

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the **SYNDICATE** held on **Sunday, 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018** at **11.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### PRESENT

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

DPI (Colleges), Punjab, Shri R.S. Brar, DHE, U.T. Chandigarh, Dr. Satish Kumar and Shri Sanjay Tandon could not attend the meeting.

**First, the items listed in the current agenda were taken up and thereafter Item C-14 and C-38 of Syndicate meeting dated 7.7.2018 were taken and made a part of the minutes.**

### **Condolence resolution**

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

- i) Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Member of Senate, PU and Principal of Govind National College, Narangwal, Distt. Ludhiana, on September 5, 2018,
- ii) Prof. Upma Bagai, Chairperson, Department of Zoology, on September 8, 2018
- iii) Dr Satwinder Singh husband of Dr. Dazy Zarabi, Chairperson, Deptt. of Community Education and Disability Studies, on September 10, 2018.
- iv) Mrs Kusum Gupta wife of Prof. V.K. Mahajan, former Fellow, PU, on September 16, 2018.
- v) Smt. Vijay Lukshmi Raina, respected mother of Professor Anil Raina, Deptt. Of English & Cultural Studies on 22.9.2018.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Professor Upma Bagai, Dr. Satwinder Singh, Mrs. Kusum Gupta and Smt. Vijay Lukshmi Raina

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

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

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that-

- (i) Ms Yamini P., Ph.D. Research Scholar, working under the supervision of Professor Kanwaljit Chopra, Chairperson, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences & Professor of Pharmacology, has won the 'Rajnibhai V Patel PharmInnova Award 2017-18', for best thesis in M.Pharm. (Pharmacology) on 15 September 2018. She received a trophy, certificate and a cash prize of Rs 51,000, with her research guide receiving Rs 25,000. The award was organised by the Rajnibhai V Patel Trust under the patronage of the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India, and sponsored by Troikaa Pharmaceuticals Limited.
- (ii) Professor Archana Rakesh Singh, Chairperson of the School of Communication Studies has been nominated as the member of the Film and Television Institute of India society for a period of three years by the Information & Broadcasting Ministry.
- (iii) Professor O.P. Katare, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, has been conferred the Association of Pharmacy Teachers of India (APTI) Manjushree Pal Memorial Award for the best Pharmaceutical Scientist.

2. I got the privilege to interact with the following distinguished dignitaries and discussed strategies for future development of this pristine university and they have assured all possible support:

- i) Hon'ble Sh. Arun Jaitley, Union Finance Minister on 31.8.2018.
- ii) Hon'ble Sh. Gajendra Singh Shekhawat, Union Minister of State for Agriculture and Farmer's Welfare on 31.8.2018.
- iii) Hon'ble Gen. V.K. Singh, Union Minister of State for Foreign Affairs on 5.9.2018.
- iv) Hon'ble Dr. Jitendra Singh, Union Minister of State in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions on 8.9.2018.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

- v) Hon'ble Sh. Satya Narayan Arya, Governor of Haryana on 11.9.2018.
  - vi) Hon'ble Sh. Vijay Sampla ji, Union Minister of State for Social Justice and Empowerment on 14.9.2018.
  - vii) Hon'ble Capt. Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister Punjab on 14.9.2018.
  - viii) Hon'ble Acharaya Devvrat ji, Governor, Himachal Pradesh on 15.9.2018.
  - ix) Hon'ble Sh. V.P. Singh Badnore ji, Governor of Punjab on 18.9.2018.
- 3.** I have attended a Vice-Chancellors workshop on Graded Autonomy under UGC [Categorization of Universities (only) for Grant of Graded Autonomy] Regulations 2018 at New Delhi on 20.9.2018
- 4.** Dr. Muneeshwar Joshi, (Formerly Registrar, Maharaja Agrasen University, Baddi and Deputy Registrar, Panjab University) has been appointed as Secretary to Vice-Chancellor and he has joined on 13.9.2018.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha and some other members congratulated Dr. Muneeshwar Joshi on his appointment as Secretary to the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal while congratulating Dr. Muneeshwar Joshi on his appointment as Secretary to Vice Chancellor said that the Vice Chancellor has deemed it fit. He further said that the Vice Chancellor is authorised to fix his salary also.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is good suggestion and he has already taken this in cognizance, it is under process.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the Director Youth Welfare had joined this University in the year 2011 and now he is thinking to go back to his parent University. He is a Professor in the Punjab Agricultural University. He pointed out that the Director Youth Welfare has also some salary issue. Principal Sangha requested the Vice Chancellor to look into this issue also.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Vice Chancellor is authorised to fix their appropriate salary.

