taken into consideration.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. A.K. Bhati (Re-employed) Professor, Department of Physics, be re-employed up to 16.09.2018 instead of 02.09.2018.

- 5.** Considered if Dr. Darshan Singh, Assistant Professor, P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, be granted voluntary retirement w.e.f. 19.12.2018 (A.N.) as per his request dated 20.09.2018 (**Appendix-II**), under Regulations 17.5 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and he be sanctioned following retrial benefits.

1. **Gratuity:** as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at page 183, 186 respectively of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007, weightage of up to five years be given as an additional to the qualifying service actually rendered by him for calculating gratuity in view of Regulation 17.8 at page 133 P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007.
2. **Encashment of Earned Leave:** as may be due as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of the P.U. Cal. Vol. III, 2016. In terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 08.10.2013, the payment of leave encashment will be made only for the number of days Earned leave as due to him but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

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

2. Minutes of the Academic and Administrative Committee dated 11.10.2018 enclosed (**Appendix-II**).

3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-II**).

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that the request dated 20.9.2018 of Dr. Darshan Singh, Assistant Professor, P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for grant of voluntary retirement w.e.f. 19.12.2018 (A.N.), be accepted, under Regulations 17.5 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and he be sanctioned following retrial benefits:

1. **Gratuity:** as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at page 183, 186 respectively of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007, weightage of up to five years be given as an additional to the qualifying service actually rendered by him for calculating gratuity in view of Regulation 17.8 at page 133 P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007.
2. **Encashment of Earned Leave:** as may be due as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of the P.U. Cal. Vol. III, 2016. In terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 08.10.2013, the payment of leave encashment will be made only for the number of days Earned leave as due to him but not exceeding 180 days, pending

final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

- 6.** Considered letter No. F. 5-1/2018 (HRDC) dated 4.6.2018 (**Appendix-III**) received from Joint Secretary, University Grants Commission that the regular teachers from the Colleges/ Universities participating in the Refresher Courses/Orientation Programs etc. organized by UGC-HRDCs be treated 'ON DUTY' and not as on duty leave.

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

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have to adopt the recent UGC guidelines.

The Vice Chancellor said they have received a circular from the UGC in this regard and they have been adopting it in toto.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in July a circular was received from the UGC wherein it was mentioned that the requirement of orientation course and refresher course for promotion under CAS shall not be mandatory upto 31<sup>st</sup> December, 2018. So, they can give promotion till December 2018. He, therefore, requested to look into the pending cases of promotions.

Dr Satish Sharma said that they should adopt the circular.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the letter had been received from the UGC in July, 2018 and now it is November, 2018. He stated that it actually affects the college teachers.

It was informed (by the Registrar) said that it has been implemented.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has not been implemented in any college. Till the time a circular is issued by the University, nobody would implement it. He requested Professor Sanjay Kaushik that he has to send circular to all the Colleges to ensure it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that already a Committee was constituted and he was also a member of that Committee, but the Committee did not take up this issue. They have finalized the minutes also and expecting that it would come as a table agenda. Some new things such concession in the past service and API have come up, so they have to revise it. The persons who have less API score, they have also been given relaxation of three years. He requested that those minutes should be revised.

Dr. Satish Sharma requested to hold the orientation courses or refresher courses preferably during the vacations, because sometimes there is a single teacher in a college department and it becomes difficult for him to attend the course.

**This was agreed to.**

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the minutes of the Committee are yet to be placed before the Syndicate. There are two ways – (i) the points, which have been covered by the Committee, would come to the Syndicate; and those which are not covered, those would be considered by the Committee; and (ii) the points, which are yet to be covered, should be referred to the Committee for consideration and the Committee should make composite recommendations, which should be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18<sup>th</sup> November 2018

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that they authorize the Vice-Chancellor to take decision on the recommendations of the above-said Committee.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu suggested that at the same time, the affiliated Colleges should also be covered in it.

**RESOLVED:** That letter No. F. 5-1/2018 (HRDC) dated 4.6.2018 received from Joint Secretary, University Grants Commission that the regular teachers from the Colleges/ Universities participating in the Refresher Courses/Orientation Programs etc. organized by UGC-HRDCs be treated 'ON DUTY' and not as on duty leave, **be adopted.**

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That –

- (1) a communication in this regard be also sent to all the affiliated Colleges;
- (2) the points relating to CAS promotions, which are yet to be covered, be referred to the Committee referred to by Professor Keshav Malhotra (above) and the Committee be requested to make composite recommendations; and
- (3) the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendations of the above-said Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate.

**7.** Considered minutes dated 05.10.2018 of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 27.08.2018 (Para 14) to frame the guidelines for the conferment of designation of Honorary Professor:

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi stated that they were assigned the duty to frame guidelines for conferment of designation of Honorary Professor. Earlier, there were no guidelines for conferment of designation of Honorary Professor and anybody could be conferred the designation of Honorary Professor. As such, they had tried to define as to who could be conferred the designation of Honorary Professor. Earlier, there was also no connection between the Honorary Professor and the University, i.e., whether the Honorary Professor is sitting in Kolkata or somewhere else and whether he/she comes to the University or not. It was only a status symbol. They had tried to define some kind of relationship between the Honorary Professor with the University. It is neither too rigid nor too flexible. Whatever best they could think of, they had tried to define so that the person could feel connected with the University, the University should gain something from his/her experience and the person should also take pride in associating with this University. They had tried to set a minimum standard for the conferment of designation of Honorary Professor. Now, the recommendations are before the Syndicate for approval.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, they were expecting that the Committee would make detailed recommendations, but they have recommended only one thing, which is not provided in the Act, because earlier anybody could be conferred the designation of Honorary Professor. The Committee has *inter alia* recommended that a person who has been appointed Honorary Professor must be having 10 years teaching experience in a University/Institute of National Eminence.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he had doubt whether anybody could be conferred the designation of Honorary Professor, but he was told by his

friends that the person concerned must be a Professor, to which he differed. His view was different and was that they should leave it open, but the other people told him that anybody would come tomorrow and there would be a problem. The other members of the Committee felt that the person must be associated with the teaching, he was not of that opinion. His opinion was that it would be left open, i.e., to the discretion of the Vice-Chancellor and he still hold that opinion.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per Act, it is left to the Vice-Chancellor, but the Committee has restricted him. The Committee has recommended that unless and until the person concerned has 10 years teaching experience, he/she could not be conferred the designation of Honorary Professor. They (members of the Syndicate) had suggested constitution of the Committee to frame the guidelines for conferment of designation of Honorary Professor. Who could be conferred the designation of Honorary Professor and if they go with that the recommendation is in the first paragraph.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that there is a difference. If they see literally, its meaning is that, but when they say conferment of designation of Honorary Professor, it would automatically mean what the person would do.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he agreed with Shri Malhi and understands his feelings/sentiments they had tried to frame further guidelines, but probably they could not do anything because the provision of the Act itself says that the person concerned has to a distinguished teacher. So as per the Act, it is only for teachers. Actually, in the past or in the recent past only, they started appointing non-teachers also. It was on that count the discussion took place and they suggested that there should be some guidelines as to how and who is entitled for conferment of designation of Honorary Professor. For conferment, they have given only one recommendation that he/she should have 10 years teaching experience in a University/Institute of National Eminence. Rest of the recommendations related to what would happen after the person is appointed as Honorary Professor. The conferment of designation of Honorary Professor is only quo Para 1 (Recommendation 1). He felt "to say that with only 10 years experience the man become eligible for conferment of designation of Honorary Professor" probably did not seem to be justified. In fact, they had expected that it would come that this and this would be eligible. If they presume for the time being that only those would be conferred the designation of Honorary Professor, is it possible for all times to come for the University to appoint somebody who did not have even 10 years teaching experience. Could they appoint a teaching having less than 10 years' experience as Honorary Professor? It is not possible. It was only to decide whether a non-teacher could also be appointed as Honorary Professor. He was also of the opinion that distinguished/ eminent people in the other fields also, who are capable of contributing, could also be appointed as Honorary Professors, but he has to make himself understand the provision(s) of the Act because the Act says it is only the teachers. Therefore, unless and until the Act is amended, it could not be done. That meant, the only thing which he could make out that those, who have been appointed as Honorary Professors, in violation of Panjab University Act, what to do about them because they could not say that it has been done by mistake, and let the past be buried. That meant, they were not favoured, for whatever reasons they said, "okay, okay". In good faith, he did not read and Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi also did not read and similarly the other members also did not read and thought that whatever the Vice-Chancellor is saying is correct. The recommendation of the Committee is "A person who has been appointed Honorary Professor must be having 10 years' teaching experience in a University/Institute of National Eminence". Meaning thereby, whosoever is appointed, but does not have 10 years' teaching experience, has to go; and their Act also says so. What he suggest in this is that

it is a very good recommendation and in consonance with the Act, and he might not agree with it, but what the Act provides, they have to follow that. It should be for the teachers, but there should be something added.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi intervened to say that that was why when he had raised this point, the Committee incorporated Para 2 (Recommendation 2).

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that what is its definition because it is already mentioned in the Act, "who has rendered eminent services to the cause of education", which meant research, publications, etc. As such, everything is included in it. He was trying to understand that they had recommended only one thing and it was also the concern of the Syndicate that non-teacher should not be appointed Honorary Professor. Now, the second concern has crept in that those who have already been appointed, should be relieved because their Act did not permit.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they would go automatically because many of them might not be coming to the University during the last two years. As per Para 3, they are supposed to come once in two years.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal said that in view of this, the recommendations should be accepted, but they have to see what is to be done of those who have already been appointed in violation of the Act and how to say them a 'Good Bye'. He thought that the Vice-Chancellor could take the services of senior Professor(s) as to how some other criteria could also be incorporated, e.g., as in the Sciences that one should be member of an Academy or two Academies or Award Winner at National or International level, so that they did not face any difficulty and it might not happen that his or her friend should be appointed as Honorary Professor.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that, in fact, he agreed with Shri Ashok Goyal that criteria have to be refined further to assist the Vice-Chancellor so that any Tom, Dick and Harry might not come.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the recommendations of the Committee are acceptable, but these should be further refined. Either the issue should be referred to the same Committee or certain more members should be added to the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that two of the members present are the members of the Committee. In fact, the recommendations should be more elaborative.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that no doubt, they have done a very good work because the basic purpose of the Syndicate was to remove the non-teachers and they have done so. When Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi suggested that the matter should be referred back to the Committee, Shri Ashok Goyal said that these recommendations of the Committee should be accepted, the matter is being referred to the Committee only for the purpose of refining.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that he could not understand as to why its need was felt. The University is functioning for the last 100 to 150 years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, Dr. Sharma has raised a very pertinent point that as to why its need was felt. It was only during the last four years that non-teachers have also been appointed as Honorary Professors.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that suppose if tomorrow any of the big industrialist say that he has done a lot of work in the industry and now he

would like to do some work in the University for some Business Management. Why do they not allow him/her?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he would like to say something on the issue raised by Dr. Subhash Sharma. Here the 'teacher' word has been written because the teaching experience has been prescribed. Secondly, he also agreed with Shri Ashok Goyal, but he felt that when the Committee was constituted, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) was also a member.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if one is unable to attend the meeting, he/she should send his/her input/viewpoints to the Convener/Chairman of the Committee in writing.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that though he has not gone through the minutes of the Syndicate meeting dated 27<sup>th</sup> August 2018, but just now seen the minutes of the Committee with which the proceedings of Syndicate dated 27.08.2018 have been attached. It has been written in the minutes that they faced a lot of problem during the tenure of Dr. Ghosh, former Director, IMTECH, whereas he had stated that his (Dr. Amit Joshi) involvement is from the time of Dr. Ghosh. In fact, Dr. Ghosh has remained his teacher. In the minutes, it has been written that the students faced many problems when Dr. Ghosh was Director, IMTECH. He pleaded that it should be got corrected, and if they wanted, he is ready to give the correct version in writing.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Navdeep Goyal (Chairman), Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, Professor Ronki Ram, Dr. Ameer Sultana and Secretary to Vice-Chancellor (convener) would remain the members of the Committee. However, he would expand the Committee by in adding 2-3 more members. He requested the members to make it more exhaustive. He reiterated that if any of the members is unable to attend the meeting owing to one reason or the other, he/she should send his/her input to the convener of the Committee in writing through email.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had already given his input on the basis of which the Committee had been constituted, but his input has not been utilized.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi clarified that the minutes of the Syndicate had not come when the Committee had met.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the absence of the minutes of the Committee, which are under consideration, they have been conferring the designation Honorary Professor in accordance with the provision of the Act. Now he is saying that Act read with the minutes of the Committee, if they have to make any appointment, this would be applicable till new input comes. Therefore, the recommendations of the Committee as such should be approved and the Committee as suggested above should be requested to refine.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu suggested that the whole matter should come to the Syndicate in one go.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter needed to be revisited by the same Committee and he would add a couple of more members in the Committee. The Committee would be requested to make it more exhaustive.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee comprised of Syndicate members and a couple of members would be added to the Committee by the Vice-Chancellor. The members had already given the input and the Committee could take care of the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members should come to the meeting of the Committee with the fresh ideas. He requested to Shri Ashok Goyal to attend the meeting of the Committee, whenever the same is convened.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that in civil also certain seats are allocated for the corporates. Citing an example, he said that 12 corporates could become Joint Secretary directly just by appearing in the interview. As such, such a provision is there in the Civil Services also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, perhaps Dr. Subhash Sharma has not listened to him completely. He has told that he totally agreed with Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and non teachers should also be included in it so that they could also be appointed as Honorary Professor, but they have not right to violate the law of the land. He therefore, suggested that the Act should be got amended.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes dated 5.10.2018, be referred back to the Committee to make the guidelines more elaborative and effective and few more members be associated with the Committee.

**8.**

Considered if the donation of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Shri S.L. Nasa, Managing Trustee, Registrar, Delhi Pharmacy Council, New Delhi, be accepted for institution of an Endowment to be named as 'Dr. Bhagwan Dass Miglani Gold Medal'. The investment of Rs. 1,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year and the interest so accrued there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 10444978140. The Gold Medal will be awarded to the topper of M.Pharm. in Pharmaceutical course every year during the Panjab University Convocation on receipt of the interest from the amount, on the following terms and conditions:

- a) The Endowment will be named as (Late) Dr. Bhagwan Dass Miglani Gold Medal.
- b) Gold Medal be awarded to the topper of M.Pharm. in Pharmaceutical course every year during the Panjab University Convocation

- NOTE:**
1. Request dated 11.07.2018 of Managing Trustee, Hospital Pharmacy Foundation enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).
  2. Letter dated 23.08.2018 of Chairperson, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).
  3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.08.2010 (Para 18) has resolved that the existing amount of donations for instituting an endowments and Scholarships, be revised, as per **Annexure-IV**) to cope up the amount of Scholarship /lectures/cash prizes on account of Special Endowment Trust (SET) Fund.
  4. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra to give some donation as well.



Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he gave donation wherever he wished. In fact, he identifies a student and gave him/her the donation. He further said that the system needed to be streamlined to ensure that the benefit reach the students, and that too, in time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor Keshav Malhotra is right. It is imperative to tell that earlier, a donation was given to the University for a particular purpose. The University took the money and converted the same into an FDR and did not use that for three years. The old person concerned kept on coming to the University shuttling between his residence and the University saying that his money should be returned to him. The University sent a reply to him that there is no such provision. Once it is remitted to the University, it could not be returned. The person said that the money belonged to him and the University is not fulfilling the purpose for which the money has been donated. The University said that is a separate issue, but it could not be returned. Then one of the former Fellows, viz. Principal Sneh Mahajan, came to his residence requesting him to help her in getting the money returned. He told her that the money would not be got returned in this way. He advised her to write a letter to the University to explain as to why the money is not being spent for the purpose it has been donated, and then the University would return the money with folded hands. Then the man wrote a letter to explain as to why the donation is not being utilized for the purpose it was given. The University wrote that it is already under process, but the man wrote back the money donated by him should be refunded, and the University refunded the money. Meaning thereby, the University took the donation, but did not utilize the same for the purpose the donation is given.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that though the second instalment of fee of the student is due, the letter has not been issued to him so far.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is seized of the matter.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is his duty to follow up the issues, but his only concern is that the system should be developed.

It was clarified that usually the returns of the students, on the basis of which certain concessions are to be given to the students, came late from the Departments. Since there is a delay of 2-3 months in the submission of returns of the students, the matter got delayed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that whatever benefit is due to the students, should be given to them without any delay; otherwise, they have to take loans, on which they have to pay high interest.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a letter has been sent stating that "It is for the information of the members that a meeting was supposed to take place at 3.00 p.m. on such and such date, due to administrative reasons, it has been **postponed** to 10.00 a.m. By chance the said letter was handed over to the guard and the guard gave the same to his guest, who had come to meet him. After reading the letter, he asked "Are you a Senator of this University"?

**RESOLVED:** That the donation of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Shri S.L. Nasa, Managing Trustee, Registrar, Delhi Pharmacy Council, New Delhi, be accepted for institution of an Endowment to be named as 'Dr. Bhagwan Dass Miglani Gold Medal'. The investment of Rs. 1,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year and the interest so accrued there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 10444978140. The Gold Medal will be awarded to the topper of M.Pharm. in Pharmaceutical course every

year during the Panjab University Convocation on receipt of the interest from the amount, on the following terms and conditions:

- a) The Endowment will be named as (Late) Dr. Bhagwan Dass Miglani Gold Medal.
- b) Gold Medal be awarded to the topper of M.Pharm. in Pharmaceutical course every year during the Panjab University Convocation

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That thanks of the Syndicate be conveyed to the donor.

**9.**

Considered consider if the donation of Rs.5,00,000/- made by Shri Vikas Garg S/o Late Ch. Satya Parkash Ji, Director, Punjab Hammers Pvt. Ltd., P.O. Box 46, G.T. Road, Sirhind Side, Mandi Gobindgarh-147301, **be accepted** for institution of an Endowment to be named as 'Ch. Satya Parkash Ji Scholarship'. The investment of Rs.5,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year and the interest so accrued there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 10444978140. The scholarship will be awarded to the topper of 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> position of ISSER course on receipt of the interest from the amount, on the following terms and conditions:

- a) The Endowment will be named as 'Ch. Satya Parkash Ji Scholarship'.
- b) The Scholarship should be awarded to the topper students of ISSER Course as per bifurcation given below:

Sr. No.	ISSER Course	Position	Amount & Period	Total Amount
1.	B.A. (H.S.) 5 yrs. Integrated	1 <sup>st</sup>	1200/- (p.m.) for 10 months	12,000/-
2.		2 <sup>nd</sup>	1000/- (p.m.) for 10 months	10,000/-
3.		3 <sup>rd</sup>	800/-(p.m.) for 10 months	8,000/-
			<b>Total</b>	30,000/-

**NOTE:** 1. Request dated 06.08.2018 and e-mail dated 11.09.2018 of Shri Vikas Garg enclosed (**Appendix-V**).

2. A copy of letter No.6076/OS-IV dated 17.10.2018 sent to the donor with regard to the certificate to avail the exemption in the Income Tax and also a acknowledgement receipt of Rs.5,00,000/- enclosed (**Appendix-V**).

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

**RESOLVED:** That the donation of Rs.5,00,000/- made by Shri Vikas Garg S/o Late Ch. Satya Parkash Ji, Director, Punjab Hammers Pvt. Ltd., P.O. Box 46, G.T. Road, Sirhind Side, Mandi Gobindgarh-147301, **be accepted** for institution of an Endowment to be named as 'Ch. Satya Parkash Ji Scholarship'. The investment of Rs.5,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year and the interest so accrued there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 10444978140. The scholarship will be

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18<sup>th</sup> November 2018

awarded to the topper of 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> position of ISSER course on receipt of the interest from the amount, on the following terms and conditions:

- a) The Endowment will be named as 'Ch. Satya Parkash Ji Scholarship'.
- b) The Scholarship should be awarded to the topper students of ISSER Course as per bifurcation given below:

Sr. No.	ISSER Course	Position	Amount & Period	Total Amount
1.	B.A. (H.S.) 5 yrs. Integrated	1 <sup>st</sup>	1200/- (p.m.) for 10 months	12,000/-
2.		2 <sup>nd</sup>	1000/- (p.m.) for 10 months	10,000/-
3.		3 <sup>rd</sup>	800/-(p.m.) for 10 months	8,000/-
			<b>Total</b>	30,000/-

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That thanks of the Syndicate be conveyed to the donor.

- 10.** Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 27.09.2018 (**Appendix-VI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, (to look into the representation (**Appendix-VI**) of Dr. Nishi Sharma, Associate Professor, University Institute of Applied Management Sciences), that her date of promotion be preponed from 28.08.2013 to 12.05.2013, as Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) under CAS. The information contained in the office note (**Appendix-VI**) was also taken into consideration.

**RESOLVED:** That, as recommended by the Committee dated 27.9.2018, the date of promotion of Dr. Nishi Sharma, Associate Professor, University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under CAS), be preponed from 28.08.2013 to **12.05.2013**.

- 11.** Considered if,
- (i) Shri Pritpal Singh and Smt. Satinder Kaur, Superintendents (Retd. on 31.03.2016 and 31.03.2018, respectively), be granted the pension benefit w.e.f. 01.04.2016 and 01.04.2018, instead of 13.05.2016 and 06.06.2018; and
  - (ii) a policy decision be also taken for future in this regard that the Regulation 1.8 (e) appearing at page 181 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is applicable to those employees who retired on or before 24.10.2005

**NOTE:** 1. Shri Pritpal Singh retired on 31.03.2016. He had opted for pension scheme, but it has been observed by the audit that an amount of Rs.1,00,000/- was less transferred to pension corpus fund. The said amount was transferred along with interest (Rs.1,00,000/- + Rs.74,545/- interest) to the pension corpus fund on 13.05.2016.

2. Smt. Satinder Kaur retired on 31.03.2018. She had also opted for pension scheme. The amount of Rs.1,75,000/- (13076 + Rs.1,62,864/- interest) was transferred to Pension corpus fund on 06.06.2018.
3. The audit has made the observation that they are entitled for pension w.e.f. 13.05.2016 and 06.06.2018, respectively, i.e. the dates on which the money was transferred to the pension corpus fund.
4. Professor A.K. Bhandari, Professor Davinder Singh and FDO have observed that the above employees are entitled for pension from the very first day after the date of their retirement i.e. 01.04.2016 and 01.04.2018 as the Regulation 1.8 (e) at page 181 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is applicable only to those employees who had been retired on or before 24.10.2005. In the instant case both the above said employees should not be deprived of the pension benefits from the very first day after their retirement, merely on the ground that the University contribution could not be transferred to the Pension corpus before the dates of their retirement.
5. It has further been observed that the PF section and Pension Cell must ensure that the contribution and interest (if any) be transferred to the pension corpus well before the date of retirement of the concerned employees.
6. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-VI**).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if anybody knew about the background of the case, he should apprise them about the same.

It was informed that actually, the Pension Scheme of the University was notified in the year 2006, and there is a provision under which they can allow pension even to those employees who have retired before 2006 subject to the condition that they refund the university contribution along with interest, but the pension would be started from the day they deposit the amount. Neither the University would claim any interest nor would they pay any arrear of pension. He clarified that this provision was applicable in those cases where the employees have retired before 2006. But these persons retired after 2006, but somehow because of some administrative reasons, the Provident Fund Section made some delay in transferring the amount for some days from their accounts to the University fund. Therefore, the audit department said that the pension of these persons be delayed for such period the delay has occurred to which they said that there is no fault of the employees in it. They told the audit department that the clause 1.8 to which they are referring to, does not relate to the case of these employees as this clause is applicable only to those employees who have already retired at the time of implementation of pension scheme. Since they have already taken their money from the University, so in their case the provision was that their pension would start from the date, they would deposit the amount. This provision was not applicable to those employees who were in the service of the University at the time of implementation of the pension

scheme. As regards these two cases, the transfer of P.F. contribution should have been done before they retired. But in these two cases there is delay of 12 days in one case and about one month in the other case, but the audit says that they should be given pension from the date their P.F. contribution was transferred. The University told the audit department that their decision is wrong. Therefore, the audit told the University to take a policy decision in this regard and hence the case has been placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that these two persons retired in the year 2016 and the audit delayed their pension by taking a cue of that rule, which is wrong. They have already opted the pension and so their contribution was already going to the pension fund. He said that it is the responsibility of the University to deduct the requisite amount due to them before 2006. He asked as to what was the objection of the audit.

It was clarified that suppose these people retired on 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2016 and their pension should have started from 1<sup>st</sup> of April. Their pension got delayed for about one month because the employer contribution has to be transferred from their account to the pension fund account.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the employer contribution was got transferred in the year 2006.

It was clarified that some less amount was deducted from their account at that time because after the deduction, the audit pointed out that in one case an amount of approximately Rs.1,37,000/- and in the other case an amount of about Rs.1,00,000/- was less deducted. So, the difference was transferred to the University pension fund later on due to which the delay occurred. There was no loss to the pension corpus as it was transferred with interest.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to what is the guarantee that in other cases the correct amount has been transferred.

It was informed that it could not happen as for every case, audit is done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the audit is done only when a person has retired.

It was informed that the audit is done 2-3 months before someone retires from the service.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is what he is saying that the audit should have been done at the time of transfer of employer share to the pension fund.

It was clarified that the audit is done at that time also, but it is also reviewed by the audit at the time of starting the pension.

Shri Ashok Goyal while putting a query that those who retired before 2006, they would get pension from the date they would deposit the amount in the pension fund. Suppose, he is not having money at that time, so they would not pay him pension. But, if after 5 or 10 or even 20 years, if he says that now he has the money to deposit, would they give pension to him? He asked, are they not denying pension to any person on this account to which the F.D.O. said that they are not denying to anybody.

It was clarified that they would neither charge any interest from him nor they would pay him any arrear of pension.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18<sup>th</sup> November 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal asked then why they are not paying pension to the Professor K.N. Pathak, former Vice Chancellor?

It was informed that Professor K.N. Pathak has not opted for the pension.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked if a person has retired before 2006, how he could opt for the pension to which the F.D.O. said that he has to give his option. Shri Ashok Goyal further said that he would opt for it only he would be having money at that time. He asked the F.D.O. to show him if there is any rule where it is written that the persons who have retired before 2006, have to opt for the pension scheme. Suppose, he is in Canada for so many years and he came to know of the pension only after he came here after 10 or 20 years. How he could opt for pension. He said, though, it is written in the P.U. Calendar and the pension is not being given to the former Vice Chancellor only because of the fact that he has not opted for this scheme.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said it is right that he (Prof. K.N. Pathak) has not opted for the pension at that time, but many former employees have come to him and requested that at that time they could not exercise the option, so they should be given the option to choose for pension.

The Regulation 1.8(a) at page 181 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-1, 2007 reads as under:

“The employees who joined the service of the University before the date of notification of these Regulations shall have the option ....”

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say, that is what he is saying. Now, he (F.D.O.) should explain about the retired employees.

It has been informed that it would cover both the employees who retired before the issue of notification as well as the in service employees. He further said that he has not implemented it, it was approved and implemented by the Syndicate in 2006.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if someone is not aware of the pension, how they can deny him as he is opting it now.

Regulation 1.8(e) at page 181 of P.U. Calendar Volume-1, 2007 reads as under:

“The employees who retired prior to 24.10.2005 may, if they so desire, elect to be governed by these Pension Regulations, subject to the conditions that they refund the University’s C.P. Fund Contribution, including interest thereon”.

It was clarified that such persons also have to give option.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could do so only when he would be having the sufficient amount to deposit to which the F.D.O. informed that an interpretation for his has already been done 2006. However, Shri Ashok Goyal said, ‘No’, interpretation has not been done. If someone has retired after 24.10.2005, then he could understand, but Professor Pathak had retired in 2001.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired if someone deposited the money 15 years after his retirement, the University would be at loss as it has to pay him pension for the last 15 years.

Professor Keshav Malhotra clarified that they would not be paid pension for these 15 years because he would be given pension only from the date one has deposited the money in the pension fund.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the issue of pension there should not be that much red tapism, rather they should think as to how they could cover maximum people in this scheme. As has been stated by Shri Sanjay Tandon, there are many people who requested that option for pension scheme should be opened once again. They had made the option time bound, but it was opened again and simultaneously, it was said that it would not be opened again. Now, it is said, under which provision it was opened once? If the pension scheme could be opened once under some provision, why it could not be opened now? It means they could do it whether there is provision or not. If there is provision to open this scheme, they should open it again.

It was informed that the scheme was opened twice, but when it was re-opened, the audit put an objection.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to why the audit did not put any objection when it was opened earlier?

It was informed that it was done before his joining the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are not blaming him and rather he is taking it on himself. As stated by Shri Tandon, they are very poor people who are requesting to get the pension scheme opened once again. There is no person senior to the Vice Chancellor. Professor K.N. Pathak remained Vice Chancellor of this University for six years. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) asked him to write a letter to the University and attach with it a cheque for the amount equivalent to employer contribution and he would see to it how the University would deny him pension. Professor Pathak said that if the University sent him regrets to pay him pension, it would be an embarrassment to him. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) said, does he not believe him? Professor Pathak said that he has no trust on the University, the University of which he was the Vice-Chancellor. They interpret the things in such a way as to how something has to be excluded. He requested that they must adopt it.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he would like to add that they do not only interpret this, rather they say, "You show me the face, I will tell you the rule". He further said that he had been raising the issue in the Syndicate meetings that they should not consider individual cases by name. The Establishment Branch should write that there is no case pending of this nature. Only then they should take up such cases, otherwise, they should deny it also. When he joined the Syndicate for the first time he wanted to know whether everything is being done as per the rules. He was referred to contact Shri Ashok Goyal ji who said that everything is being done by the Estt. Branch, as per rules. But, whatever is not covered under the rules, that comes to the Board of Finance or Syndicate or Senate. I was surprised to see whether it is the duty of the Syndicate or Senate to see the individual promotion cases. There are so many things which they could do for the upliftment of the University, but they keep on discussing the establishment matters all the times. The valued time of the honourable members goes into discussing the individual matters. To his mind, there is no issue relating to the development of the University. He, therefore, requested the Vice Chancellor to strengthen the Establishment Branch and they should be instructed to decide the things at their own level. If something is

given to one person, that should be given to all similar cases or if something is taken back from one person, it should be taken back from all other such cases. He said what he meant to say is that there should not be any pick and choose. The rule is applied after looking at the face fraternity, cast or the field where one is employed. So, they are going towards a dark future. He requested the Vice Chancellor that look into it and resolve it as it is an administrative matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had written a letter regarding pension 5-6 years back and they (University) neither discuss this letter in the Committee nor any legal opinion is taken on it. They say that legal opinion would be taken only when he (Shri Ashok Goyal) would come to the meeting. That letter does not suit them because that letter would include maximum persons in the pension scheme. Most of the people think that it would be beneficial to include lesser number of persons in the pension scheme. It may not happen that in order to provide pension to someone else, his own pension may not be put in danger. They think the other person may die, but there should not be any risk to his pension. In the regulations, everything is explained separately such as those who joined before date of implementation of the pension scheme and those who retired before that date. He requested that he should be explained the meaning of Regulation 1.9. He asked to read out Regulation 1.9, which states as under:-

“An employee who is recruited at the age of thirty five years or more, may within a period of three months from the date of his appointment elect not to be governed by the Regulations of the Pensionary Scheme”.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the regulations above, it is written that this is applicable for those who were in service on 1.1.2004. The pension regulations were notified in 2006 wherein it is written that those who would join the University service after the age of 35 years, they could give their option for pension within three months. Then how a person joining in 2004 could give the option when the University has asked for options in 2006? Actually it is for those who joined after the date of notification after crossing the age of 35 years. They have been given three months if they are not to opt for the pension scheme, otherwise, automatically, they are entitled for pension. Professor Karamjeet Singh, Registrar also falls in that category. He joined the duty after the age of 35 years, but in his case, he is also not convinced with this. In his case, he joined the university after the date of notification of these regulations and his appointment letter says that he will be governed by the rules and regulations of the University contained in the Calendar and at that time the pension regulations were there. He thought that he is working in non-pensionary scheme, he joined the University because of pension scheme here. But when he joined the service, after one year, he was told that he is not entitled for pension. Can they put one into disadvantage with retrospective effect by notification prospectively. He, therefore, requested the Vice Chancellor that one must be given for what he is entitled as per the regulations and if it is possible to open the pension scheme again, it should be opened. He requested the Vice Chancellor to do it as those who have gone to the Court, they are not likely to get anything from the Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was in his mind and this issue has come to him earlier also through Syndicate and Senate members, but he is of the opinion that they should make a Committee so that to thoroughly look into the issue so that no person is left out.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a Committee has already been constituted, but perhaps its meeting has never held.



**The Vice Chancellor said it could be given to the same Committee or to a fresh committee to look into the issue thoroughly as it has legal aspects also. There is huge requirement of money also.**

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have fixed a date to deposit the money for the retired employees. Now the question is where from they could get the money to deposit. At that time, they were not having money to deposit, so they could not get pension, but now after 5 years, when they got the money to deposit, the University says, why they have not deposited it at the time of retirement.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would constitute a Committee to look into the issue.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it should also be kept in mind that they may not open a Pandora box.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, if as per rules, ten thousand persons become entitled, they have to give this benefit to ten thousand persons.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said if they agree to what Shri Ashok Goyal has said, then they have also to see from where the money would come.

The Vice Chancellor said that on the receipt of the recommendation of proposed Committee, it would be placed before the Syndicate as to wherefrom the funds would come. This is very-very important issue.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the Committee would have to see whether any funding requirement is there. If so, then who will fund? They have to see if by doing that funding, the normal working of the University does not get affected. So, all these things have to be seen.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they may examine the case, but they should not make a Committee because it would raise the aspirations of the people.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, suppose the University is not having money, would they stop the salary of teachers and non-teachers and pension of the pensioners. Then they have to close the University. If somebody is entitled for pension, they cannot deny him the benefit on the ground that they have not money to pay pension.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it is right what Shri Ashok Goyal has said, but that should be looked into by the office establishment

The Vice Chancellor said, he appreciates that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is very pro-employees, as he is putting that part on the first place and the financial implications at the second place, but they have to take into consideration the implications part also as he is to run the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, 'no' he is not pro-employee. To run the University does not mean that the benefit be given to some persons and denied to others.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is taking that issue also into consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they cannot ignore someone knowingly who is entitled pension in the name of funding to which the Vice Chancellor said that he will not do that.

The Vice Chancellor said that funding is must and without that it is not possible.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the Vice Chancellor can see the whole issue himself dispassionately, but the constitution of a Committee would raise the aspirations of the people.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he vividly remember that he has written a letter in 2011 which should be dug out and got examined.

The Vice Chancellor said that he honours and respects each and every word of the members and also the feelings of the House, but there is huge problem of money. It may not happen that by providing pension to more persons, the employees may not have to wash their hands from salary.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu apprehended that in order to meet the enhanced fund requirement, the University would have to increase the fee of the college students.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is focusing on the point that they do not feel the necessity to increase the fee of the students this year. They should manage the things in such a way that they may not feel the necessity to increase the fee. However, if pandora's box is opened, that would be really difficult to manage.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that in such a situation they would lose control.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the requests come, they would allow pension to all. The pension documents are ready with him, which have been prepared in consultation with the former Vice Chancellors. When Shri Goyal enquired whether his letter (referred to above) is available in the file, the Vice Chancellor said that letter would be there and he has already done lot of home work on this issue. So far as the payment of arrear of 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission is concerned, he had already submitted the proposal to the Honourable Finance Minister. As and when this issue moves forward, then he would take up the pension issue also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said so far as the issue of opening of pension is concerned, they should first examine the issue to explore the viability and feasibility. Secondly, those, who are already covered under the pension regulations (where they do not have to go anywhere), should be given pension at the earliest. Thirdly, he does not know under which regulation it has been done as they had already a provision for commutation of pension, but they are not allowing the commutation of pension. He does not know under which decision, they are allowing it. But the person who approaches the Court, this benefit is extended to him because they could not disobey the order of the Court and they have so far given this benefit to two persons. If he is correct, perhaps one of the former Finance & Development Officers has got the benefit through Court.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested the Vice Chancellor to use his good offices to get the case cleared from the MHRD for giving full pension to those have rendered 25 years of service.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) Shri Pritpal Singh and Smt. Satinder Kaur, Superintendents (Retd. on 31.03.2016 and 31.03.2018, respectively), be granted the pension benefit w.e.f. **01.04.2016** and **01.04.2018** respectively, and;
- (ii) the Regulation 1.8 (e) appearing at page 181 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is applicable to those employees who retired on or before 24.10.2005.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That a Committee consisting of Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Amit Joshi will be constituted to look into various aspects of Pension Policy of Panjab University.

**12.**

Considered:

- (i) recommendation (No.7) dated 18.07.2018 of the Research Promotion Cell Committee that Defence Institute of High Altitude Research (DIHAR), DRDO, c/o 56 APO Leh, DIHAR Base Lab, Chandigarh, be recognised as Research Centre of Panjab University for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. Degree of P.U., Chandigarh in the subject of 'Biotechnology' under the Faculty of Sciences.

**NOTE:** A copy of letter No. DRES/18/207 dated 17.10.2018 enclosed.

- (ii) recommendation (No.10 (ii)) dated 18.07.2018 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Research Promotion Cell Committee that Centre for Research in Rural & Industrial Development (CRRID), 2-A, Sector-19, Madhya Marg, Chandigarh, be recognised as Research Centre of Panjab University for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. Degree of P.U., Chandigarh in the subject of 'Sociology', under the Faculty of Arts, under the broader CRIKC Initiative.

**NOTE:** A copy of letter No. DRES/18/206 dated 17.10.2018 enclosed (**Appendix-VII**)

Dr. Subhash Sharma and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this item has already been taken up in the earlier meeting, why it has been brought again

Dr. Amit Joshi wanted to know the criteria for recognitions of certain Institute as Research Centre of Panjab University. Did any Inspection Committee visit the Defence Institute of High Altitude Research (DIHAR), DRDO, c/o 56 APO Leh, DIHAR Base Lab, Chandigarh, for this purpose?

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu also wanted to know whether any Committee was sent to that Institute. There is no recommendation of any Committee.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that since there is no recommendation of the Committee, it means that no Committee has visited this Institute. There is one thing more. The department has given some other recommendation whereas the Research Promotion Cell at page 80 of the agenda papers has written that "Biotechnology" under the Faculty of Science and done it directly, whereas the Biotechnology Department is writing that DIHAR-DRDO will be required to have a co-supervisor from the department have to adhere to the rules of Department of Biotechnology, Panjab University. So it is subject to certain condition. Why the R.P.C. has omitted this line? Has the R.P.C. authority to do so?

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what should be done in this matter.

Dr. Amit Joshi wanted to know the role of R.P.C. in this matter.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu wanted to know the guidelines and parameters which are required to be checked.

Dr. Amit Joshi again wanted to know as to what the Research Promotion Cell has been doing.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that there seems no involvement of the concerned Department.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the whole work has to be done by the Dean Research or Dean Science or by the Departmental Committee. The Vice Chancellor has to form the Committee and they have to visit the Institute. What is the role of R.P.C. in it? The R.P.C. has omitted some lines arbitrarily. He wanted to know the terms of reference of R.P.C. Then why they have appointed Director Research, he should be relieved.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Research Promotion Cell is headed by Director Research.

Dr. Amit Joshi wanted to know as to who is the Dean Research.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that Professor Ramanjit Kaur Johal is not holding the charge of Dean Research; rather, she is Director Research.

It was informed that there is no Dean Research.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that earlier there was the post of Dean Research. Where is that post?