Provessor Navdeep Goyal spoke about the untimely demise of Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal. He said that the members would like to record their homage because he has been a Senate member for many terms. When he became the Principal of Gobind National College, Narangwal, the College was on the verge of closure. He really worked very hard for the development of the College. He was a very able administrator. He did a lot for the College as well as for the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

University as he had been the Honorary Director of P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has already been recorded, but he does not know where it should be recorded.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that a communication from the Syndicate should also go to his college for the appreciation of his services by the Syndicate to which the Vice Chancellor said, they should see to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that usually it is done that when the condolence resolution is read, before the Vice Chancellor reads the achievements, it should be recorded in that sequence.

The Vice Chancellor asked whether it is done after the business is started? It could be stated after observing two minutes' silence. Let it be, it is a matter of sentiments.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what Principal Sangha means to say that a resolution be passed appreciating his services and the contribution made by him towards the development of the college and the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should be put in the Vice Chancellor's Statement at the appropriate place as suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. Felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Ms Yamini P., Ph.D. Research Scholar, working under the supervision of Professor Kanwaljit Chopra, Chairperson, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on her winning the 'Rajnibhai V Patel 'PharmInnova Award 2017-18', for best thesis in M.Pharm. (Pharmacology) and also receiving a trophy, certificate and a cash prize of Rs 51,000, with her research guide receiving Rs 25,000.
  - (ii) Professor Archana Rakesh Singh, Chairperson of the School of Communication Studies on her being nominated as the member of the Film and Television Institute of India society.
  - (iii) Professor O.P. Katare, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on his being conferred the Association of Pharmacy Teachers of India (APTI) Manjushree Pal Memorial Award for the best Pharmaceutical Scientist.
2. Information contained in Vice Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (2), (3) and (4) be noted and approved;

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

3. That the appreciation of the Syndicate be conveyed to the Principal, Govind National College, Narangwal for the services rendered and the contribution made by Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal for the development of the College.
4. The Vice-Chancellor was authorised to fix the salary of Secretary to Vice-Chancellor

**Re-appointment as Part Time Assistant Professor in the Department of Laws, P.U. for the Academic session 2018-2019**

**2.** Considered if the following person be re-appointed as Part Time Assistant Professor in the Department of Laws, P.U. w.e.f. the date they start work for the Academic session 2018-2019, against the vacant positions of the Department, on the same terms and conditions according to which they have worked previously:

Sr. No.	Name
1.	Ms. Neetu Gupta
2.	Ms. Priyanka Bedi
3.	Ms. Yashesvi Singh
4.	Ms. Sonia
5.	Dr. Reena Kansal
6.	Ms. Imrose K. Tiwana

**NOTE:** 1. A copy of letter dated 27.07.2018 of Chairperson, Department of Laws is enclosed (**Appendix-I**).

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

On the instance of the Vice Chancellor, the Registrar read out the item No.C-2 of the agenda.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he has only one question every time as to how many years these people would continue?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this has a background.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the department just says that these teachers were working last year also. The Syndicate changes every year. As Syndicate members they want to know for how many years they had been continuing. If they are required, as for as the item is concerned, there is no problem. Would they go on working as part-time teachers for 10 years or so? He said that at page number 11 of the agenda papers, Sr. No. 7, under the head 'Decisions of the Syndicate/Senate' points (a) and (b) are written. In point (b) it is written "as per extract of Para 78 from the minutes of the Syndicate Meeting dated 29.6.2010, the Guest Faculty could be appointed only to the extent of 10% of the total sanctioned posts". Then at page 12 of the agenda under point (d) it is written, "Furthermore as per decision of the Board

of Finance/Syndicate approved by the Senate at its meeting held on 25.5.2014 the departments can appoint upto 3 Guest Faculty/Part-time teachers concurrently against 1 vacant post. These two things are contradictory in itself. On the one hand it is said that 10% of the total strength could be appointed as Guest Faculty and on the other it is said that three Guest Faculty teachers could be appointed against one vacant post. So, he said that the old decision of appointing 10% Guest Faculty of the total strength should be abolished so that there could not be any confusion.