It was informed that the senior-most Professor after the Dean University Instruction used to be the Dean Research, but thereafter, certain other things crept into it and so the post was changed to that of Director, Research Promotion Cell.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested the Vice Chancellor to examine this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is right that there had been the post of Dean Research and the Dean Research was used to be appointed on seniority as that of the Dean University Instruction. But for the reasons not to be discussed here, in place of Dean Research, it was proposed that that it be re-designated as Director Research and the Director, Research Promotion Cell would appointed through the selection process which was objected to at that time by so many people, which was the demand of PUTA and all others also that the same system should be continued which was there in place before 2015. To his mind, in this agenda, there are two issues – one about which Dr. Amit Joshi is referring to is DRDO.

Dr. Amit Joshi intervened to say that what he is referring to is – (a) what are the exact terms of reference of R.P.C. and (b) when they grant affiliation as Research Centres for pursuing research to these Institutes, what is the criteria that they adopt (c) whether the criteria is the same for the colleges or some exemption is granted for some institutes. There can be some institutes which can be granted the status of Research Centres and they may not fall in the category of approved Research Centres which is applicable to other institutes,

still they grant them affiliation or recognition to such institutes. So, his only submission is as to what is the exact criteria under which these affiliations are granted. A *pro forma* has to be filled where infrastructure and faculty has to be mentioned and then it is submitted. On the basis of that *pro forma*, decision is taken. In this case the Committee never visited this laboratory. It is just on good faith that they have submitted the list of infrastructure and faculty. The department may have granted affiliation on that basis, but the department has put a rider that there must be one co-supervisor from the department. So, any institute cannot be granted affiliation. They are here for promotion of research. Any institute can apply and if some department wants that one supervisor can be from the University, it is okay, but why the R.P.C. deleted this line and has granted blanket approval to the Centre, this is objectionable.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was also going to say the same thing. Dr. Amit Joshi is also referring to as to what are the guidelines. How the R.P.C. has exceeded its authority. No Committee has visited the institute and he is in agreement with him. But in the item they have mixed two things together. One is that what Dr. Amit Joshi is referring to that the R.P.C. has exceeded its authority, what are the guidelines and that no Committee has visited the institute etc. As regards the other part, he does not know why it has been brought here again. The CRRID and IDC had already been approved their Research Centre in social sciences in 2015. They have been issued letters and the copies of the letters are annexed here.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that now they have applied for Economics.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said when they wanted to make Research Centre in Sociology, the case was sent to the Sociology Department. The department on page 112 of the agenda wrote that 'moreover CRRID as a research centre has already been approved by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 8.3.2015'. So, the Research Centres which had been approved in social sciences in 2015, those cases should not have come here again. He informed that they are already having the guidelines for Research Centres. As per those guidelines, a Committee is constituted which visit the Institute which is proposed to be converted into Research Centre and there are norms also as to what are the things which needs to be checked and thereafter the report is submitted and then they do it and that is probably seems to be the case of DRDO. But that is not with the case of IDC and CRRID.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said what he could understand is that perhaps they have asked for Research Centre in the subject of Sociology. They had appointed three members from the subject of Sociology and they were recognised as Research Centre in Sociology for pursuing Ph.D. Now they have asked for Research Centre in the subject of Economics and so they have also enclosed a list of Professor in the subject of Economics.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there cannot be absolute approval. It is subject to periodic inspection by the University even if it is granted in 2015. Its periodic inspection is must even if it is done in 2015.

Dr. Ashok Goyal said that they should see if the periodic inspection has to be done and when it is to be done.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is mentioned in the guidelines.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the periodic inspection is required, it should be done. If it has not been done, why it is not being done? They should not single out one or the other Institute for conducting periodic inspection. He informed that IIT, Delhi is their Research Centre and IIT, at least, in the last 30

years, has never been inspected. There are so many other such Centres. If an institution was granted permission as Research Centres in 2015 and if they say that there should be periodic inspection, then it should be for all the other Research Centres also. They have received two types of cases. One case has come for the first time, but why the other case has come here, it is not understandable.

It was informed that they have framed guidelines in 2016. But they have not ever got done the periodic inspection of IFB, Delhi.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he (Registrar) should forget about the DRDO case, but he wanted to know why the CRRID case has come here and he wanted to know from the Registrar and not from any member.

Shri Ashok Goyal, however, said that he would explain it. It is very simple that the recommendations of the Research Promotion Cell were sent to the office to be put up to the Syndicate. It was a fault on the part of the Research Promotion Cell to send the other case also for consideration of the Syndicate, specially, when the Sociology Department has already written that CRRID is already an approved Research Centre and they did it with DRDO. He agrees to Dr. Amit Joshi that the Research Promotion Cell should at least know that as to what is the criteria, whether everything has been followed properly, though earlier such things were in a hurry without following proper procedure. So, the only solution to this problem is that they should revert back to the previous system of Dean Research, this would otherwise also improve the image of the University. Now he would talk about the concern shown by Dr. Subhash Sharma. For Economics, the Research Centre is running since 2015 and for Sociology, they have applied now. He (Dr. Subhash Sharma) has perhaps spoken opposite to it. There are so many other institutes which are doing a very good job and who, in fact, want them to be converted into Research Centres of Panjab University and they should encourage them.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is a little confusion. A letter was sent by the CRRID itself on June 4, 2018 with the subject permission to start Ph.D. Programme in the subject of Sociology at CRRID, Chandigarh. The office did nothing. The Department considered the letter sent by CRRID and said it was a case of 2015 and as per the due procedure, the case was placed before the Syndicate by enclosing the CVs of three persons. It is not only the grant of affiliation to an institute for Research Centre, the CVs of the teachers are also sent along with the application. So, to my mind, it is not the case as Shri Ashok Goyal ji has said. Actually these three persons were not available in 2015, now the three persons are available and so they sent the CVs of these three persons. The Research Centre was already approved, but they have now got the approval of three persons.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that one thing which Dr. Amit Joshi has said is absolutely right. The three points which he has mentioned, to his mind, should apply in both the cases.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they have no problem in it. If the department has approved it, it is okay. In the case of CRRID, the recommendations of the department and its subsequent inclusion in the agenda, is fine. If they want the names of persons mentioned in the list approved, they have no objection and they do not want to overrule the sanctity of the department, but his simple question was in some departments some lines or some recommendations have been omitted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is why he has said how the R.P.C. has exceeded their authority.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that since the department has given it in the case of CRRID, that is not the problem. He requested the Vice Chancellor to determine the terms of reference of the R.P.C.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would call a meeting which he would chair.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the recommendation (No.7) of the Research Promotion Cell Committee dated 18.07.2018 **be not accepted** and the proposal be re-submitted after following the proper procedure for grant of Research Centre.
- (ii) the recommendation [No.10(ii)] of the Research Promotion Cell Committee dated 18.07.2018 **be accepted**.

Arising out of the discussion, it was decided that the post of Dean Research be restored at the earliest.

**13.** Item 13 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

- 13.** To fix the dates for the meetings of the Faculties to be held in March 2019 for the purpose of election of various Boards of Studies (i.e. Undergraduate and Postgraduate Boards of Studies) for the term 1.4.2019 to 31.3.2021, as provided under Regulation 2.8 at page 55 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 2.8 at page 55 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

“The election of teachers from the affiliated colleges of Under-graduate and Post-graduate Boards of Studies by the Faculties concerned shall be held by March 31 every alternate year by Single Transferable Vote System.

The Syndicate shall fix a date or dates on which meetings of the various Faculties shall be held for the purpose of electing Board of Studies.

xxx                      xxx                      xxx”.

2. An office note along with a copy of the schedule approved last time for the term i.e. 01.04.2015 to 31.03.2017 enclosed.

**RESOLVED:** That March 30 & 31 and April 1, 2019 be fixed for holding the meetings of the Faculties for the purpose of election of various Boards of Studies (i.e. Undergraduate and Postgraduate Boards of Studies) for the term 1.4.2019 to 31.3.2021, as provided under Regulation 2.8 at page 55 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the Registrar, be authorised to prepare a schedule for holding the meetings of the Faculties, in accordance with the regulations.

- 14.** Considered request dated 24.09.2018 (**Appendix-VIII**) of Ms. Biney Preet Kaur, Research Scholar, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, duly recommended and forwarded by the Director, UIET, that she be allowed to submit her Synopsis/approval of candidacy by condoning extra ordinary delay of six months i.e. 10.07.2018 to 10.01.2019 beyond two & half years from the date of her enrolment, as a special case.

**NOTE:** 1. Ms. Biney Preet Kaur was enrolled as a Ph.D. candidate on 11.01.2016 in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology (Biotechnology Engineering). She was required to submit her synopsis/ approval of candidacy up to 10.07.2017 i.e. within 1½ years from the date of enrolment in view of the provision under UGC guidelines (clause 8.4) but she could not do so and she was granted extension up to 10.01.2018 by the DUI.

Further, the Vice-Chancellor condoned the delay up to 10.07.2018 and she was advised to submit the synopsis on or before the said date.

2. The DUI has observed that as per precedence in case of Mr. Rajiv Kumar (**Appendix-VIII**) the case of Ms. Biney Preet Kaur may be considered as a special case.
3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-VIII**).

**RESOLVED:** That the request dated 24.09.2018 of Ms. Biney Preet Kaur, Research Scholar, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, for allowing her to submit her Synopsis/approval of candidacy by condoning extra ordinary delay of six months i.e. 10.07.2018 to **10.01.2019** , **be accepted**.

- 15.** Considered if, the decision of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2016 (Para 98) with regard to the effective implementation of policies and programmes of GOI for SC/ST students, covered under Post Matric Scholarship (P.M.S.) schemes, be extended for examination fee also.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 01/15/28/29.05.2016 (Para 98) considered the minutes of the Standing Committee dated 11.12.2015 and minutes of the Committee dated 21.12.2015 regarding implementation of policies and programme of GOI, UGC and State Government for SC and ST and to supervise the work of Scholarships/stipends/free-ships to be conferred to the SC/ST students and resolved that the recommendations of the:-

- (1) Standing Committee dated 11.12.2015 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to (i)



oversee the effective implementation of policies and programmes of Government of India, U.G.C. and State Government for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and (ii) to suggest follow-up measures for achieving the objectives and target laid down in respect of these reserved categories, be approved; and

(2) Committee dated 21.12.2015 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to supervise the work of Scholarship/ stipends/free-ships to be conferred to the SC/ST students, under various schemes, be approved.

2. A copy of tentative status covered under P.M.S. Scheme in self financing courses along with examination fee is enclosed.
3. An office note enclosed.

Shri Prabhjit Singh while briefing the item said the crux of the item is that the concession being given to the SC/ST students is to be extended in the examination fee. The minutes of the meetings which have been attached, these were rejected many times by the Senate, so there was no need to attach these documents. The actually required document is attached at page No. 230 of the agenda papers. The item is concerned only with this document and not with others. The old recommendations have already been considered by the Syndicate and Senate and whatever decision was required to be taken, that had been taken. He read out the letter at page 230 which states that the students of SC category of Punjab State studying in self-financing courses of Panjab University Teaching Departments & Regional Centres and constituent colleges may be allowed to pay on 25% of the total Examination fee. It would burden the exchequer to the tune of about Rs.19 lacs. He wanted to know why they have to do it and who has asked them to do so. The admissions have already taken place. This would also affect the colleges who have no money to pay salaries of the staff. Even the colleges are not having funds even to bear the expenditure of Inspection Committees. He, therefore, pleaded to reject this item.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is the decision of the Syndicate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if it is the decision of the Syndicate, why it has come here again.

Shri Prabhjit Singh clarified that the Syndicate had decided to give 25% concession in the fee but now they are demanding concession in the examination fee in the self-financing courses also. He suggested that the request should be rejected.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked as to why this item has been brought to the Syndicate.

It was clarified that the Coordinator of SC/ST Cell, Panjab University has recommended that 25% concession in examination granted to SC/ST students by the University in normal courses in accordance with the guidelines of Punjab Government, should also be extended to the students studying in self-financing courses.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is merely a recommendation.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that, in fact, it should have been rejected by the Vice Chancellor himself. However, now the same should be rejected, otherwise the financial position of the University would become grim.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that proposal for enhancement of fee relating to self-financing courses should be shown separately for University and affiliated colleges as the University gets funds from the government. The University normally increases the fee by 2%, but the salary of college teacher would enhance much, especially with the implementation of recommendations of 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. So far as the item is concerned, the same should be rejected.

**RESOLVED:** That the exemption of 25% of examination fee available to the SC/ST students studying in normal courses be **not** extended to the SC/ST students studying in self-financing courses.

- 16.** Considered if, delay of 7 years, 2 months and 23 days as on 31.12.2018 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Tripta, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Education, Department of Education, be condoned w.e.f. 09.10.2011 to 31.12.2018 and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision of the Syndicate, as she could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons as mentioned in her request dated 14.09.2018 (**Appendix-IX**).

- NOTE:**
1. Ms. Tripta was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Education on 09.10.2006. She was granted two years extension upto 08.10.2011 by the DUI for submission of his thesis. However, she had not taken her last extension i.e. 09.10.2011 to 08.10.2012.
  2. The extract from the clause 17 of Revised Ph.D. Guidelines, duly approved by the Syndicate/ Senate is reproduced below:

“The maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis be fixed as eight years from the date of registration, i.e. normal period: three years, extension period: three years (with usual fee prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time) and condonation period two years, after which Registration and Approval of Candidacy shall be treated as automatically cancelled. **However, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond eight years may be considered by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reasons to be recorded”.**

3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-IX**)

Dr. Amit Joshi asked as to what are the recommendations of the department in this case.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the Syndicate is empowered to condone such a delay.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should be taken as a resolution.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said they should reject this request and it should not have been brought here.

The Vice Chancellor drew the attention of the members to note-2 of the item, especially the highlighted portion.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that had the delay been one year or so, the same could have been considered.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha stated that only the wearer knows where the shoe pinches. In fact, her sister and brother-in-law died in an accident. She has to take care of their children. Thereafter, someone snatched her gold ornaments. She had also met with an accident and remained in Hospital for about 2-3 years, and that too, in coma. Further, she had no child and now she adopted a one. Her precious 4-5 years elapsed on this and everything is written here. As such, it is genuine case and has been recommended by her Supervisor(s) and the Chairperson of the Department. He added that, earlier, they had allowed certain cases wherein the delay was more than this.

Dr. Amit Joshi remarked that they convert the result of certain students from fail to pass, and sometimes also gave golden chance, diamond chance, special chance, etc. This is just a minor issue.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that one of his friends got admission in Harvard University and he was supposed to submit the papers on 'X' day, but he could not upload the documents on 'X' day owing to internet problem, and the University rejected his admission. After all, one could say anything, but the Institutions keep on working. If anything is happened to someone personal life, they could always sympathize, but they should not change the system, regulations, rules, etc. for him/her. According to him, this request should have been rejected at the lowest level.

On a query, it was informed that in the revised Ph.D. Guidelines, it has been mentioned that "up to 8 years, the delay could condone. However, under special circumstances, condonation beyond 8 years might be considered by the Syndicate. As such, the item has rightly been placed before the Syndicate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this meant that they have the power to condone the delay. Secondly, if the delay in the case under consideration is condoned, what is the harm? Thirdly, in all the Institutions, the scope of some subjectivity is always there, so that they could decide with their wisdom as to what is to be done. This power is also with the Cabinet at the Centre and the Cabinet could also change the Act, Regulations, etc. He, therefore, requested they there should case to case study. If this case is genuine and it has also been recommended by the Department, they must do it. Moreover, only Ph.D. would be done by the candidate and not any money would be given by the University.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha clarified that, in fact, she is only seeking condonation of delay and not any time in the submission of thesis as the same is ready.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that as is being told by Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha and Dr. Amit Joshi, if they go through the request of the candidate, they would find that the candidate has written that "Otherwise, my thesis is ready for submission and I will submit when permitted". He pleaded that the candidate

should be permitted to submit her thesis within a period of one month. When Dr. Subhash Sharma pointed out that the candidate is seeking only 15 days, Shri Prabhjit Singh suggested that then the candidate should be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days, and if not submitted within 15 days, the permission be treated as withdrawn.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that if the condition of withdrawal of permission is to be imposed, the candidate should be asked to submit her thesis within a period of one month from the date of issuance of the letter.

**RESOLVED:** That the request dated 14.9.2018 of Ms. Tripta, Research Scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Education, Department of Education, for submission of Ph.D. thesis, be accepted and she be advised to submit her thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision of the Syndicate with the condition that no further condonation will be granted.

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

**(i)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the introduction of following three new B.voc courses to be started from the academic session 2018-2019:

1. B.Voc (Tax, Laws and Management)
2. B.Voc (Banking & Insurance)
3. B.Voc (Fashion Designing)

- NOTE:**
1. The Rules and Regulations, scheme of the B.Voc. Courses running in the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University, as recommended by the Skill Development Board (B.Voc. Course) dated 03.08.2016 was ratified by the Senate in its meeting dated 17.12.2016 (Para XXIV R-1) **(Appendix-X)**.
  2. Minutes dated 30.08.2018 of the Skill Development Board enclosed **(Appendix-X)**.
  3. The Senate in its meeting dated 26.06.2018 (Para XXXVI), has authorised the Vice-Chancellor to take decision non the left out courses/items, on behalf of the Academic Council.
  4. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-X)**.

**(ii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Dharam Chand, Senior Technician G-II as Senior Technical Assistant (G-I), University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, P.U., in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP of Rs.5400/- with initial pay of

Rs.21000/- plus allowances, as per University rules, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant post of Senior Technical Assistant G-I in the UIPS.

- NOTE:** 1. A copy of office order No. 13277-78/Estt. dated 11.10.2018 enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).
2. He has joined as Senior Technical Assistant on 15.10.2018 (F.N.).
3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).

**(iii)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted further extension in term of appointment of Mrs. Renuka B. Salwan, Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News (appointed on temporary basis against the leave vacancy of Shri Vineet Punia) for further period w.e.f. 23.07.2018 to 31.12.2019 (i.e. the date upto which the date upto which the Extra Ordinary Leave (without pay) of Shri Punia has been extended by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.05.2018) or until the person (Shri Punia) holding lien joins back in University, whichever is earlier, on the previous terms and conditions.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 28.05.2017 (Para 13) (**Appendix-XII**) while granting EOL without pay to Shri Vineet Punia, DPR w.e.f. 01.07.2017 to 22.07.2018 has further resolved that the person appointed on temporary basis as Director, Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News, be granted extension during the leave period of Shir Vineet Punia.
2. Shri Vineet Punia, DPR was granted EOL without pay w.e.f. the date he proceed on leave upto 30.06.2017. He was also allowed to retain the accommodation upto 30.06.2017 vide office orders dated 17601/Estt. dated 05.12.2016 (**Appendix-XII**).
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.05.2018 (Para 33) (**Appendix-XII**) considered and accepted the request dated 21.05.2018 of Shri Vineet Punia, DPR, P.U. for extension of Extra Ordinary Leave with effect from 23.07.2018 to 31.12.2019 on the previous terms and conditions.

Mrs. Renuka B. Salwan joined as DPR-cum-Editor, P.U. News vide letter dated 10.05.2017 (A.N.) (**Appendix-XII**).

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

**(iv)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has extended the term of the appointment of the following Lab. Instructors, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, w.e.f. 01.08.2018 to 01.06.2019, purely on

temporary basis, in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP of Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible under University rules and their salary be charged/paid against the vacant post as mentioned against each:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Post against which salary to be charged</b>
1.	Mr. Nand Kishore (IT)	Technical Officer
2.	Mr. Sandeep Trehan (M.E.)	Technical Officer
3.	Ms. Seema (Biotechnology)	Workshop Instructor
4.	Mr. Lokesh (C.S.E.)	Senior Workshop Superintendent
5.	Ms. Sunaina Gulati (C.S.E.)	Deputy Librarian

- NOTE:** 1. The above Lab. Instructors were re-appointed by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.06.2017 (Para 40 (v)) w.e.f. 11.07.2017 to 01.06.2018 i.e. upto end of the Semester examinations (after one day break on 10.07.2017, 08.07.2017 & 09.07.2017 being Saturday & Sunday) or till the vacancies are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier.
2. The term of appointment of above persons has been extended w.e.f. 05.06.2018 to 31.07.2018 after giving one day break on 04.06.2018 vide letter No.8275-77/Estt. dated 27.06.2018 (**Appendix-XIII**).
3. The above item was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate meeting dated 07.07.2018 as Item No. C-51, but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.
4. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 14.10.2018 (General Discussion 1) (**Appendix-XIII**) has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to take decision in the matter relating to release of salaries in the contractual appointments.
5. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XIII**)

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the payment of Diwali festival advance of Rs.7000/- to all 'B' & 'C' employees, as per past precedent/practice and the recovery will be made from their salary in four equal instalment @Rs. 1750/- per month starting from November, 2018 (paid in December 2018) to February 2019 (paid in March 2019).

**(vi)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the following recommendation of the Committee dated 16.01.2018 (**Appendix-XIV**), constituted by Science Research Board in its meeting dated 27.09.2017, to determine the term of Pre-Ph.D. course work in Science Departments as per the UGC guidelines:

1. if any Department/Research Centre wants to run the Pre-Ph.D. course beyond one semester, they can offer course as an option in the Second semester.
2. the students can apply continuously in the nodal departments. The list of teachers, availability of slots will be available on the department/s website and it will be updated twice a year.
3. the attendance would be 75% in the Pre-Ph.D. course work.
4. if a student fails in any of the papers of the Pre-Ph.D. course work, he/she shall be re-examined after 3-4 months.
5. there shall be a Research Advisory Committee of minimum of three members, to be formed by the respective departments/ research centre for each Ph.D. scholar and the concerned Supervisor will be the convener of the Committee. The research proposal and the topic of research will be finalized by this Committee followed by approval of the Research Degree Committee of the Synopsis and the name of the Supervisor/Co-supervisor and thereafter by the concerned Research Board.
6. In inter-disciplinary topics, a Research Scholar could be given option to take up specialized course in Department of his/her choice, in consultation with supervisor and Chairperson (s)/Dean of Faculty.

**NOTE:** A copy of circular No. ST 11857-11946 dated 23.10.2018 is enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

**(vii)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has re-appointed afresh Dr. Manoj Kumar as Assistant Professor, Centre for Public Health, IEAST, Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date of start of classes for the academic session 2018-19 i.e. 09.07.2018, on the first opening day after the summer vacation or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs. 6000/- + two increments, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which he is working earlier.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.05.2018 (Para 18) (**Appendix-XV**) while extending the term of appointment of Dr.

Manoj Kumar, Assistant Professor, purely on temporary basis, till 29.06.2018 has also resolved that the case of re-appointment, of Dr. Manoj Kumar, purely on temporary basis, for the academic session 2018-2019 be again placed before the Syndicate with the whole information.

2. An item No. C-52 regarding re-appointment of Dr. Manoj Kumar as Assistant Professor, Centre for Public Health, IEAST was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 07.07.2018, but no business was took place on 07.07.2018.
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 14.10.2018 (General Discussion 1) (**Appendix-XV**) has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to take decision in the matter relating to release of salaries in the contractual appointments.
4. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XV**).

**(viii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Mr. Inder Bhagat, Assistant Professor in Computer Science (Temporary), Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College Balachaur, Distt. S.B.S. Nagar w.e.f. 12.11.2018 as he has given one month notice from 12.10.2018 to 11.11.2018, under Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Cal. Vol. III, 2016.

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

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

2. Request dated 22.10.2018 of Mr. Inder Bhagat enclosed (**Appendix-XVI**).
3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XVI**).

**(ix)** In pursuance of the orders dated 16.08.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No.18751 of 2018 (Arun Prabha Vs P.U. and others), the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed:

- (i) Mrs. Arun Prabha, Deputy Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, P.U. to continue in service on re-employment basis after 30.09.2018 (i.e. the date on which she attained the age of superannuation)



till she attains the age of 62 years, without prejudice to her legal right to monetary claims in the event of acceptance of these appeals to comply with the court orders in her CWP No.18751 of 2018 (Arun Prabha Vs P.U. and others) or till the final outcome of the CWP filed by her, whichever is earlier.

- (ii) her to retain the residential accommodation, if any, allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions.
- (iii) that she be paid salary on the same terms and conditions as already ordered by the Vice-Chancellor in the court case (LPA No.1505 of 2016 Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs PU and others and connected LPAs) i.e. the salary which they were drawing immediately before the pronouncement of the order dated 16.08.2016 passed by the Hon'ble court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. P.U. and others excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone) as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the LPA filed by them for which they should submit the prescribed undertaking.

(x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has:-

- (i) re-appointed afresh the following faculty at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on temporary/Contractual basis w.e.f. 14.11.2018 for 11 months i.e. upto 13.10.2019 with break on 13.11.2018 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

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

- (ii) re-appointed afresh the following faculty at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital purely on temporary/Contractual basis w.e.f. 12.12.2018 for 11 months i.e. upto 11.11.2019 with break on 11.12.2018 (Break day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same

terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:-

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation &amp; Nature of Appointment</b>
1.	Dr. Shally Gupta	Professor (contract)
2.	Dr. Neeraj Sharma	Associate Professor (Temporary)
3.	Dr. Ikreet Singh Bal	Associate Professor (Temporary)
4.	Dr. Simranjit Singh	Sr. Assistant Professor (Temporary)

- (iii) re-appointed afresh Dr. Vandana Chhabra, Associate Professor, at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital on temporary basis w.e.f. 21.12.2018 for 11 months i.e. upto 20.11.2019 with break on 20.12.2018 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal.Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier.

**NOTE:** 1. Minutes dated 20.09.2018 of the Academic and Administrative Committee of Dr. HSJIDS is enclosed (**Appendix-XVII**).

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

- (xi) In partial modification to this office order No. 6161-6162/Estt.I dated 12.09.2018 (**Appendix-XVIII**), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the re-appointment of Mohd. Samshad Alam and Mohd. Taukir Alam Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, P.U. w.e.f. 11.7.2018 i.e. the date they actually started working for the session 2018-2019, against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, on the same terms and conditions on which they have worked previously during the session 2017-2018, under Regulation 5 page 111 of P.U. Calendar Vol. I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 27.08.2018 (Para 5) has approved that Mohd. Samshad Alam and Mohd. Taukir Alam be re-appointed as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) in the Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, P.U., with immediate effect for the session 2018-2019. Accordingly the orders were issued vide No. 6161-6162/Estt.I dated 12.09.2018.

2. Request dated 20.09.2018 of the Chairperson, Department of Community

Education and Disability Studies, P.U., is enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**)

**(xii)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Kamlesh Narwana, Assistant Professor in History, P.U. Rural Centre Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 28.11.2018 to 30.04.2019 (with one day break on 27.11.2018) i.e. for the academic session 2018-19, against the sanctioned post or till the post is filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+ AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 (a)(i) of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2017.

**NOTE:** 1. A copy of request dated 24.09.2018 of Honorary Director, PURC, Kauni, along with minutes of the Administrative & Academic Committee of the Department is enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**).

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

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in Items **R-(i) to R-(xii)**, be ratified.

**18.** The information contained in Items **I-(i) to I-(iv)** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**(i)** To note the consent received through e-mail dated 22.10.2018 (**Appendix-XX**) of Dr. Girish Sahni, Director General, CSIR and Secretary, DSIR, New Delhi with regard to conferment of designation of Honorary Professor to him at Panjab University, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 27.08.2018 (Para 14).

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.08.2018 (Para 14) (**Appendix-XX**) had considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor with regard to conferment of the designation of Honorary Professor on Dr. Girish Sahni and it was resolved:-

That the Syndicate in principle has agreed to confer the designation of Honorary Professor at Panjab University, on Dr. Girish Sahni, Director General, CSIR and Secretary, DSIR, New Delhi. It further recommends that Dr. Sahni be requested to give his consent to accept the Honorary Professorship in accordance with the Section 18 of Panjab University Act. After the receipt of the consent from him, the case be again placed before the Syndicate.

**(ii)** In pursuance of orders dated 03.10.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 25365 of 2018 (Anil Kishore Sinha 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, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Anil Kishore Sinha, Professor, Department of Anthropology, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.11.2018 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No. 25365 of 2018 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing on attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him will be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) he be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to him by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

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

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the employee and post held</b>	<b>Date of Appointment</b>	<b>Date of Retirement</b>	<b>Benefits</b>
1.	Dr. Pankaj Malvia Professor Department of Russian P.U.	02.03.1995	31.12.2018	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulations 3.6 & 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007.
2.	Dr. Neera Garg Professor Department of Botany P.U.	28.04.1987	30.11.2018	(ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18<sup>th</sup> November 2018

				days by the Government of India.
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

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

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Ms. Neelam Mehta Superintendent UIET	23.12.1983	31.10.2018	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
2.	Shri Raj Kumar Kanojia Superintendent UBS	14.12.1988	31.10.2018	
3.	Ms. Suversha Superintendent Secrecy Branch	02.11.1982	31.10.2018	
4.	Shri Virender Singh Senior Assistant Conduct Branch	01.04.1977	30.11.2018	
5.	Shri Randhir Singh Tractor Driver P.U. Construction Office	04.07.1986	31.10.2018	
6.	Shri Tek Chand Security Guard P.U. Extension Library Ludhiana	09.03.1978	31.10.2018	

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

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

When the meeting resumed after lunch, the Vice-Chancellor said that he would like to inform them that he has been able to improve the image of the Syndicate and Senate at various levels, i.e., Chancellor's Office, Ministry's of Government of India. He would also apprise them of the positive discussion which took place in the meeting of the Syndicate and Senate so far.

Shri Sanjay Tandon stated that he would like to inform them that in the meeting of the Board of Finance, they have evolved a system wherein the status of Action Taken, including the proposals which are pending for action at whatever level it might be, and pending items should be briefly given on a separate sheet so that the member are able to know the things at just a cursory look. He pleaded that this system should be adopted from the next meeting of the Syndicate.

It was informed that as stated by Shri Tandon, since May 2018 they are already on the job. They would definitely update the members of the Syndicate about it in the next meeting.

It was informed that Items C-24, C-25, C-26, C-27 and C-28 of the Syndicate meeting dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2018, which are pending, needed to be taken up for consideration, as the same are of urgent nature. Item C-24 related to recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 20.04.2018, and Item C-25 related to recommendations dated 17.05.2018 on the issues pointed out by Dr. Karamjeet Singh, Professor, UBS, to examine the API Score for Direct Recruitment of Associate Professor/Professor and recast the template. Similarly, Item C-26 related to recommendation (No.5) dated 23.03.2018 of the Research Promotion Cell Committee that Defence Institute of High Altitude Research (DIHAR), DRDO, c/o APO Leh, DIHAR Base Lab, Chandigarh, be recognized as Research Centre of Panjab University, Chandigarh, in the subject of Botany and Item C-27 related to Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and EdCIL (India) Limited, a CPSE under MHRD, Implementing Partner for Study in India, a programme under Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

**24.** Considered and

**RESOLVED:** That the following recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 20.04.2018 (**Appendix-XXI**) (Items 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40 and 41), be approved:

**ITEM 1**

That addition in Regulation 11.1 (h) appearing at page 92 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2017-18) with respect to eligibility criteria for M.A. in Human Rights and Duties, be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<b><u>PRESENT REGUALTION</u></b>	<b><u>PROPOSED REGUALTION</u></b>
11.1 A person who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education :-	11.1 No Change

<p>(i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 per cent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.</p> <p>(ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of the Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School course.</p> <p>(iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.</p> <p><b>Provided that-</b></p> <p>(a) to (g) xxx      xxx      xxx</p>	<p>(i) to (iii) No Change</p> <p><b>Provided that-</b></p> <p>(a) to (g) xxx      xxx      xxx</p> <p>(h) A Postgraduate Diploma in the subject of Human Rights with 50% marks shall also be eligible.</p>
---	--

**ITEM 5**

That amendment in the eligibility criteria for M.A. Defence & Strategic Studies (effective from the session 2017-18), be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<b><u>PRESENT REGUALTION</u></b>	<b><u>PROPOSED REGUALTION</u></b>
<p><b><u>For M.A. Defence &amp; Strategic Studies</u></b></p> <p>(i) Candidate shall offer Defence &amp; Strategic Studies who had passed Defence &amp; Strategic Studies/Military Science at graduate level;</p> <p>(ii) had passed Bachelor's Degree in allied subjects History, Political Science, Economics, Sociology, Psychology, Geography, Geology, Public Administration in Faculty of Arts/Social Sciences;</p> <p>(iii) had passed their qualifying examination in other subjects/Faculties; and</p> <p>(iv) had Candidates belonging to the Armed Forces (i.e. Army, Navy &amp; Air Force) after having put in five years of regular service provided they have passed the graduation examination.</p>	<p><b><u>For M.A. Defence &amp; Strategic Studies</u></b></p> <p>(i) <b><u>A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 per cent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course (Defence and Strategic Studies), or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.</u></b></p> <p>(ii) <b><u>B.A. with Honours in the subject of the Postgraduate course (Defence and Strategic Studies).</u></b></p> <p>(iii) <b><u>Bachelor's degree in any discipline with 50 percent marks in the aggregate.</u></b></p> <p>(iv) <b><u>Master's degree examination in any other subject.</u></b></p> <p>(v) <b><u>Candidates belonging to Armed Forces i.e. Army, Navy, Air Force &amp; Central Armed Police Forces (CAPF) after having put in five years of regular service provided they have passed the graduation examination.</u></b></p>

**ITEM 6**

That addition in Regulation 2 for B.A. (Honours) Economics (effective from the session 2017-18), be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT REGULATIONS</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATIONS</b>
<p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible for admission to the first semester of B.A.(Honours) Economics.</p> <p>(i)+2 examination under 10+2+3 system of education conducted by a recognized Board/ University/ Council with at least 60 per cent (55 per cent in case of SC/ST candidates) marks in the +2 examination.</p> <p>(ii) Any other examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (i) above.</p> <p>(iii) Given the quantitative requirements of the Programme, only students who have passed Mathematics at the class XII level are eligible for admission as per UGC Guidelines under the CBCS system.</p>	<p>2. No Change</p> <p>(i) No Change</p> <p><b><u>The candidate must not be above 20 years of age as on 1<sup>st</sup> August of the year in which admission is sought to the First semester (22 years in the case of SC/ST).</u></b></p> <p>(ii) Any other examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (i) above.</p> <p>(iii) No Change</p>

**ITEM 8**

That amendment in Regulation 1.2 for Master of Arts (Education) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2017-18), **be made as under and be given effect to**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<b><u>PRESENT REGUALTION</u></b>	<b><u>PROPOSED REGUALTION</u></b>
<p>1.2 A person who possesses one of the following qualifications shall be eligible to join the course:-</p> <p><b>(I) For Indian Nationals:</b></p> <p>A graduate in any discipline/stream with 50% marks from recognized Indian Universities with B.Ed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>The candidates who have studied Education</p>	<p>1.2 A person who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education :-</p> <p>(i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 per cent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.</p>



<p>or Philosophy; or Psychology or Sociology as an elective subject or Honors course at first or second degree level with 50% Marks.</p> <p><b>(II) For Foreign Nationals:</b></p> <p>A candidate having 50% marks in the qualifying examination with Education/ Philosophy/Psychology/Sociology as elective subject/ Honours or equivalent grade from Foreign University having equivalent graduate degree certified by the Association of Indian Universities (AIU), and;</p> <p>Proficiency in English language (TOFEL)</p>	<p>(ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of the Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School course.</p> <p>(iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.</p> <p>Provided that:</p> <p><b>(a) <u>Bachelor's degree in any discipline/stream with 50% marks from only recognized Indian University with B.Ed.</u></b> <b>OR</b> <b><u>A student who has passed B.A./B.Sc. examination with Education or Philosophy or Psychology or Sociology or Public Administration or History or Economics or Geography or Political Science or Anthropology with 50% marks.</u></b></p> <p><b>(b) <u>For Foreign National students who have 50% marks in the qualifying examination or equivalent grade from Foreign University having the equivalent graduate degree certificate by the Association of Indian University (AIU).</u></b></p>
--	---

**ITEM 9**

That addition of Regulation 2(b) for B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Honours) 5-years Integrated course (effective from the session 2017-18), be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT REGULATIONS</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATIONS</b>
<p>2. Minimum qualifications for admission to B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons) first semester of the course shall be-</p> <p>(a) 10+2 examination with at least 50% marks (45% marks in case of SC/ST/BC) from any recognized University /Board.</p> <p>(c) The admission shall be on such criteria (academic merit or Entrance Test or both etc.) as may be prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time.</p>	<p>2. Minimum qualifications for admission to B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons) first semester of the course shall be-</p> <p>(a) No Change</p> <p><b><u>(b)The candidate must not be above 20 years of age as on the date fixed for submission of application form of Entrance Test (22 years in case of SC/ST).</u></b></p> <p>(c) (No change )</p>

**ITEM 10**

That amendment in Regulation 2.1 and 2.2 for Bachelor of Engineering courses (effective from the session 2017-18), be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>2.1 The mode of admission to the Second year course (lateral entry) in any branch will be decided by the Syndicate from time to time. It will be open to a candidate who has passed 3-year Diploma from the State Board of Technical Education in India with 60% marks in the aggregate. The admission will only be made in the corresponding or equivalent branches of degree courses.</p>	<p>2.1 The lateral entry from Diploma to 2<sup>nd</sup> year of 4-year B.E. degree level will subject to the following conditions:-</p> <p><b>(i) The candidate must have passed Diploma in Engineering of minimum three year duration after Matriculation examination with Physics and Mathematics from Polytechnic College/Institute affiliated with State Board of Technical Education/ University, or recognized by University Grants Commission/AICTE. In addition, the candidate must have obtained 60% (55% for SC/ST/BC/PWD) marks in the aggregate in Diploma course as required by AICTE.</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>The candidate must have passed Diploma in Engineering of minimum two year duration after 10+2 from Polytechnic College/Institute affiliated with State Board of Technical Education/ University, or recognized by University Grants Commission/AICTE. In addition the candidate must have obtained 60% (55% for SC/ST/BC/PWD) marks in the aggregate in diploma course as required by AICTE.</b></p> <p><b>(ii) Candidate must have passed their qualifying examination i.e. Diploma in Engineering two years prior from the year of admission.</b></p> <p><b>(iii)</b> Admission would be made on the basis of merit obtained in the Entrance Test examination to be conducted by the Panjab University, Chandigarh.</p> <p><b>(iv)</b> Candidate having re-appear or compartment in Diploma in Engineering is not eligible for admission in the course even through he/she clears the reappear or compartment by the time of counseling.</p>

2.2 Admission in the affiliated Colleges and Swami Sarvanand Giri P.U. Regional Centre, Bawara, Hoshiarpur be made on the basis of merit obtained in an Entrance Examination to be conducted by the Panjab University.	2.2. ( No change )
--	--------------------

**ITEM 11**

That addition in Regulation 2 for Postgraduate Diploma in Nutrition and Dietetics (effective from the session 2017-18), be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<b><u>PRESENT REGULATIONS</u></b>	<b><u>PROPOSED REGULATIONS</u></b>
<p>2. A person who possesses one of the following qualifications shall be eligible to join the course:</p> <p>(i) B.Sc. Home Science from Panjab University/any other examination equivalent to B.Sc. Home Science, recognized by Panjab University.</p> <p>(ii) B.A. with Home Science/B.Sc./B.Sc. Microbial and Food Technology/B.Sc. Food Science/B.Sc. Clinical Nutrition and Dietetics/B.Sc. Homeopathy/B.Sc. Physiotherapy/ B.Sc. Nursing/ BAMS/ MBBS/ allied fields with atleast 50% of the aggregate marks.</p>	<p>2. A person who possesses one of the following qualifications shall be eligible to join the course:</p> <p>(i) No Change.</p> <p>(ii) B.A. with Home Science/ B.Sc./ B.Sc. Microbial and Food Technology/B.Sc. Food Science/ B.Sc. Clinical Nutrition and Dietetics/B.Sc. Homeopathy/ B.Sc. Physiotherapy/ B.Sc. Nursing/ BAMS/ MBBS/ <b>B.Sc. Biotechnology/Bachelor of Dental Science (BDS), B.A., B.Sc. Sports Nutrition, under allied fields except B.Sc. in Medical Lab Technology</b> with at least 50% of the aggregate marks.</p>

**ITEM 12**

That addition of Regulation 27 for M.Sc. (Microbial Biotechnology) (effective from the session 2017-18), be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

27. A candidate who has passed the M.Sc. (Microbial Biotechnology) examination may reappear as a private candidate in a course/s in which he/she wishes to, with a view to improving his/her performance.