The Vice Chancellor said okay, it is a good idea.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the situation is different in the case of Department of Laws as compared to other departments. The pertinent question which is asked is that for how long they would continue to teach on part-time basis? There is a specific requirement in the department of Laws only for Part-time teachers, who come from the High Court, they are practicing lawyers, they are appointed on part-time basis. But there used to be unwritten law for part-time teachers in their University earlier that these people could continue for a maximum of 5 years. But after the judgement of the High Court that they cannot be replaced, so these part time teachers are allowed to continue. They are recruited as part time and they would remain part-time. So they are supposed to teach practical classes. But he thinks that they have to take into account the special consideration for this.

Professor Ronki Ram said that Shri Prabhjit Singh has rightly said that for how long these teachers would continue? They have part time teachers not only in law, the problem is this wherever they need to appoint teachers, there is a bar from the Ministry of Human Resource Development. They cannot appoint teachers without first taking permission from them, but they cannot stop the courses being taught in the department.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that in the last meeting it was said that since the previous Vice Chancellor had no authority to make appointments beyond one year, so they have said that all the appointments are illegal. But those items have not been placed in this agenda also, so those persons are working illegally. The previous Vice Chancellor was not authorized for that at that time.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the appointment to which Shri Prabhjit Singh is saying illegal, actually the question was that the session had started. There is an emergency provision in the Calendar. That emergency power was inherent with the Vice Chancellor and he used that power.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the agenda which they received, there was no time-table of most of the departments. He would not like to take the name of the department, because then it would become biased. They must check this whether the appointment was emergent or not. How the Vice Chancellor did it, who did not have the powers? His question is that, as per the statement of Professor Navdeep Goyal, they have to see whether there was an emergency or not.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that whatever Shri Prabhjit Singh is saying regarding emergency, it is correct because there are many positions where there is no emergency.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is a confusion. It is a very-very important issue. What he (Shri Prabhjit Singh) is raising, that item was withdrawn. Now withdrawn means, what? Did it not require ratification? He told Professor Navdeep Goyal that it is the item which relate to the appointment under emergency clause which he is referring to, was withdrawn. The item which was withdrawn, it means it did not require ratification.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there was a note where it was written that the items were shifted from consideration to ratification.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, does it mean that the ratification has been done?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the ratification was done.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said, no, there was no item.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he remember exactly that he had explained that there is no difference between consideration and ratification. They have evolved this nomenclature and it is not mentioned anywhere in the calendar, because they cannot ratify any item until they consider it to which the Vice Chancellor said 'yes'. Consideration and ratification are one and the same thing. But taking a practical view, there is not much difference between ratification and consideration. Some items are put in the information. So, this item is for appointment and was already under the consideration of the Syndicate and the Syndicate meeting could not take place. While the item is still under consideration, he could have understood, had the orders been passed keeping in view the emergency, that in view of the fact this item is already pending for consideration by Syndicate, till the decision of the Syndicate is taken and subject to approval of the Syndicate, these appointments were approved. But to say that the Regulation 14 give inherent powers to the Vice Chancellor, it does not, because there is specific power under Regulation 5 in Chapter V for appointing teachers under emergency situation for which the Vice Chancellor has got powers to make appointment only for one year and beyond that it is with the Syndicate. So, then the Syndicate has to take into consideration when the item is there. The situation so developed that something or the other was to be done, that could be done for the remaining period till the Syndicate takes place. He does not know, why the item was withdrawn and after drawing from the list of consideration items, it was taken to ratification. While discussing the ratification, this was also very clearly said that it does not matter whether it is ratification or consideration. The item is to be passed by the Syndicate. As far as his memory goes, this was very clearly made out in the last meeting that they can take it in the next meeting. In the end of the meeting when the Vice Chancellor asked, if the House thinks if there is anything urgent in the previous agenda which they could not take up today, so two items were considered to be very important, one was as pointed out by Dr. Amit Joshi and one was pointed out by him. Dr. Amit Joshi pointed out only towards appointment items and it is the Vice Chancellor who requested, can they wait to the next meeting, so he immediately agreed on that. The other items was about the M.A. (Public Administration and Public Policy) which he had pointed out which they threadbare discussed and taken a decision. Now to say that it was ratified, probably, they are not doing justice to that. So, he is right that actually, this should have been discussed from the item of appointments which were made by the Vice Chancellor by whatever clause. If he (Vice Chancellor) was justified in making it, the Syndicate has no difficulty in endorsing that. If they feels that some irregularity or illegality which has been committed, the Syndicate should not hesitate to undo that also.