For this purpose, he/she may be given two chances, within a period of seven years from the date of his/her passing the degree course. The candidate in the first instance shall be required to intimate all the courses in which he/she would like to improve his/her performance. He/she shall then appear in the respective course/s at the main semester examination i.e. for the course

offered for first and Third semesters in the November/December examination and for the second and fourth semesters in April/May examination. If he/she does not improve his/her performance in any course/s, he/she shall be eligible to do so in again in the following years in the semester examination concerned which would be treated as a second chance. The candidate shall be charged fee as prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time for each course, subject to the maximum admission fee prescribed for the semester concerned.

The result of the candidate shall be declared only if he/she improves his/her performance.

### **ITEM 13**

That Regulation 2(iv) for M.Sc. (Honours) Bio-Technology (effective from the session 2017-18), be added as under and be **given effect to**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<b><u>PRESENT REGULATIONS</u></b>	<b><u>PROPOSED REGULATIONS</u></b>
<p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join M.Sc. (Honours School) Semester System:</p> <p>(i) B.Sc. (Honours School) examination of the Panjab University in the subject of M.Sc. (Honours School) course provided that BCA/B.Tech./B.E. (Computer Science/Engineering) with 50% marks or any other examination recognized as equivalent thereto shall also be eligible for M.Sc. (Honours School) Computer Science.</p> <p>(ii) B.A. or B.Sc. examination of the Panjab University or any other examination recognized by the Panjab University as equivalent thereto, for admission to M.Sc. (Honours School) in Anthropology.</p> <p>Provided that admission of the eligible students other than B.Sc. (Honours School) from Panjab University will be based on their merit in the Entrance Test (OCET) for B.Sc. (Pass or Honours) examination with 50% marks from Panjab</p>	<p>2. No Change</p> <p>(i) No Change</p> <p>(ii) No Change</p> <p><b>(iii) The students who have passed B.Sc. Bio-Technology (50% marks)/B.Sc. with 50% marks with Biotechnology as elective/vocational subject (studied for 3 years) are eligible for admission to M.Sc. (Hons.) in Biotechnology.</b></p> <p>No Change</p>

University or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto/the fulfillments of such other requirements as may be laid down by the Syndicate.	
---	--

**ITEM 14**

That amendment in Regulation 2 (a) for Master of Science (Semester System) examination (Revised) appearing at page 132 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007, be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

PRESENT REUGLATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>1. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join M.Sc. (Semester System):-</p> <p><b>Anthropology</b></p> <p>xxx            xxx            xxx</p> <p><b>Botany</b></p> <p>xxx            xxx            xxx</p> <p><b>Physics</b></p> <p>xxx            xxx            xxx</p> <p><b>Chemistry</b></p> <p>(a) B.Sc. (Medical/Non-Medical) candidates who have passed the said examination securing 50% marks in the aggregate as also 50% marks in the subject of Chemistry separately. The candidates, who have passed B.Sc. (Medical Group) examination, shall be required to study Mathematics in First and Second Semesters and those who have passed B.Sc. (Non-Medical) examination shall be required to study Biology for First and Second Semesters.</p> <p>(b) B.Sc. Pass Degree under the old B.Sc. (Honours School) regulations awarded by the Syndicate on the</p>	<p>2. No Change</p> <p><b>Anthropology</b></p> <p>xxx            xxx            xxx</p> <p><b>Botany</b></p> <p>xxx            xxx            xxx</p> <p><b>Physics</b></p> <p>xxx            xxx            xxx</p> <p><b>Chemistry</b></p> <p><b>(a)</b> B.Sc. examination of the Panjab University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate securing at least 50% marks in aggregate <b><u>with Chemistry for M.Sc. (Chemistry) course along with any Science Subject.</u></b></p> <p>Provided that the student who had not taken mathematics as one of the subjects in B.Sc. examination may be admitted to M.Sc. (Two Year Course) in Chemistry on the condition that he/she passes and additional paper in Mathematics in the first year examination securing at least 40% marks and the student who studied Mathematics as one of the subjects in B.Sc. examination should pass additional paper in Biology in the first year examination securing at least 40% marks.</p> <p><b>(b)</b> No Change</p>

<p>recommendation of the Board of Control in the subject of M.Sc. course.</p> <p>(c) B.Sc. examination with 50 percent marks in aggregate from any other University recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a).</p> <p>(d) B.Sc. (Honours) examination of Panjab University or of any other University (recognized as equivalent thereto) in the subject of M.Sc. course.</p>	<p>(c) No Change</p> <p>(d) No Change</p>
---	---

**ITEM 15**

That amendment in the Regulations 1.1, 2.1, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 4.2 for Advanced Diploma in Labour Laws appearing at pages 390-392 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2016-2017), be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT REGULATIONS</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATIONS</b>
<p><b>1.1</b> The duration of the Course for Advanced Diploma in Labour Laws shall be one years. It shall be a part-time Course, open to in-service candidates associated with appropriate organizations as may be approved by the Head of the Department of Laws in consultation with Board of Control and others eligible under the Regulations.</p>	<p><b>1.1 The duration of the course for Advanced Diploma in Labour Laws shall be one year. It shall be a full time course, as may be approved by the Head of the Department/Institute/Center/Principal of the Law College in consultation with Board of Control and other eligible under the Regulations.</b></p>
<p><b>2.1</b> The minimum qualifications for admission to the Course shall be :-</p> <p>(a) A Post-Graduate degree in Business Administration, Commerce, Psychology, Sociology, Economics or Public Administration of the Panjab University in second class (50 per cent marks);</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>(b) A B.L. (Bachelor of Laws: Non-Professional) or LL.B. (Bachelor of Laws) degree of the Panjab University in second class (50 per cent marks);</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Or</p> <p>(c) A Bachelor's degree or a Post-Graduate degree in any Faculty of Panjab University in second class (50 per cent marks) and having at least 2 years relevant work experience;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Or</p>	<p><b>2.1</b> No Change</p> <p>(a) No Change</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>(b) No Change</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Or</p> <p><b>(c) A Bachelor's degree or a Post-Graduate degree in any Faculty of Panjab University in second class (50 per cent marks).</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Or</p>

<p>(d) A degree of any other University in second class (50 per cent marks) recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a) or (b) or (c). Provided that in cases falling under I, the candidate must fulfil the requirement of 2 years relevant work-experience;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>(e) A Post-Graduate degree in Social work in second class (50 per cent marks); 87recognized by the Panjab University.</p>	<p><b>(d) A degree of any other University in second class (50 per cent marks) recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a) or (b) or (c).</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>(e) No Change</p>
<p><b>2.4</b> Three type-written copies of the Dissertation/Project Report/ Term Paper shall be submitted by a candidate to the Chairperson/Head of the Department along with a certificate by the Supervisor/s (a) either one month before the commencement of the examination or (b) up to the date of the commencement of the examination, with the permission of the Chairperson/Head of the Department or (c) within three months after the commencement of the examination with the prior permission of the D.U.I. on the recommendation of the Chairperson/Head of the Department.</p>	<p><b>2.4</b> Three type-written copies of the Dissertation/Project Report/ Term Paper shall be submitted by a candidate to the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/ Principal of the Law College</b> along with a certificate by the Super Supervisor/s (a) either one month before the commencement of the examination or (b) upto the date of the commencement of the examination, with the permission of the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/ Principal of the Law College</b> or (c) within three months after the commencement of the examination with the prior permission of the D.U.I. on the recommendation of the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/ Centre/Principal of the Law College.</b></p>
<p><b>3.1</b> A person who possesses the qualifications laid down in Regulation 2.1. and produces the following certificates signed by the Head of the Department of Laws shall be eligible to appear in the examination :-</p> <p>(i) of good character;</p> <p>(ii) of having remained on the rolls of the Department of Laws for the academic year preceding the examination;</p> <p>(iii) of having attended not less than 66 per cent in the aggregate of lectures/seminars/case-discussions/field topics;</p> <p>(iv) of having satisfactorily done his class assignments.</p>	<p><b>3.1</b> A person who possesses the qualifications laid down in Regulation 2.1. and produces the following certificates signed by the Head of the Department /Institute/ Centre/Principal of the Law College shall be eligible to appear in the examination:-</p> <p>(i) No Change</p> <p>(ii) of having remained on the rolls of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/Law College</b> for the academic year preceding the examination;</p> <p>(iii) of having attended not less than 66 per cent in the aggregate of lectures/seminars/case-discussions/field topics;</p> <p>(iv) of having satisfactorily done his/her class assignments.</p>
<p><b>3.2</b> A deficiency in the required number of lectures/seminars/case-discussions/ fieldtrips may be condoned :-</p>	<p><b>3.2</b> A deficiency in the required number of lectures/seminars/case-discussions/ fieldtrips may be condoned :-</p>

<p>(a) up to 15 by the Head of the Department;</p> <p>(b) up to 25 by the Dean of University Instruction on recommendation of the Head of the Department.</p>	<p>(a) up to 15 by the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/Principal of the Law College</b>;</p> <p>(b) up to 25 by the Dean of University Instruction on recommendation of the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/Principal of the Law College</b>.</p>
<p><b>3.3</b> A candidate who has attended the prescribed number of lectures but does not appear in the examination and has not submitted his Dissertation/Project Report/ Term Paper or having appeared in examination and having submitted his Dissertation/Project Report/ Term Paper has failed, may be permitted on recommendation of the Chairperson/Head of the Department of Laws to appear in the examination and submit the Dissertation/Project Report/Term Paper as a private candidate before the next two consecutive examinations. A candidate who having attended the prescribed number of lectures does not appear in the examination or appears but fails shall not be permitted to re-join the course.</p>	<p><b>3.3</b> A candidate who has attended the prescribed number of lectures but does not appear in the examination and has not submitted his Dissertation/Project Report/Term Paper or having appeared in examination and having submitted his Dissertation/ Project Report/Term Paper has failed, may be permitted on recommendation of the <b>Head of the Department/Institute/ Centre/Principal of the Law College</b> to appear in the examination and submit the Dissertation/Project Report/Term Paper as a private candidate before the next two consecutive examinations. A candidate who having attended the prescribed number of lectures does not appear in the examination or appears but fails shall not be permitted to re-join the course.</p>
<p><b>4.2.</b> (a) Every candidate shall apply for approval of the subject of his Dissertation/Project Report to the Chairperson/ Head of the Department of Laws within four weeks of his admission.</p> <p>(b) The Head of the Department shall nominate a teacher/s to supervise and guide the Dissertation/Project.</p> <p>(c) Three type-written copies of the Dissertation/Project Report shall be submitted by a candidate to the Controller of Examinations through Chairperson/Head of the Department Along with a certificate by the Supervisor/s that Dissertation/ Project Report has been written by the candidate under the guidance of the Supervisor/s (a) either one month before the commencement of the examination, or (b) up to the date of commencement of the examination with the permission of the</p>	<p><b>4.2</b> (a) Every candidate shall apply for approval of the subject of his/her Dissertation/ Project Report to the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/ Principal of the Law College</b> within four weeks of his/her admission.</p> <p>(b) The Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/Principal of the Law College</b> shall nominate a teacher/s to supervise and guide the Dissertation/Project.</p> <p>(c) Three type-written copies of the Dissertation/Project Report shall be submitted by a candidate to the Controller of Examinations through Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/Principal of the Law College</b> along with a certificate by the Supervisor/s that Dissertation/Project Report has been written by the candidate under the guidance of the Supervisor/s (a) either one month before the commencement of the examination, or (b) up to the date of commencement of the examination with the permission of</p>



<p>Chairperson/Head of the Department, or (c) within three months after the commencement of the examination with the prior permission of the D.U.I. on the recommendation of the Chairperson/Head of the Department.</p>	<p>the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/Principal of the Law College</b>, or (c) within three months after the commencement of the examination with the prior permission of the D.U.I. on the recommendation of the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/Principal of the Law College</b>.</p>
<p>A candidate who does not submit his dissertation within the above prescribed period, his result will be declared as 'fail'.</p>	<p>A candidate who does not submit his dissertation within the above prescribed period, his result will be declared as 'fail'.</p>

### **ITEM 16**

That amendments in the Regulations 1.1, 2.1, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 4.2 for Advanced Diploma in Taxation appearing at pages 393-395 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2016-2017), be made as under and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

<b>PRESENT REGULATIONS</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATIONS</b>
<p><b>1.1</b> The duration of the Course for Advanced Diploma Course in Taxation shall be one year. It shall be a part-time Course, open to in-service candidates associated with appropriate organizations as may be approved by the Head of the Department of Laws in consultation with the Board of Control and others, eligible under the regulations.</p>	<p><b>1.1</b> The duration of the Course for Advanced Diploma in Taxation shall be one year. <b>It shall be a full time Course</b>, as may be approved by the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/ Principal of the Law College</b> in consultation with the Board of Control and others eligible under the Regulations.</p>
<p><b>2.1.</b> The minimum qualifications for admission to the Course shall be :-</p> <p>(a) A Bachelor's degree in Commerce of the Panjab University in second class (50 per cent marks);</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>(b) B.L. (Bachelor of Law: Non-Professional) or LL.B. (Bachelor of Laws) degree of the Panjab University in second class (50 per cent marks);</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>(c) A Bachelor's degree of the Panjab University in second class (50 per cent marks) and having at least 2 years relevant work experience or at least two years experience as officer of a Scheduled Bank;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>(d) A degree of any other University in second class (50 per cent marks) recognised by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a) or (b) or (c). Provided that in cases falling under</p>	<p><b>2.1.</b> The minimum qualifications for admission to the course shall be :-</p> <p>(a) No Change</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>(b) No Change</p> <p><b>(c) A Bachelor's degree of the Panjab University in second class (50 per cent marks).</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p><b>(d) A degree of any other University in second class (50 per cent marks) recognized by the</b></p>

<p>(c), the candidate must fulfil the requirement regarding experience as specified;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>(e) An Accountancy examination as is recognised by the Central Board of Director Taxes and which is also recognised by the Panjab University;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>(f) A Chartered Accountant.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Syndicate as equivalent to (a) or (b) or (c).</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>(e) Change</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Or</p> <p>(f) No Change</p>
<p><b>2.4.</b> Three type-written copies of the Dissertation/Project Report/Term Paper shall be submitted by a candidate to the Chairperson/Head of the Department along with a certificate by the Supervisor/s (a) either one month before the commencement of the examination or (b) up to the date of the commencement of the examination, with the permission of the Chairperson/Head of the Department or (c) within three months after the commencement of the examination with the prior permission of the D.U.I. on the recommendation of the Chairperson/Head of the Department.</p>	<p><b>2.4.</b> Three type-written copies of the Dissertation/Project Report/Term Paper shall be submitted by a candidate to the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/Principal of the Law College</b> along with a certificate by the Supervisor/s (a) either one month before the commencement of the examination or (b) upto the date of the commencement of the examination, with the permission of the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/ Centre/ Principal of the Law College</b> or (c) within three months after the commencement of the examination with the prior permission of the D.U.I. on the recommendation of the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/ Centre/Principal of the Law College</b>.</p>
<p><b>3.1.</b> A person who possesses the qualifications laid down in Regulation 2.1 and produces the following certificates signed by the Head of the Department of Laws shall be eligible to appear in the examination :-</p> <p>(i) of good character;</p> <p>(ii) of having remained on the rolls of the Department of Laws for the academic year preceding the examination;</p> <p>(iii) of having attended not less than 66 per cent in the aggregate of lectures/seminars/case-discussions/ field topics;</p> <p>(iv) of having satisfactorily done his class assignment.</p>	<p><b>3.1.</b> A person who possesses the qualifications laid down in Regulation 2.1 and produces the following certificates signed by the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/Principal of the Law College</b> shall be eligible to appear in the examination :-</p> <p>(i) of good character;</p> <p>(ii) of having remained on the rolls of the Department/<b>Institute/ Centre/Law College</b> for the academic year preceding the examination;</p> <p>(iii) of having attended not less than 66 per cent in the aggregate of lectures/seminars/case-discussions/ field topics;</p> <p>(iv) of having satisfactorily done his/her class assignments.</p>
<p><b>3.2.</b> A deficiency in the required number of lectures/seminars/case discussions/Fieldtrips may be condoned :-</p> <p>(a) up to 15 by the Head of the Department;</p>	<p><b>3.2.</b> A deficiency in the required number of lectures/ seminars/case discussions/ fieldtrips may be condoned:-</p>

<p>and</p> <p>(b) up to 25 by the Dean of University Instruction on recommendation of the Head of the Department.</p>	<p>(a) upto 15 by the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/Principal of the Law College</b>; and</p> <p>(b) upto 25 by the Dean of University Instruction on recommendation of the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/Principal of the Law College</b>.</p>
<p><b>3.3</b> A candidate who has attended the prescribed number of lectures but does not appear in the examination and has not submitted his Dissertation/Project Report/Term Paper or having appeared in examination and having submitted his Dissertation/Project Report/Term Paper has failed, may be permitted on recommendation of the Chairperson/Head of the Department of Laws to appear in the examination and submit the Dissertation/Project Report/Term Paper as a private candidate before the next two consecutive examinations. A candidate who having attended the prescribed number of lectures does not appear in the examination or appears but fails shall not be permitted to rejoin the course.</p>	<p><b>3.3</b> A candidate who has attended the prescribed number of lectures but does not appear in the examination and has not submitted his/her Dissertation/Project Report/ Term Paper or having appeared in examination and having submitted his/her Dissertation/Project Report/ Term Paper has failed, may be permitted on recommendation of the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/ Centre/Principal of the Law College</b>; to appear in the examination and submit the Dissertation/Project Report/Term Paper as a private candidate before the next two consecutive examinations. A candidate who having attended the prescribed number of lectures does not appear in the examination or appears but fails shall not be permitted to re-join the course.</p>
<p><b>4.2.</b> (a) Every candidate shall apply for approval of the subject of his Dissertation/Project Report to the Chairperson/Head of the Department of Laws within four week of his admission.</p> <p>(b) The Head of the Department, shall nominate a teacher/s to supervise and guide the Dissertation/Project.</p> <p>(d) Three type-written copies of the Dissertation/Project Report shall be submitted by a candidate to the Controller of Examinations through Chairperson/Head of the Department along with a certificate by the Supervisor/s that Dissertation/Project Report has been written by the candidate under the guidance of the Supervisor/s (a) either one month before the commencement of the examination, or (b) up to the date of commencement of the examination with the permission of the Chairperson/Head of the Department, or (c) within three</p>	<p><b>4.2.</b> (a) Every candidate shall apply for approval of the subject of his/her Dissertation/Project Report to the Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/Principal of the Law College</b> within four weeks of his/her admission.</p> <p>(b)The Head of the Department/<b>Institute/Centre/ Principal of the Law College</b> shall nominate a teacher/s to supervise and guide the Dissertation/Project.</p> <p>(c) Three type-written copies of the Dissertation/Project Report shall be submitted by a candidate to the Controller of Examinations through Head of the Department <b>Institute/ Centre/Principal of the Law College</b> along with a certificate by the Supervisor/s that Dissertation/Project Report has been written by the candidate under the guidance of the Supervisor/s (a) either one month before the commencement of the examination, or (b) up to the date of commencement of the examination with the permission</p>

<p>months after the commencement of the examination with the prior permission of the D.U.I. on the recommendation of the Chairperson/Head of the Department.</p> <p>A candidate who does not submit his dissertation within the above prescribed period, his result will be declared as 'fail'.</p>	<p>of Head of the Department/<b>Institute/ Centre/Principal of the Law College</b> or (c) within three months after the commencement of the examination with the prior permission of the D.U.I. on the recommendation of the Head of the Department <b>Institute/ Centre/ Principal of the Law College.</b></p> <p>A candidate who does not submit his dissertation within the above prescribed period, his result will be declared as 'fail'.</p>
---	--

**ITEM 17**

That Regulations for the Postgraduate Diploma in Disaster Management & Corporate Security newly introduced at University School of Open Learning (effective from the session 2016-17), **be approved**, as per Appendix and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

**ITEM 18**

That Regulations for B.A. (Honours) Economics under Choice Based Credit System (effective from the session 2016-17), **be approved**, as per Appendix, and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

**ITEM 20**

That Regulations for the Bachelor of Commerce (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), **be approved**, as per Appendix with following stipulation, and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

1. The Regulation 2 shall not be part of the Regulations.
2. The clause C mentioned under regulation 3.1(A) be changed with respect to the marks from **50% to 55%**.
3. The word '**compartment**' mentioned under Regulation 23 be replaced with '**re-appear**'.

**ITEM 21**

That Regulations for the Bachelor of Fine Arts (Four Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), **be approved**, as per Appendix, and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

**ITEM 22**

That Regulations for Bachelor of Computer Applications (BCA) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), **be approved**, as per Appendix, and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

**ITEM 23**

That nomenclature and eligibility conditions for LL.M. (Evening Shift) (Self-financed) newly introduced at University Institute of Legal Studies (effective from the session 2015-2016) be amended as under and be given effect to, in anticipation approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

**Addition of the Nomenclature**

<b><u>PRESENT NOMENCLATURE</u></b>	<b><u>PROPOSED NOMENCLATURE</u></b>
(i) Master of Laws (LL.M.) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2009-10)	(i) No change  (ii) <b>Master of Laws (LL.M.) Two-Year Course (Four Semesters) (Evening Shift) (Self-financed) newly introduced from the session 2015-16 at University Institute of Legal Studies.</b>

**Addition in the Eligibility Conditions:**

<b><u>PRESENT REGULATIONS</u></b>	<b><u>PROPOSED REGULATIONS</u></b>
2.1 A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible after qualifying the entrance test to join the first semester class of the LL.M. Course.  (a) LL.B. degree examination of this University; or  (b) Any equivalent examination of another University recognized by the Syndicate for this purpose.	2.1 A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible after qualifying the entrance test to join the first semester class of the LL.M. Course.  (a) No change  (b) No change.  <b>Special Weightage for LL.M. (Evening Shift) (Self financed)</b>  <b>The special weightage shall be given to Advocates/ Judicial officers/ Civil servants/employees of Panjab University. The weightage will be up to a maximum of 10 marks with ½ marks for every completed year of practice/employment.</b>

**ITEM 25**

That Regulation for Prak Shastri (Semester System) (effective from the session 2016-17), be made as under and be given effect to **as per Appendix**, and in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

**ITEM 28**

That Regulations for Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences (effective from the session 2015-2016) **be approved**, as per appendix and be given effect to, in anticipation approval of the various University bodies/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India.

**ITEM 29**

That an **addition** in nomenclature for Master of Commerce (Accounting and Finance) an Innovative Course at page 345 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007), be made as under and be given effect to in anticipation approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

<b>PRESENT NOMENCLATURE</b>	<b>Approved by the Senate dated 25.5.2014</b>	<b>PROPOSED NOMENCLATURE</b>
(i) M.Com. (Semester System) (To take effect from the admissions of 1975) <i>and</i>	(i) No Change	(i) No Change
(ii) M.Com. (E-Commerce) (effective from the session 2002-03)	(ii) M.Com. (Honours) course has been introduced from the academic session 2011-12 in placed of M.Com. (E-Commerce) and there is separate Regulations for the said course.	<b>(ii) M.Com. (Accounting and Finance)</b>

**ITEM 30**

That amendment in Regulation 2 for Diploma/Advanced Diploma at Page 229 & 235 and addition of clause (J) for M.A. in French at Page 92 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2017-18), be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

<b>Name of the Courses</b>	<b>Present eligibility conditions</b>	<b>Proposed eligibility conditions</b>
Diploma course in French ( <b>appearing at page 229 of P.U. Calendar Volume II, 2007</b> )	<b>Certificates in (i) French, (ii) German, (iii) Russian and (iv) Chinese</b>  2. A person who has passed one of the following examination shall be eligible to join these courses:-	<b>For admission to Diploma Course in French (effective from 2017-18)</b>  (a) Certificate Course in French.

	<p>(a) Certificate in French/ German/Russian of the Panjab University;</p> <p>(b) B.A. Part I examination with French/German/Russian as an elective subject of the Panjab University;</p> <p>(c) For admission to Diploma Course in Russian, Elementary Technical Translation Certificate in Russian;</p> <p>*(d) For admission to Diploma Course in German, the Certificate in German for Science Students with 50% marks;</p> <p>(e) An examination of another University/Board recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a), (b), (c) or (d).</p> <p>*To take effect from the admission of 1977.</p>	<p>(b) B.A. Part I examination with French as an elective subject of the Panjab University.</p> <p>c) An examination of another University/Board recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a) and (b) above.</p> <p>Provided that:-</p> <p>For admission to Diploma course in French, a candidate who has obtained A2 de 1' Alliance Francaise shall also be eligible.</p>
<p><b>Advanced Diploma course in French (appearing at page 235 of P.U. Calendar Volume II, 2007)</b></p>	<p><b>Advanced Diploma course in (i) German (ii) Russian (iii) French (iv) Chinese and (iv) Tamil</b></p> <p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join these courses:-</p> <p>(a) Diploma of the Panjab University in the language concerned.</p> <p>(b) For admission to Advanced Diploma course in Russian, B.A./B.Sc. examination with Russian as an elective subject from this University.</p> <p>(c) For admission to Advanced Diploma Course in French B.A./B.Sc. examination with French as an elective subject from this University.</p> <p>(d) An examination of another University/Board recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a), (b) or (c) above.</p>	<p><b>For admission to Advanced Diploma Course in French (effective from 2017-18)</b></p> <p>(a) Diploma in French</p> <p>(b) B.A. Part-II examination with French as an elective subject of Panjab University.</p> <p>(c) An examination of another University/ Board recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a) above (b) above.</p> <p>Provided that:</p> <p>(i) For admission to <b>Advanced Diploma course</b> in French, a candidate who has obtained B1 de 1 Alliance Francaise shall also be eligible.</p>

<p><b>M.A. (French)</b></p>	<p>(i) B.A./B.Sc./B.Com./B.B.A./B.C.A . or Honours (under 10+2+3 system of education) and Advanced Diploma Course in French with at least 45% marks from the Panjab University or any other University.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) B.A./B.Sc./B.Com./B.B.A./B.C.A. (under 10+2+3 system of education) with at least 45% in French elective or Honours (under 10+2+3 system of education) from the Panjab University or any other University.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(iii) B.A./B.Sc./B.Com./B.B.A./B.C.A. or Honours (under 10+2+3 system of education) and have cleared Add-On Advanced Diploma Course in French (3 years Course) with at least 45% marks will have to clear a department level entrance examination.</p> <p>In addition, this be also noted under 2.1.</p> <p>Provided that:-</p> <p>A candidate shall apply for M.A. in French only if he/she has the knowledge of the Language as clarified in 3.1(i).</p>	<p><b>For M.A. in French (effective from the session 2017-18)</b></p> <p>(i) A Bachelor's degree with at least 45 per cent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.</p> <p>(ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School course.</p> <p>(iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.</p> <p>Provided that:</p> <p>(i) For the M.A. in French, a candidate who has a Bachelor's degree under 10+2+3 system of education and Advanced Diploma in French with at least 45 per cent marks from Panjab University or any other University recognized by Panjab University shall also be eligible.</p> <p>(ii) A candidate who has Master's degree in any other subject must have the knowledge of French equivalent to that of Graduation level/ Advanced Diploma to be eligible to apply for M.A. in French.</p>
-----------------------------	---	---



		(iii) A candidate who has 50 per cent marks in the aggregate in Bachelors' degree must have the knowledge of French equivalent to that of Graduation level/ Advanced Diploma to be eligible to apply for M.A. in French.
--	--	--

**ITEM 32**

That an addition in Regulation 3 (g) and 3.2 for Master of Commerce (Semester System) at page 345 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2017-18), be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

<b>PRESENT REGULATIONS</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATIONS</b>
<p>3.1 The minimum qualification for admission to the first semester of the course shall be:</p> <p>(a) A Bachelor's degree in Commerce or Business Administration with not less than 45% marks in the aggregate; OR</p> <p>(b) B.Com. (Hon.) Degree with not less than 45% marks in the aggregate; OR</p> <p>(c) A graduate with Honours in Economics OR Mathematics OR Statistics OR Commerce with not less than 45% marks in the aggregate; OR</p> <p>(d) A graduate with 50% marks in the aggregate having offered either Economics, Mathematics, Statistics or Commerce as a subject in the examination:</p> <p>Provided that in case of candidates having Bachelor's degree of the University through Modern Indian Languages [Hindi/Urdu/Punjabi (Gurmukhi Script)] and/or in a Classical Language (Sanskrit/ Persian/ Arabic) or degree of any other University obtained in the same manner recognized by the Syndicate; 50% marks in the aggregate shall be calculated by taking into account full percentage of marks in all the papers in Language excluding the additional optional per, English and the elective subject taken together;</p>	<p>3.1 The minimum qualification for admission to the first semester of the course shall be:</p> <p>(a) No Change.</p> <p>(b) No Change.</p> <p>(c) No Change.</p> <p>(d) No Change.</p>

OR	
(e) An associate of the (i) Institute of Chartered Accountants of India or England or (ii) Institute of Cost and Works Accounts of India or England;	(e) <b><u>A candidate who has passed B. Voc. (Banking, Insurance &amp; Retailing) and B.Voc. (Retail Management) shall be eligible to get admission in the course with not less than 45% marks .</u></b>
OR	OR
(f) A pass in the final examination conducted by the Institute of Company Secretaries of India; OR	(f) No Change
(g) Any other qualification recognized by the Syndicate for this purpose.	(g) Change.
xxx      xxx      xxx	
	(h) No Change
	xxx      xxx      xxx

**ITEM 33**

That an addition in Regulation 4.4 (ii) for Bachelor of Arts/Science (General and Honours) examinations (Semester System) effective from the session 2017-18, be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

<b>PRESENT REGULATIONS</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATIONS</b>
<p>4.4. A candidate who has passed B.A./B.Sc. First Year (1<sup>st</sup> &amp; 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester)/Second Year (3<sup>rd</sup> &amp; 4<sup>th</sup> Semester) Examination may be allowed to change the subject/s in the same Stream –</p> <p>(a) If the combinations of subjects in that college is not available, or</p> <p>(b) Instruction is not being imparted at the college in the subject/s studied by him in the earlier classes subject to the condition that he shall have to clear the deficient subject/s of the examination concerned as the case may be, at the next two consecutive examinations. If he fails to clear the deficient subject/s his result of B.A./B.Sc./B.Com. Second Year (3<sup>rd</sup> &amp; 4<sup>th</sup> Semester)/Third Year (5<sup>th</sup> &amp; 6<sup>th</sup> Semester) class as the case may be, shall stand cancelled.</p>	<p>4.4(i) No Change</p> <p>(ii) <b><u>The candidate shall change the subject in the 3<sup>rd</sup> semester in the B.A./B.Sc. if he/she is unable to clear the paper with the condition that he/she has to clear the subject to deficient of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester which he/she has changed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Semester.</u></b></p>

**ITEM 34**

That an addition in Regulation 11.10 w.r.t. eligibility conditions for M.A. Sanskrit Course at page 92 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2017-18), be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>11.1. A person who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education –</p> <p>(i) to (iii) xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>Provided that-</p> <p>(1) (a) to (f) xxx xxx xxx</p> <p><b>11.2 For the Physical Education course</b></p> <p>11.2 For Women Studies course</p> <p>11.3 For M.A. Human Rights</p> <p>11.4 For Masters in Public Health</p> <p>11.5 For M.A. Social work</p> <p>11.6 For M.A. Police Administration</p> <p>11.8 For M.A. in the Language Departments</p> <p>11.9 For M.A. (Buddhist and Tibetan Studies) (for private candidates)</p>	<p>11.1 No Change</p> <p>(i) to (iii) xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>Provided that-</p> <p>(1) (a) to (f) xxx xxx xxx</p> <p><b>11.2 to 11.9 No Change</b> <b>11.10 For Sanskrit Course:-</b></p> <p>(i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 percent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course.</p> <p>(ii) A Bachelor's degree obtaining 50 percent marks in the aggregate provided the candidate has passed Sanskrit as an elective or literature subject.</p> <p>(iii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of the Postgraduate Course.</p> <p>(iv) B.Sc. Honour's School course.</p> <p>(v) Master's degree examination in any other subject provided the candidate has studied Sanskrit at graduation level.</p> <p>(vi) A person who has passed "Shastri" examination either under 3 year (10+2+3) Degree course New Scheme or under the old scheme (10+2+3) Degree course.</p>

**ITEM 36**

That amendment/addition in Regulation 1.2 for M.Sc. Medical Physics at Page 132 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the

session 2016-17), be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>1.2 The duration of the course shall be two years. There will be two semesters for each year and four semesters for the whole course.</p> <p><b>M.Sc. Medical Physics course</b></p> <p><b>Eligibility conditions:-</b></p> <p>A candidate who has passed B.Sc. with 1<sup>st</sup> class from a recognized University /Institution with Physics as an elective subject during all the three years of the B.Sc. candidates having recognized B.Sc. degree in Biophysics and Medical Physics will also be eligible.</p> <p>The duration of M.Sc. Medical Physics course shall be two years followed by one year Internship Programme. The students shall undergo one year internship in the Radiation Therapy, Department of PGIMER (Chandigarh) <b><u>and the dissertation should be submitted in that year instead of second year.</u></b></p>	<p>1.2 The duration of the course shall be two years. There will be two semesters for each year and four semesters for the whole course.</p> <p><b>For M.Sc. Medical Physics</b></p> <p><b>Eligibility conditions:-</b></p> <p>Admission to M.Sc. Course in Medical Physics will be B.Sc. (Regular course) first class with Physics as core subject (studied for three years) and Mathematics as one of the subjects (studied for minimum two years) from a recognized University. The candidates who studied B.Sc. through correspondence and open University stream are not eligible.</p> <p><b>Admission shall be made on the basis of P.U.-CET (P.G.). The entrance test will be same as that for the admission to M.Sc. (Honours School) in Physics. While deciding the final merit of the entrance test, a weightage shall be given to the B.Sc. marks obtained by the candidate as per University Rules. However, the interested candidates have to apply separately for this course.</b></p> <p><b><u>The duration of M.Sc. Medical Physics course shall be of three years which includes one year internship programme in the final year of the course. The students shall undergo one year internship in Radiotherapy, Department of PGIMER (Chandigarh) or any other hospital as per AERB Regulations. Dissertation on project work after its completion shall be submitted in the final year of the course.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>The dissertation as partial fulfilment for the award of M.Sc. degree in Medical Physics shall be submitted by the end of 3<sup>rd</sup> year. The dissertation shall carry 300 marks and marks shall be awarded after conducting the viva-voce. M.Sc. degree shall be awarded after the completion of three years (3 years) and having scored 50% of the aggregate marks.</u></b></p>

**ITEM 37**

That amendment in the eligibility conditions for M.Sc. (Instrumentation) (effective from the session 2018-19), be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:-

<b>ELIGIBILITY CONDITION (effective from the session 2010)</b>	<b>ELIGIBILITY CONDITION</b>
B.Sc. with Physics/Electronics/Instrumentation Science/Computer Science/Vocational Physics/ Electronics OR B.E. (E&TC)/ Instrumentation/Electrical & Electronics/Electronics & Electrical Communication Engineering with minimum 50% marks in the aggregate.	B.Sc. <b>(Medical/Non-Medical)</b> / Physics/Electronics/Instrumentation Science/Computer Science/ Vocational Physics/ Electronics OR B.E.(E&TC)/Instrumentation/ Electrical & Electronics/ Electronics & Electrical Communication Engineering) with minimum 50% marks in the aggregate.

**ITEM 38**

That amendment in Regulation 2.1 for M.Sc. (Information Technology) (effective from the session 2016-17), be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:-

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p><b>2.1</b> The minimum qualification for admission to the first year of the course shall be –</p> <p>BCA/B.Tech/B.E. in Computer Science examination from Panjab University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto.</p>	<p>2.1 A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join First Semester of M.Sc. (IT):-</p> <p>(i) B.C.A. examination from the Panjab University.</p> <p>(ii) B.E./B.Tech. in Computer Science/Information Technology from the Panjab University.</p> <p>(iii) B.C.A./B.Sc. (Honours) in computer Science/B.Sc. (Honours School) in Mathematics &amp; Computing or any other graduation with Computer Science/Information Technology/Computer Applications and Mathematics in all three years of graduation.</p> <p>(iv) Any examination of another University recognized by Panjab University Chandigarh as equivalent to any of the above examination.</p>

**ITEM 39**

That amendment/addition in Regulation 1.2 for Master of Science (Semester System) examination at page 132-136 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007, be made as under and be given effect to, in anticipation of

approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

PRESENT REGULATIONS	PROPOSED REGULATIONS
<p>1.2 The duration of M.Sc. Medical Physics course shall be three years which includes one year internship programme in the final year of the course. The students shall undergo one year internship in Radiotherapy, Department of PGIMER (Chandigarh) or any other hospital as per AERB Regulations. Dissertation on project work after its completion shall be submitted in the final year of the course.</p> <p>The dissertation as partial fulfillment for the award of M.Sc. degree in Medical Physics shall be submitted by the end of 3<sup>rd</sup> year. The dissertation shall carry 300 marks and marks shall be awarded after conducting the viva-voce. M.Sc. degree shall be awarded after the completion of three years (3 years) course and having scored 50% of the aggregate marks.</p>	<p>1.2 The duration of M.Sc. Medical Physics course shall be three years which includes one year Internship Programme in the final year of the course. The students shall undergo one year internship in Radiotherapy, Department of PGIMER (Chandigarh) or any other hospital as per AERB Regulations.</p> <p><b>The student shall start his/her internship only after passing of all theory and practical papers of M.Sc. I and II year. Special examination chance shall be given in July/August to the students for clearing their papers so that they can continue their internship.</b></p> <p><b>The dissertation as partial fulfilment for the award of M.Sc. degree in Medical Physics shall be submitted by the end of Internship year.</b> The dissertation 200 marks and the viva voce examination shall carry 100 marks. M.Sc. degree shall be awarded after completion of three years (3 years) course and having secured 50% of the aggregate marks.</p>

#### **ITEM 40**

That addition of eligibility conditions for following courses in M.E. course (for the session 2018-19), be approved **as per Appendix**, and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

1. M.E. (Information Technology)
2. M.E. (Computer Science & Engineering)
3. M.E. (Electronics and Communication Engineering )
4. M.Tech. (Microelectronics)
5. M.E. (Mechanical Engineering)

#### **ITEM 41**

That Regulations for grant of Child Care Leave to University Women employees (Teaching and Non-Teaching), **be approved**, as per Appendix and be given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**25.** Considered and

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations dated 17.05.2018 (**Appendix-XXII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine and give its recommendations on the issues pointed out by Dr. Karamjeet Singh, Professor, UBS, to examine the API Score for Director Recruitment of Associate Professor/Professor and recast the template, be approved.