The Vice Chancellor said that the items were ratified.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that unless and until the item as a whole is discussed, how they can say that all the other items were ratified.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members as to what is to be done?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that now they are coming to the agenda, they can discuss now and they can go through all those items, that is not a problem. He had submitted in the last time also that in the Senate meeting too, when an information item came up for discussion, the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

discussion never took place in the Senate meeting, whereas the minutes which were circulated to them, it was very implicitly mentioned that they have been passed whereas the DVDs are available, the recording is there, those were never passed, they were not brought up in the Senate meeting. That precedent should not be followed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what Dr. Amit Joshi has said is that the item under information was not even taken up in the Senate and it is something very surprising if the minutes are recorded like that information was noted and it was approved.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is a very bad kind of precedent that the discussion did not take place and then the minutes are circulated that this has been passed. He said they can discuss on information item too.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not a point of decision. If it is written anywhere that item under Information cannot be discussed, let them should read that. That is why he has said it that this is rule made by them only regarding consideration, ratification or information items. There are specific provisions in the Calendar that if they do this thing, they have to place it before the next Syndicate for approval. If they do this thing, they have to place it before the next Syndicate for information. What for information? If they cannot ask for anything. Now if Professor Keshav Malhotra has pointed out that in the Vice Chancellor's statement in the word 'member' 'b' is missing, can that not be corrected. If something has come for information, they can say that the University is not rightly informed and needs to be corrected. But are they not supposed to speak on any information item. He would like to tell another thing that here have been the Vice Chancellor, who has given the ruling that on information item there cannot be any discussion. The same Vice Chancellor after two meetings, says that when the item is before the House, they are free to discuss it. Why, because there is no such law that they cannot discuss. They have done the classification? Classification has been done by those who are the authors of the agenda. If they have to make someone mum, then put that item in the information and after that, say, it is approved. There is another burning issue which is pending. He said that it is his utmost request, the purpose for which the DVDs were introduced that wherever mistake is occurred in the recording of minutes, after all the Chairman or the Secretary of the Syndicate or Senate is also not God, he is also a human-being, mistake could be committed by him, so in that case, the DVDs could help to correct the minutes if someone points so. DVD cannot speak lie. If the DVD is saying that which he is saying, but if they say that he is not to go by the DVD, that thing would be perhaps be wrong. So, he requested the Vice Chancellor that if he receives such letter or if such a thing is pending or such an objection is raised by someone, then the right way to that, they should refer to the DVD. If there is any difference in the minutes as per the DVD, that should be corrected and it should not be made a prestige issue. He is telling this to the Vice Chancellor because he could face this problem. It has happened that one honourable member pointed out that they should see the DVD as something different is recorded in the DVD and the minutes have been written wrongly. He said it three times. After that he was given the reply that the Chairman of the Senate has over-ruled his objection. He said that he is not raising any objection, whatever is written in the DVD, they should write that. So, can there be any such power in the calendar or with anybody in the law of the land. So such things are necessary to see.

The Vice Chancellor said, 'sure'. They have to see if such things happen anywhere.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that if the honourable members say so, then there should not be any problem in discussing information items, to which the Vice Chancellor said, right, okay, should they proceed further?



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to what has been done with this agenda to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said the agenda of July meeting is still pending and it could be taken up later on.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this item 2 of law department relates to part-time teachers which is under consideration, it has come to his notice that these people have not been allowed to join. The session is already on and they have not been allowed to join. It is not in his knowledge, perhaps they might be teaching unofficially, but they may have already been teaching assuming that their item would be approved. So, now he (Vice Chancellor) can see that where the emergency power was required to be used, it was not used, but where the session has started and he could use the inherent power, it was not used. But where there was a quarrel that it was not needed, there it is said that what has been done, that is done, that probably is not correct.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said, that is why he was pointing out that the earlier appointments are without workload.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should allow them to join because otherwise the students would suffer. They should be allowed to join from the date they start classes and the formalities could be completed in the meantime.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the item is passed. They can say in this item that their appointment is approved w.e.f. the date they start work/have stated working. In case they confirm that they have already been working, then at least for that period, they are not going to suffer.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if they are teaching and the Chairpersons verifies it, then they must be given salary for that period.