**26.** Considered recommendation (No.5) dated 23.03.2018 of the Research Promotion Cell Committee that Defence Institute of High Altitude Research (DIHAR), DRDO, c/o APO Leh, DIHAR Base Lab, Chandigarh, be recognized as Research Centre of Panjab University, Chandigarh, for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. degree of Panjab University, Chandigarh, in the subject of Botany, under the Faculty of Science, under the broader CRIKC Initiative.

When, it was pointed out by the one of the members that the item has already been approved, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the consideration of the item should be deferred. In case, the item is approved, it would serve the purpose and if not, the same may be placed before the Syndicate again.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of above Item C-26, be deferred.

**27.** Considered if, Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh, and EdCIL (India) Limited, a CPSE under MHRD, Implementing Partner for Study Development, Government of India, be executed to increase the inflow of inbound international students through systematic brand-building, marketing, social media and digital marketing campaigns.

The members were briefed about the item, which related to a tie-up between the University and EdCIL (India) Limited, a CPSE under MHRD.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it is so, why it has been got legally vetted. It is surprising that the legal experts have also been involved in the Promotion of Research. How a Professor of Law could become a member of Research Promotion Committee as a legal expert, and he has been mentioned in the Committee as RPC Legal Expert. Has the RPC appointed its own Legal Expert?

The Vice-Chancellor said that if there is a problem, the same could be got reviewed.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the MoU has already been executed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even if it has been signed, it could be reviewed.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if the MoU has already been executed, it should have come for information only and not for consideration.

Shri Sanjay Tandon stated that whenever any left out item(s) is/are placed before any statutory body, the item(s) is/are included in the agenda of the said meeting as it is. There are several left items, which contained in 2-3 huge volumes. How could they carry them? Why those items have not been included in the agenda of this meeting, which would be convenient to all. The items, which are being considered now, are not with any of the members.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18<sup>th</sup> November 2018

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that this item should no more be discussed and the same be deferred.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that only those items should be taken up for consideration, which are of urgent nature.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of above Item C-27, be deferred.

At this stage, Shri Prabhjit Singh suggested that now, Item 5 (pending Item of Syndicate meeting dated 10.6.2018), which related to pay fixation of Dr. Arvin Kumar, Assistant Professor, UIET, should be taken up for consideration.

- 5.** Considered deferred Item 9 of the Syndicate meeting 29.04/26.05.2018 relating to the request dated 14.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXIII**) of Dr. Arvind Kumar, Assistant Professor, UIET, for counting of his past service for the purpose of promotion under the CAS, as has been done in the case of Dr. Latika Sharma, Department of Education and Dr. Naveen Gupta, Assistant Professor, pursuant to the orders of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court passed in CWP No. 8417 of 2005, filed by the Dr. Latika Sharma.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.02.2016/14.03.2016 (Para 44) (**Appendix-XXIII**) had resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred until clarification from the UGC is received as decided by the Syndicate dated 23.01.2016/ 06.02.2016 (Para 34) (**Appendix-XXIII**).
2. An office note along with chart showing the particulars in respect of past service rendered by the incumbent and also the particulars in respect of the case of Dr. Latika Sharma and Naveen Gupta, in this regard enclosed (**Appendix-XXIII**).
3. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 29.04.2018 but the same could not taken up and the same was again placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.05.2018 (Para9) (**Appendix-XXIII**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

Shri Prabhjit Singh requested the Registrar to inform him status of Item 5 (pending Item of Syndicate meeting dated 7.7.2018), which related to pay fixation of Dr. Arvin Kumar, Assistant Professor, UIET.

It was clarified that the case was sent for legal opinion, but the file has not come back.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if the case has been sent for the legal opinion, why the same was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held in the month of July 2018 for consideration. At that time, the issue could not be considered as the members had boycotted to attend the meeting, and since then the case is pending. Moreover, three Committees, that too, on the basis of a judgement of High Court, has already recommended him the benefit.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they are in his (Dr. Arvin) favour, but they should not adopt the policy of pick and choose. According to him, there are about 180 such cases and all have been sent for legal opinion. If they



adopted the policy of pick and choose, it would be wrong on their part as they might do something wrong.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that as to when the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar was sent for legal opinion.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that when they had already done four similar cases on the basis of a judgement of the High Court, what the problem in doing this as well.

Professor Keshav Malhotra intervened to say that no such case has been done.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar comprised of two parts – (i) those, whose cases have been sent for legal opinion, their cases should be done on the basis of legal opinion; and (ii) since his case has not been sent for legal opinion, it should be done as recommended by the Committees. Similar to his case, four cases have already been done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that no such case has been done. Once the legal opinion comes, the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar should be done.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that when the case has not been sent for legal opinion, how the legal opinion would come.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they should be told whether the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar has actually been sent for the legal opinion, and if not, its status should be given.

It was informed that the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar has been sent for the legal opinion.

Shri Sanjay Tandon enquired if the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar has been sent for legal opinion, why the same was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 7.7.2018.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar is clear, there would be heart-burning amongst the teachers, whose cases are pending since long.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar is different to other 180 cases being referred to Professor Keshav Malhotra.

Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that he (Dr. Arvind) has done this much canvassing that every member is suggested that the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar should be done.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar has come to the Syndicate twice.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that since this case has come to the Syndicate, it should be approved. As and when the other cases would come, the same would also be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he did not believe in double standards. On one side, the Syndicate has unanimously resolved today in the evening though it was repetition for 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> time that let the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar certifies that there is no other similarly placed case pending for consideration by the University, and it was also suggested that all such cases should be brought

together. On the other side, now they are saying that whichever case has come, the same should be done and when the others would come, those would also be done. Secondly, how do they say that his case is exactly at par with some orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court? Thirdly, how do they say that his (Dr. Arvind) case is not similar to other 180 cases? That meant, a Committee has been constituted to look into 180 cases of the teachers. When his (Dr. Arvind) case came here, could they not say that this case should also be referred to that Committee. Now, they are saying that since it has come to the Syndicate, it should be done. What is the urgency in suggesting that his case should be done? Either his (Dr. Arvind) case should also be referred to the Committee which is considering the cases of other 180 teachers or if his case is not sent for legal opinion, the same should be sent for legal opinion, and if it has already been sent for legal opinion, let the legal opinion come. In the end, he said that they are not against anybody.

Shri Sanjay Tandon stated that if they had already done certain similar cases on the basis of instructions/judgement of Hon'ble High Court, on that basis they are doing the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar. Now, the point is that again this matter is becoming subjective. He has nothing against or for, but this matter is becoming subjective and there is a division with this viewpoint that everybody was talking during the lunch time that the case of that poor fellow (bechara) should be got cleared. When Professor Keshav Malhotra said bechara sarcastically, Shri Sanjay Tandon said that when they talked about doctors and say them becharas, then he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) is right. He requested Professor Keshav Malhotra not to interrupt him. He (Professor Keshav Malhotra) could talk about his friends, but he (Shri Sanjay Tandon) has no friend here. He requested Professor Keshav Malhotra not to ridicule the other persons. It is not the way. They could always raise an issue, and everybody has his own opinion that this person would not be allowed to come in, which is wrong. Under the normal circumstances, if they do not want to do the case, it might not be done, but they have formed an opinion from the very beginning that this case would not be allowed to be done. Why are they arguing on this subject? They are saying that a view has come to them and they should consider the same, and if found proper, the case should be cleared. There seems to be a subjective reason for not doing it, and he is against that point.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that Shri Ashok Goyal is absolutely right. They do not know whether this case is similar to the ones which had been cleared on the basis of judgement of Hon'ble High Court or in accordance with the cases which have been sent for legal opinion, and to that extent he agreed with him (Shri Ashok Goyal). Had this case been in accordance with those cases, it would also be sent for legal opinion, and would not have been placed before the Syndicate for consideration. As such, this case is different from other 180 cases.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he agreed with Dr. Subhash Sharma because it also is his question that the cases, which are similar to this, have not been placed before the Syndicate for consideration, whereas this has been placed before them. Had the similar cases to this one been sent for the legal opinion at that time and his case not sent for legal opinion as told by Dr. Subhash Sharma, he could understand that his case is different to other cases. His (Dr. Arvind) case was brought to the Syndicate and others were sent for the legal opinion, and that too, later on. Now, they are saying that the cases, which have been sent for legal opinion, should be kept pending and his (Dr. Arvind) case should be considered here. What he is saying is either those cases, which have been sent for legal opinion, should also be placed before the Syndicate without waiting for the legal opinion or this case should also be sent for legal opinion. They are also referring to some judgement of the Hon'ble High Court. If the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar also covers under that judgement of the Hon'ble

High Court, then first of all, he is not opposed to this man. Even if he wanted to oppose, he could not oppose. Where the opinion has been sought that the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar is also covered under the said judgement of Hon'ble High Court? They had just appointed a Committee, which opined that the case of Dr. Arvind is also covered under that judgement of Hon'ble High Court. In fact, his case does not cover under that judgement of Hon'ble High Court. If the legal opinion has not been sought in his case, the same should be obtained now. Secondly, if there is any doubt in anybody's mind that somebody is against him (Dr. Arvind), it is wrong, but they wished that along with him the cases of other 180 teachers should also be considered.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he would like to clarify that they are not against Dr. Arvind Kumar at all.

Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that he would like to inform them the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar came to the Syndicate in its July 2018 meeting. Had his case been sent for legal opinion, it is implied that it would not have come to the Syndicate. Secondly, in accordance with the documents appended with the agenda item, a judgement of Hon'ble High Court has come in similar cases, and an office note was also appended that his case is similar to those cases on which the Hon'ble High Court had given the judgement. On the basis of that, a Committee was again constituted despite the fact that two Committees were constituted earlier. Either someone from the office or outside is intentionally not allowing his case to be cleared as per the circumstances of the case, which are mentioned in the appended documents. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to go through the office note himself, if the same is available with him. They have to believe the office and the office has said that his (Dr. Arvind) case is similarly situated in accordance with the judgement of Hon'ble High Court. Should every person/teacher go to the High Court? The Committee as well as the office has said that his case is similar to the ones on which the Hon'ble High Court has given the judgement. Moreover, the case has also come to the Syndicate. Let the office say that the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar is not similar on ones on which the Hon'ble High Court has given the judgement. When the office as well as the Committee is saying that his case is similar to ones on which the Hon'ble High Court has given the judgement, where is the problem in doing the same. He suggested that even if legal opinion is to be sought, the same should be obtained within a week and this case is done by next to next week, then he has no problem. It seemed to him that this person is being targeted intentionally, which is a problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he agreed with the suggestion given by Shri Prabhjit Singh.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to get the legal opinion on the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar within a week and after the legal opinion if he (Vice-Chancellor) feels that the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar could be clear, he could do so.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that if it is so, it should be done.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that on this case, Committees were appointed twice. As told by Shri Prabhjit Singh, when his case came to them, it was understood that some sort of 'No Objection Certificate' is wanted. They wrote to the concerned Institution and got the 'No Objection Certificate'. However, his case is not similar to those 180 cases, which have been sent for legal opinion. As such, the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar could not be compared with the case of 190 persons, and no legal opinion is required in his case.

**RESOLVED:** That the case be got legally examined and the Vice Chancellor be authorised to take decision.

**Hereinafter, following Items C-28, C-32, C-36, C-45 and C-61 of Syndicate agenda dated 7.7.2018, were taken up for consideration.**

**28.** Considered if, Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XXIV**) between National Technology & Engineering Solutions of Sandia, LLC and Panjab University, Chandigarh, be executed, to enhance and strengthen the relationship between the two Participants and to identify and develop cooperative activities that further promote a culture of Biorisk Management in India and in the region.

**RESOLVED:** That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between National Technology & Engineering Solutions of Sandia, LLC and Panjab University, Chandigarh, **be executed.**

**32.** Considered that the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name:

Smt. Razia Sultana Higher Education and Water Supply & Sanitation Minister Punjab	1. Languages 2. Arts 3. Education 4. Design & Fine Arts
--	--

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that Smt. Razia Sultana, Higher Education and Water Supply & Sanitation Minister, Punjab, be assigned to the Faculties mentioned below:

1. Languages
2. Arts
3. Education
4. Design & Fine Arts

**36.** Considered if, the condition of 75% compulsory attendance System, be waived off, for students of Part Time courses in Foreign Languages, for appearing in the final examinations, as recommended by the Committee in its meeting dated 28.05.2018.

- NOTE:**
1. A copy of letter dated 31.05.2018 of Chairperson, Department of French & Francophone Studies, P.U. enclosed.
  2. A copy of letter dated 12.06.2018 of DUI enclosed.
  3. A copy of page 217 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 enclosed.

It was clarified that as per UGC, 75% attendance is compulsory. However, the item under consideration related to Diploma and Certificate courses, and perhaps, the 75% attendance is not must for Diploma and Certificate courses.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, in fact, the Diploma and Certificate courses are usually done by the employees. Owing to 75% compulsory

attendance, less number of students is getting admission in the University as they are getting admission in the private academies which are running in the region. Owing to this University suffering and the private academies are getting benefitted as they did not adhere to 75% compulsory attendance. However, this condition would apply in the postgraduate courses, e.g., M.A., M.Sc., etc.

Dr. Subhash Sharma requested the Vice-Chancellor to see the relevant rules and if found that this condition is not applicable on Diploma, Certificate/part-time courses, the item should be approved, on behalf of the Syndicate.

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice Chancellor, be authorised to take decision, as per the UGC norms.

**45.** Considered if the donation of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Mrs. Urmila Das, W/o Late Professor B.K. Das, # 602, Tower 7, Orchid Petals, Sector 49, Gurugram (Haryana) 122018, be accepted for institution of an Endowment in the memory of his revered husband "Professor B.K. Das Memorial Gold Medal". The investment of Rs.1,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year and the interest so accrued there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 10444978140. The Gold Medal will be awarded, to the most deserving student who secures highest marks in M.Sc. (Final) class, every year during the Panjab University Convocation, on receipt of the interest from the amount, on the following terms and conditions.

- a) An endowment will be named as Professor B.K. Das Memorial Gold Medal.
- b) Gold Medal to be awarded to the most deserving student who secures highest marks in M.Sc. (Final) of Geology Department, every year during the Panjab University Convocation

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

**RESOLVED:** That the donation of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Mrs. Urmila Das, W/o Late Professor B.K. Das, # 602, Tower 7, Orchid Petals, Sector 49, Gurugram (Haryana) 122018, be accepted for institution of an Endowment in the memory of his revered husband "Professor B.K. Das Memorial Gold Medal". The investment of Rs.1,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh, @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year and the interest so accrued thereon be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 10444978140. The Gold Medal be awarded, to the most deserving student who secures highest marks in M.Sc. (Final) class, every year during the Panjab University Convocation, on receipt of the interest from the amount, on the following terms and conditions:

- a) An endowment be named as Professor B.K. Das Memorial Gold Medal.
- b) Gold Medal to be awarded to the most deserving student who secures highest marks in M.Sc. (Final) of Geology Department, every year during the Panjab University Convocation

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That thanks of the Syndicate, be conveyed to the donor.

Arising out of the above, Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he had also said that he would like to institute an Endowment in the memory of his father (Late

Shri Balram Ji Dass Tandon). The Finance & Development Officer had communicated to him on phone about five days ago that they are preparing the document. He requested that the matter should be expedited so that they could start scholarship in the Leadership Department.

- 61.** Considered if, the reservation policy for employment and increasing the reservation from 3% to 4% for the persons with benchmark disability, be approved, as per DoPT directives dated 15.01.2018 (**Appendix-XXVI**) issued by the Government of India, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pension, Department of Personnel & Training, New Delhi, pursuant to Gazette notification dated 28.12.2016 (**Appendix-XXVI**) of the Government of India, Ministry of Law & Justice.

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

**RESOLVED:** That the reservation policy for employment and increasing the reservation from 3% to 4% for the persons with benchmark disability, be adopted, as per DoPT directives dated 15.01.2018 issued by the Government of India, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pension, Department of Personnel & Training, New Delhi.

**The following Items C-8 and C-10 of Syndicate meeting dated 10.6.2018 were also taken up for consideration.**

- 8.** Considered deferred Item 29 of the Syndicate meeting dated 26.05.2018 (also enlisted in the agenda of Syndicate dated 10.6.2018) relating to the minutes dated 03.05.2018 (**Appendix-XXVII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.03.2018 (Para 3) (**Appendix-XXVII**) to prepare the roster in consonance with the directions of the UGC enshrined in its letter dated 05.03.2018 for teaching position i.e. Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors.

**NOTE:** 1. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.05.2018 (Para 29) (**Appendix-XXVII**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

2. The roster of the posts of Assistant Professors has already been sent with the agenda of Syndicate meeting dated 26.05.2018

**RESOLVED:** That the roster prepared as per the direction of the UGC, be noted.

- 10.** Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that Dr. Devinder Dhawan, Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, Panjab University, be granted extension in service as such for two years beyond the age of 60 years, pursuant to Regulation 17.4 appearing at page 133 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007.

**NOTE:** Dr. Devinder Dhawan has already been granted extension in service for a period of one year w.e.f. 1.6.2018 i.e. beyond the age of 60 years vide Senate decision dated 27.5.2018 (Para X).

Dr. Subhash Sharma pointed out that since Dr. Devinder Dhawan has already been granted extension for one year and the same has also been approved by the Senate, there is no need to consider the item.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Devinder Dhawan, Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, Panjab University, has already been granted extension for one year. The case be resubmitted after the expiry of the said period.

**Following Items for Ratification and Information of Syndicate meeting dated 7.7.2018 were also taken up:**

**19.** The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(viii)** on the agenda was read out, i.e. –

**(i)** To ratify the recommendations (**Appendix-XXVIII**) of the Vice-Chancellor that the Shooting Range, P.U., be named as Captain Vikram Batra, PVC, Shooting Range.

**(ii)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has allowed that the word BDS, be added at page 1 in the 2<sup>nd</sup> para of the minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 03.10.2017, already approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 48 R-(xii) (**Appendix-XXIX**)).

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

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

**NOTE:** 1. The Senate in its meeting 16.12.2017 (Para XXXIII (I-30)) (**Appendix-XXX**) had re-appointed above persons as part time Assistant Professor, PUSSGR, Hoshiarpur, on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours per week) for the session 2017-18.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015 (General Discussion (1& 2)) has decided that all the persons working as guest faculty and/or temporary or part-time basis should be allowed to continue as such until they are replaced by the regular appointee.

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

**(iv)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has accepted the resignation submitted by Shri Subodh Bansal, Programmer (on contract), Computer Unit, P.U. w.e.f. 23.04.2018 (A.N.), with the condition to deposit a sum-equal to his Pay & Allowances for period failing short i.e. 10

days, in lieu of prior notice, as per the Syndicate decision dated 28.05.2017 (Para 30).

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

(v) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has re-employed Shri Jagan Nath Dhiman, Senior Scientific Officer (Cartographer) (G-I), University School of Open Learning, P.U. (who retired from the University service on 31.07.2015) on contract basis for six months i.e. w.e.f. 01.07.2018 to 31.12.2018, on fixed emoluments i.e. half of the salary last drawn (excluding HRA, CCA & other special allowances) rounded off to nearest lower 100 irrespective of the fact whether he has opted for pension or not w.e.f. the date he reports for duty. His salary be charged/paid against the post of Senior Scientific Assistant/Scientific Officer (Cartographer) (G-I), USOL vacated by him on his retirement.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has condoned the shortage of lectures of the following students of various teaching Department, for the session 2017-18

Sr. No.	Name of the Student/ class	Department
1.	Ms. Shreya, B.Sc.(Hons.) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester, (Session 2017-2018)	Department of Botany
2.	Ms.Tsultim Wangdus B.Sc. (Hons.) 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year 6 <sup>th</sup> Semester (May 2018)	Department of Biochemistry
3.	1. Mr. Lakshay Sharma Masters in Disaster Management- 2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester 2. Mr. Sanjay Dorje Masters in Disaster Management- 2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester 3. Mr. Sunil Masters in Disaster Management- 2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester	Department of Geography
4.	<b>Certificate course in German</b> 1. Ms. Alisha Naryal 2. Ms. Ankita Nadda 3. Ms. Hasrat Shehbaz Kaur Sandhu 4. Ms. Neha Negi 5. Mr. Pranav Pathak 6. Ms. Puneeta Dutta 7. Ms. Rashika Kaushal 8. Mr. Sarthak Gulati 9. Mr. Stanley Saboo 10. Mr. Saurabh Verma 11. Mr. Suprabh Koul 12. Mr. Surbhi Arora 13. Varinder Bir Singh <b>Diploma course in German</b>	Department of German



	1. Arushi Sharma 2. Riya Bangia 3. Sehdev Saini	
5.	1. Mr. Akhil Vashisht 2. Mr. Vaibhav Jain 3. Ms. Rupanpreet Kaur 4. Mr. Parvinder Singh	University Business School
6.	1. Mr. Hardhian Singh 2. Ms. Neha Maurya 3. Ms. Parveen K. Dyal 4. Mr. Gurpreet Singh Saroa 5. Mr. Gurpreet Singh M.A. Semester IV	M.A. Sem.-II Department of Public Administration

**(vii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the revised guidelines (**Appendix-XXXII**) for payment/disbursement of scholarship to the SC students under centrally sponsored scheme of Post Matric Scholarships belonging to Scheduled Castes students studies in India w.e.f. the new academic session 2018-2019, pursuant to notified by the Government of India, Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment.

**NOTE:** 1. The Senate in its meeting dated 11.6.2009 (Para XLVI) has resolved that the recommendations (1) and (2) of the Committee dated 19.5.2009, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine and recommend, if Tuition Fee and other Non-refundable charges are not to be charged from the Scheduled Castes Students at the time of admission in view of the letter No.2/6-2007-Sch.(8) dated 11.11.2008 as per Appendix, be approved, with the stipulation that in case the money was not reimbursed by the Punjab Government, the scheme would be discontinued. Further, this scheme would not be implemented in the self-financing courses.

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

**(viii)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the fee structure for M.A. (Punjabi) course at P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib as equivalent to the courses at P.U. Regional Centre, for the session 2018-19 (**Appendix-XXXIII**).

**NOTE:** A copy of letter dated 09.06.2018 of Principal, P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIII**).

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in **Items R-(i) to R-(viii)**, be ratified, subject to the condition that if any corrections/modifications are pointed out/suggested by the members, the Vice-Chancellor, be authorized to incorporate the same, on behalf of the Syndicate.

**NOTE:** The tentative minutes of the Syndicate meeting dated 18.11.2018 were circulated to the member of the Syndicate on 26.012.2018 with a request to point out discrepancy/s, if any, in recording of the minutes within two weeks' from the date of issue. None of the Syndicate pointed out any discrepancy/s.

**20.** The information contained in Items **I-(i)** to **I-(xii)** on the agenda was read out, i.e. –

- (i)** The Vice-Chancellor has allowed Professor Manjit Singh, Department of Sociology, P.U. (completed his re-employment term on 16.02.2018 i.e. after attaining the age of 65 years) to take classes on voluntary basis without remuneration for the session 2018-19.
- (ii)** The Vice-Chancellor, has:-
- (i) allowed Dr. Satish Patil, Assistant Registrar, Estt. Branch-II, to officiate as Deputy Registrar in the Pay-Band of ₹ 15600-39100/-+G.P. of ₹ 7600/-with initial Pay of ₹ 31320/- plus allowances as admissible under the University Rules and posted him at P.U.S.S.G.R.C, Hoshiarpur against the leave vacancy of Mrs. Devinder Kaur, Deputy Registrar, with effect from the date he report for duty, till further orders.
  - (ii) transferred Sh. G.J. Hardy, Assistant Registrar, R & S Branch to Estt. Branch-II against the post of Assistant Registrar vacated by Dr. Satish Patil on his promotion, with immediate effect.
  - (iii) transferred Sh. Ravinder Mohan Trikha, Assistant Registrar, Exam. Branch-III to R & S Branch against the post of Assistant Registrar vacated by Sh. G.J. Hardy on his transfer to Estt. Branch-II, with immediate effect.
  - (iv) allowed Mrs. Sarita Sharma, Supdt., USOL to officiate as Assistant Registrar in the Pay-Band of ₹ 15600-39100/-+G.P. of ₹ 6600/-with initial Pay of ₹ 25250/- plus allowances as admissible under the University Rules and posted her in the USOL against the post of Assistant Registrar to be vacated by Mrs. Chander Kanta on her retirement on 31.5.2018 , w.e.f. the date she report for duty, till further orders but not before 1.6.2018.
  - (v) allowed Mrs. Komal Sharma, Supdt., Secrecy Branch, to officiate as Assistant Registrar in the Pay-Band of ₹ 15600-39100/-+G.P. of ₹ 6600/-with initial Pay of ₹ 25250/- plus allowances as admissible under the University Rules and posted her in the Exam. Branch-III against the post of Assistant Registrar vacated by Sh. Ravinder Mohan Trikha

on his transfer, w.e.f. the date she report for duty, till further orders.

(iii) To note action taken report (**Appendix-XXXIV**) submitted by Chief Vigilance Officer, P.U. in respect of the decision of the Syndicate dated 23.07.2017 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) regarding prosecution sanction against Professor Om Prakash Katare, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

(iv) In pursuance of orders dated 16.02.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 3576 of 2018 (Dr. Parveen Rishi & Ors. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) tagged with LPA No. 1505 of 2016, wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected in the said case. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) was fixed for hearing on 05.03.2018 (now fixed for 16.07.2018), the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

(ii) Dr. P.S. Dhingra, Professor, P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.03.2018 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing as on 28.02.2018 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.

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

(v) The Vice-Chancellor has allowed to invest an additional donation of Rs.10,00,000/- made by Professor DVS Jain for existing endowment namely 'Smt. Prem Lata and Professor D.V.S Jain Research Foundation', in the shape of FDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year in the Special Endowment Trust Fund A/c No.10444978140.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.01.2015 (Para 31) had created the above said endowment in the Department of Chemistry & Centre for Advance

Studies in Chemistry, P.U. to promote scientific research.

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

**(vi)** To note the updated status and summary report (as on 31.05.2018) **(Appendix-XXXV)** submitted by Chief Vigilance Officer, Vigilance Cell, P.U. on the various matters.

**(vii)** The Vice-Chancellor has allowed that the name of Ms. Shubreet Kaur, Advocate, Punjab & Haryana High Court, be included, in the existing Panel of Advocates/Legal Retainers of the Panjab University for the High Court.

**(viii)** **A** The Vice-Chancellor, has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Asha Arya, (Wife), nominee of the deceased employee/ Mr. Kritya Arya (Son) legal heirs, in respect of Late Shri Hemant Kumar, Senior Assistant, R&S Branch (who expired on 15.12.2015) while in service:

- (i) Gratuity (in the event of death) under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 (while in service)
- (ii) Ex-Gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 141 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
- (iii) Encashment of Earned Leave under Rule 17.4 at page 98 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2016.

**B** The Vice-Chancellor has also passed orders that:

- (i) 2/3<sup>rd</sup> amount be paid to Smt. Asha Arya wife of Late Shri Hemant Kumar, Senior Assistant, R&S Branch.
- (ii) Remaining amount be deposited in any scheduled bank in the form of FDR in the name of Mr. Kritya Arya and Smt. Asha Arya in order to safeguard his interest. The F.D. amount in the bank as FDR in the name of Kritya Arya not to be withdrawn by him till he attains 18 years of age and Smt. Asha Arya would be the nominee.

**(ix)** The Vice-Chancellor has accepted the resignation of Dr. Madhu Raka, Professor (Re-employed), Department of Mathematics, w.e.f. 19.07.2018, to join as CSIR Emeritus Scientist.

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

**(x)** To note that the item No. 56 I-(vii) **(Appendix-XXXVII)** of the meeting of the Syndicate dated 26.05.2018, with regard to sanction of Extra Ordinary Leave (without pay) to Mr.

Tarun Kumar, Assistant Professor, UBS, P.U. Regional Centre, P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana, enabling him to join his Ph.D. programme, be treated as withdrawn.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.05.2018 (Para 32) **(Appendix-XXXVII)** had resolved that Shri Tarun Kumar Vashisth, Assistant Professor, UBS, PURC, Ludhiana, be granted study leave with pay for a period of two years w.e.f. 25.05.2018.

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

**(xi)** To note the letter No. Misc./A-8/5390 dated 11.06.2018 **(Appendix-XXXVIII)** issued to the Principal, Arya College, Ludhiana, in response to the complaint/s **(Appendix-XXXVIII)** received against her with regard to illegally detaining the complainants from appearing University examination held in may 2018.

**(xii)** To note letter No.F.2-7/2018-U.II. dated 28.6.2018 **(Appendix-XXXIX)** received from Deputy Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education, regarding amendment in the Panjab University Calendar.

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in **Items I-(i) to I-(xii)**, be noted, subject to the condition that if any corrections/modifications are pointed out/suggested by the members, the Vice-Chancellor, be authorized to incorporate the same, on behalf of the Syndicate.

**NOTE:** The tentative minutes of the Syndicate meeting dated 18.11.2018 were circulated to the member of the Syndicate on 26.012.2018 with a request to point out discrepancy/s, if any, in recording of the minutes within two weeks' from the date of issue. None of the Syndicate pointed out any discrepancy/s.

### **General Discussion**

1. Dr.Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that there are disparities between the affiliated colleges and Regional Centres of the University in the migration of students. The students of affiliated colleges having compartment are not allowed migration to Panjab University whereas such a condition is imposed on the students of Regional Centres. He requested this disparity be removed and a circular be issued in this regard.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that a new Committee has to be constituted for this purpose and this issue could also be looked into by this Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter be referred to the new committee to be constituted.

2. Shri Prabhjit Singh requested to look into the pending leave of 5 days of Professor Baljinder Kaur as she has to go to attend the World Punjabi conference.
3. Dr. Subhash Sharma while raising the issue of affiliation of Government College for Girls , Ludhiana (East), said that it was resolved in the last meeting of the Syndicate meeting and it was a unanimous view of the members that since it is a Government College, the fee would be very less and the poor students would be benefited from it. The affiliation Committee has also recommended to grant affiliation with some conditions. Similarly, the Syndicate took a sympathetic view and allowed affiliation to the said college. Thereafter, the issue was placed before the Senate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the reason for not granting affiliation was that the Senate had observed that the timeline given by the affiliation Committee and Syndicate for compliance of the conditions has not been adhered to by the Punjab Government as they did not appoint the faculty and Principal. So, the item has been deferred by the Senate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma wanted to know from the Controller of Examination to inform as to what was the recommendation of the Inspection Committee.

It was informed (by the C.O.E.) that the recommendations of the Inspection Committee were placed before the affiliation Committee dated 29<sup>th</sup> September, 2018. The letter written by Dr. Dharam Singh Sandhu was placed before the Senate. They have complied with the conditions as imposed by the Inspection Committee. Shri Prabhjit Singh had raised certain questions in the Senate meeting as to who is the Principal. There was no reply, except one of the members of the Senate. The second part of the issue is that the affiliation committee has given one month's period to comply with the conditions, but the said period is not over yet to the meeting of Syndicate i.e. 14.10.2018. So, the roll number etc. were stalled.. The College is not operating from the Government. College for Girls, Ludhiana (East), but it is working from SCD Government College, Ludhiana, which is stop gap arrangement. The things would take time to materialize.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the government has to follow procedures for which time is required.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they have admitted 60 students and so for them, regular teachers cannot be appointed, so they assigned one period each to a teacher from SCD Government. College. The regular faculty could be appointed in the third session only, so why such condition has been imposed.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that why such condition are imposed on private colleges.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan, while replying to it, said that a particular course has four period of a subject whereas in the arts, there is only one period.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that as the House is aware that the promotion of the Principals could not be done, the Government given charge of four colleges to one Principals.

The Vice Chancellor said that why such conditions are laid on private colleges. All such things would create problems later on. The Senate has also rejected it.

Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested that the officers should brief the issue to the Syndicate and the member who wish to speak should not take more than one minute on the issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there were two cases, one was of Government College at Chandigarh and the other was Government College at Ludhiana which were also discussed in the Senate. In one of the colleges, the Inspection Committee had not visited the college and in the other case the Inspection Committee had rejected the affiliation, in spite of that the returns of the students were accepted by the R & S. Branch. But here the case is different, being a government college, decision was taken by the Syndicate to grant exemption in the conditions unanimously. Now there are two types of cases – one where no inspection committee had visited but affiliation was granted and the other is where the inspection committee but not granted affiliation.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to say something about what has transpired in the Senate on the issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that in the Senate has also taken the decision to defer the item and it would be placed before the Syndicate again for reconsideration.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan requested that the students be issued roll numbers so that they could appear in the examination. This was also endorsed by Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu and some other members.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should given as one time exception and for the next time they should comply with all the conditions.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he does not have any objection to it. The students must study there. Being a government college, the fee is very less. Taking a cue of it, no private college should take advantage of the same, in case if they do so, the entire fee of the students will be shifted to University account and college would close.

On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal, Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the candidates should be given roll numbers subject to approval by the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said in case the Senate did not give approval, then what would they do. Let they should differentiate it. Dr. Amit Joshi has rightly pointed out that there are two categories of colleges – there are some college where Inspection Committee has gone and there are some other colleges who have even not applied for affiliation. The third category is, where the Inspection Committee has visited the college and rejected the affiliation. But there are such cases of this type where they have granted affiliation even to such colleges who have not applied; where no inspection committee visited and where inspection committee has rejected. But this is not the case with this college. He does not want to go into the details under which conditions they have granted affiliation to them. They have granted affiliation to this college and a letter has been sent to them that they are granted permission subject to such and such conditions. Thereafter, the students were admitted and now continuing their studies. If today, we decide that it is granted subject to the decision of the Senate, this would not be the right decision. They could say that the matter was discussed in the Senate, where the item has been deferred and it is understood that it has been referred back to the Syndicate. So, the Syndicate after taking into consideration the discussion and as a special case, the first year students of the College, be allowed, and not subject to anything. They would recommend this and from the next year they would get it done from the Senate.

The members were of the unanimous view that the return of the students of Government College of Girls, Ludhiana (East). be accepted and roll numbers be issued to the students for this session.

**This was agreed to.**

4. Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in his department as also in the departments under language, arts and multidisciplinary faculties, the workload is much. Their own teachers are taking classes and they are not taking any money for that. He said that he is not asking to pay any remuneration to them. He informed that there are some very good retired teachers. He requested that the said departments should be allowed to engage such teachers as guest faculty and be paid as per the University norms.
5. Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that an Enquiry Committee was constituted to visit three colleges. When one of the colleges came to know of it that the Committee is going to submit the report today, they terminated the Principal Ms. Rashmi Gujrati. Her probation period was going to end on 8<sup>th</sup> December. Then Dr. R.K. Mahajan handed over the report of the three colleges to the Vice Chancellor and requested that if the Vice Chancellor wishes, all the three member could come to him to explain about it.

**The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to put up the case.**

6. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that it seems there is no importance of zero hour now. He, therefore, requested to take his point seriously. In the two meetings of the Syndicate, he had requested to issue the circular to the colleges regarding grant of 15 days paternity leave, but the same has not been issued so far. He requested the Vice Chancellor to get that circular issued at the earliest. This is for the third time that he is requesting for this. If it is not done even now, then he would stop raising this issue. It should be looked as to where is the flaw and the explanation should be called for. This is a very serious matter.

**The Dean College Development Council was asked by the Vice Chancellor to take necessary action.**

7. Professor Ronki Ram said that there are four blocks i.e. Arts Block- to IV. In each block there are 3-4 departments. In these department there is one Peon and one Sweeper. These persons take care of the cleaning work of their own departments only, but waste papers/garbage remains scattered around the Block and nobody takes care of it. He requested that a circular be issued that the Peons and Sweeper of that Block should keep the surroundings of the block clean. For that the Chairman(s) of the Department (s) should report to the Dean of University Instruction. If any garbage is found scattered around the Block, the concerned Sweeper should be held responsible, otherwise it would not be possible to keep surroundings of these block clean.

**The Vice Chancellor desired that the Dean University Instruction may kindly look into the matter.**

8. Professor Ronki Ram while thanking the Vice Chancellor for taking up the issue of giving the security persons one month's additional salary, requested that the Vice Chancellor should also think to provide them uniform and a shoes to which the Vice Chancellor said that it has been done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra intervened to say that the work relating to cleaning of floors and toilets and the dusting work does not relate to Sweeper. Dusting of rooms is done by the Peons.



9. Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Chairperson of a department is appointed for a period of three years by rotation, but some of the Chairperson think that they have become Chairperson forever and nothing could be done without their consent. He informed that some departments do not have auditorium, but these department are doing a very good job. For example, the Department of Hindi does not have an auditorium of its own. According to him that department is doing best job as compared to others, but the Hindi Department is not having its own auditorium. He said that the auditorium belongs to the University and requested that if the auditorium is free, then they should be allowed to use it as it is in the interest of the University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there are two auditoria. If they call a person from the Department of Evening Studies, he cannot work for 12 hours. So, they have decided that if there is a function in the morning, it would be taken care of the departments opening in the morning and if the function is in the evening then it would be taken care of the Department of Evening Studies to which some of the members said that it has been done.

**The Vice Chancellor desired that the Dean University Instruction may kindly look into the matter.**

10. Dr. Amit Joshi wanted to know as to what has been done regarding the issue of timings of hostels for which the girl students are standing outside.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Vice Chancellor should behave like an Administrator, he should either say 'yes' or 'no'. It has been clearly written in the prospectus and their parents have also given in writing to abide by the rules. He requested the Vice Chancellor to clearly say 'no' to it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the reporting in newspapers is done in a different way and they should not go by that. He has already issued a circular as per the hostel manual about all the things which are permissible.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Chairpersons be requested to mark these students absent.

The Vice Chancellor said the Syndicate/Senate members have the equal responsibility of running this University as that of the Vice Chancellor being the Chief Executive of this University. He is sorry to say that the honourable members of the Syndicate and Senate do not give any statement regarding this issue. He requested that they should meet the students and inform him as to what could done in this matter.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he do agree with it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he also like to talk in the same context. The way he (Vice Chancellor) has said, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is also saying in the same way that when some problem like this arises, has any suggestion been asked for by anybody from the Vice Chancellor's Office or from any other office, to know as to how the problem is to be handled. Now what is happening is that they know from the newspapers that negotiations are going on with such and such person. He wanted to know as to which authority is allowing the students to come upto 11.00 p.m. Can they go beyond the statutes and Hand Book of Information. When they would once break the time limit, then they would ask to allow them to come even upto 4.00 a.m. in the morning. If the closing time of the Hostel gates is 10.00 p.m., it would remain 10.00p.m. If they have to enhance the time beyond 10.00 p.m., then one should say that they would take this matter to the competent authority i.e. Syndicate or Senate. If by ignoring the Syndicate and Senate, the time is enhanced to 11.00 p.m., it is not fair.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18<sup>th</sup> November 2018

They are equally pained as that of the Vice Chancellor. He agrees that in such a situation a strong statement should go that this cannot be even considered.

11. Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he had requested to place the case of Chawarianwali College before the Syndicate as it is a co-education college and it does not fall under the purview of Affiliation Committee. He desired to know why that case is not being placed before the Syndicate in spite of the fact that they have written several letters. They were allowed co-education status after the receipt of NOC from the government, why it was stopped last year. After granting affiliation, this year it was again withheld. The affiliation Committee cannot stop it. Why that issue has not been brought to the Syndicate so far whereas it should have come in the month of May.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this case be brought to the next Syndicate meeting with all the documents.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan requested that the students be allowed to appear in the examination.

**The Vice Chancellor asked the Dean College Development Council to put up the case.**

(Karamjeet Singh)  
Registrar

Confirmed

( Raj Kumar )  
VICE-CHANCELLOR