The Vice Chancellor said that he absolutely agrees with them that it does not mean that discussion could not take place on information items. He requested the members not to bring this in their mind. He always welcomes any suggestion or correction.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that one information and there is another very dangerous word i.e. statement. A belief has been spread that if something has come as a part of the Vice Chancellor's statement, then there would not be any ifs and buts, and it is approved. This has happened when the University regulations were changed by bringing a statement. They should refrain from such things.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does agree to it. He would not say that they should discuss such things only here, but he would request all the members that if such a thing comes in their mind, they should inform him. They can inform him by making a telephone call or send him an SMS. He is very clear in such things. Different categories are there for the streamlining of the process and everything. He would never have any type biasedness and there should not make be any prestige issue in such things. All the people are making efforts for the one objective.

Shri Ashok Goyal said he thinks that the view of the Vice Chancellor is right. The members are also having the same thinking and there is no prestige issue for anyone.

Shri Prabhjit Singh and some other members said that the item is passed.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the item is passed, but it should be written that their appointment is approved w.e.f. the date they have actually started taking the classes.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that part time teachers do not join, but they are asked to teach the classes and that the approval would come later on.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that part time teachers also join, but in the absence of any extension, how would they give joining. So, the department ask them to teach the classes and their appointment would get through. He said that he does not say firmly whether they have taught or not. But if they have taught, then they must be paid for that to which the Vice Chancellor said, 'sure'.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said what they do is that they write that one has joined today w.e.f. so and so date i.e. the date from which they actually joined/started teaching.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that instead of writing the word 'joining' they may be deemed to have joined from the date they have started taking the classes.

The Vice Chancellor said that what Dr. Amit Joshi and Shri Ashok Goyal has said, it is in the interest of the person who have been appointed. Secondly, he asked the Registrar to note, why they have not been allowed to join so far.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they cannot join as their appointment is on part-time basis.

The Vice Chancellor said that for part-time also, there must be some procedure for joining.

The Vice Chancellor said that this word would be right.

Dr. Amit Joshi said even if they submit their joining report today, the Chairperson can verify that this was subject to the outcome of the Syndicate mandate, but they were taking the classes from such and such date.

The Vice Chancellor said that the word 'deemed to have joined' would be the right words.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have also to suffice the audit objection, if any.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be re-appointed as Part Time Assistant Professor in the Department of Laws, P.U. for the Academic session 2018-2019, against the vacant positions of the Department, on the same terms and conditions according on which they have worked previously and they would be deemed to have joined the department from the date they started taking the classes as verified by the Chairperson of the Department:

Sr. No.	Name
1.	Ms. Neetu Gupta
2.	Ms. Priyanka Bedi
3.	Ms. Yashesvi Singh
4.	Ms. Sonia
5.	Dr. Reena Kansal
6.	Ms. Imrose K. Tiwana

**Minutes dated  
09.07.2018 regarding  
change in  
qualifications for  
Management Guest  
Faculty to teach  
Integrated B.E.  
(Chemical)-MBA**

**3.** Considered minutes dated 09.07.2018 (**Appendix-II**) of the committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the issue of change in qualifications for Management Guest Faculty to teach Integrated B.E. (Chemical)-MBA classes at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology.

Initiating the discussion on this item Professor Navdeep Goyal read out few lines from the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held 9.7.2018 at page 15 of the agenda which are reproduced below:

“Therefore, it is recommended that the faculty requirement for the course of B.E. (Chemical)-MBA should have the same qualifications as that of Management, recommended by the University Grants Commission”.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is alright.

The Vice Chancellor said that on any agenda even if it is under information items in a suggestive mode, they note it as these inputs are very important for future. They may remove the same from the recording later on. The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Ronki Ram and Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi if the item is okay, to which they said that it is alright.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the recommendations made by the office are alright.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor asked the members whether the suggestions given by the members could become a part of the resolved portion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, if need be, these suggestions could be made a part resolved portion.

Professor Navdeep Goyal endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

The Vice Chancellor again asked the members if the suggestion being given by them could be recorded in the resolved part.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that it could be included in the resolved part, if the situation so warrants.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the suggestions are good as it could be referred to at any time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that three types of decisions could be taken, one, that the decision is taken here and now only, second, that this needs to be looked into thoroughly by constituting a Committee and the third, this needs to be looked into at the level of the Vice Chancellor. It is right if all the things are recorded.

The Vice Chancellor asked if all this is for future only to which Shri Ashok Goyal said, ‘obviously’.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Dr. Amit Joshi said that whatever they are discussing here it will become a part of the proceedings as the recording is already on. But the personal notes that he (Vice Chancellor) is taking, they are not part of the proceedings.

Professor Ronki Ram said that though the resolved part is there, but if one would like to see as to how it has been resolved, then everything would be there in discussion to which Professor Keshav Malhotra said it is very good.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes dated 09.07.2018 of the committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the issue of change in qualifications for Management Guest Faculty to teach Integrated B.E. (Chemical)-MBA classes at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Resignation of Shri Amandeep Singh, Programmer (Sr. Scale), UIET**

**4** Considered if the resignation of Shri Amandeep Singh, Programmer (Sr. Scale), UIET, PU be accepted w.e.f. 14.03.2016 (duly recommended by the departmental Academic & Administrative Committee) with the condition that a sum equal to his pay & allowances for period failing short i.e. 3 months, in lieu of prior notice, be deducted from his P.F. A/c No. 7519, under Rule 16.1 at page 84, P.U. Cal. Vol.-III 2016.

**NOTE:** 1. Kind attention is invited to Rule 16.1 at page 84, P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2009 reads as under:

“A permanent employee shall not leave or discontinue his/her service in University without first giving a prior notice to the Registrar/Vice-Chancellor, as the case may be of his/her intention to leave or discontinue service the period of notice shall be:

- (i) Three Calendar months in case ‘A’ & ‘B’ employees
- (ii) One calendar month in case of Class ‘C’ employees

Provided that such notice may be waived in part or in full by the appointing authority for valid reasons.

In case of breach of this provision, he/she shall be liable to pay to the University, in lieu of notice, a sum equal to his/her pay & allowances for the period falling short of notice required to be given by him/her which sum may be deducted from any money due to him/her”.

- 2. Shri Amandeep Singh is class ‘A’ employee.
- 3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-III**).

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

**RESOLVED:** That the resignation of Shri Amandeep Singh, Programmer (Sr. Scale), UIET, PU be accepted w.e.f. 14.03.2016 (duly recommended by the departmental Academic & Administrative Committee) with the condition that a sum equal to his pay & allowances for period falling short i.e. 3 months, in lieu of prior notice, be deducted from his P.F. A/c No. 7519, under Rule 16.1 at page 84, P.U. Cal. Vol.-III 2016.

**Confirmation  
Superintendents**

**of 5.** Considered that the following Superintendents (enlisted at Sr. No. 1 to 114 (except Sr. No. 1 and 87), be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch/ Department</b>	<b>Date of Appointment as Superintendent</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
1.	Sh. Surinder Kumar Thind	VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur	26.08.2014	26.08.2015 NOTE: An enquiry is pending against him in a fraud case.
2.	Mrs. Veena	Re-evaluation	28.06.2011	27.08.2015
3.	Sh. C.S. Rahi (Retd. on 31.1.2017)	Estt-I	05.07.2011 (A.N.)	28.08.2015
4.	Sh. Balbir Singh (Retd. on 28.2.2017)	Accounts	06.07.2011	29.08.2015
5.	Sh. Madan Gopal Singh (Retd. on 28.2.2018)	Exams.	03.08.2011	30.08.2015
6.	Mrs. Mamta Kumari Ghai (Retd. on 30.6.2016)	R & D (R & S)	14.10.2011	31.08.2015
7.	Mrs. Santosh Kumari	UIET	01.08.2011	01.09.2015
8.	Sh. V.K. Mahajan (Retd. on 31.12.2016)	R & S	03.05.2011	02.09.2015
9.	Sh. Prit Pal Singh (Retd. on 31.3.2016)	Exams.-III	07.09.2011 (A.N.)	03.09.2015
10.	Sh. Dhara Dutt	Accounts	08.09.2011	04.09.2015
11.	Sh. Omesh Verma	Conduct	08.11.2011	05.09.2015
12.	Sh. Kamal Kumar (Retd. on 30.6.2018)	Research Promotion Cell	16.11.2011	06.09.2015

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch/ Department</b>	<b>Date of Appointment as Superintendent</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
13.	Sh. Mohinder Singh (Retd. on 31.3.2018)	Exams.	17.11.2011	07.09.2015
14.	Mrs. Pawan Kumari Aneja	Accounts	09.01.2012	08.09.2015
15.	Sh. Hari Din (Retd. on 31.8.2016)	Exam.-II	09.01.2012	09.09.2015
16.	Sh. Arvinder Singh, (Retd. on 30.09.2016)	Dr. H.S.J. Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital	09.01.2012	10.09.2015
17.	Sh. Surinder Kumar, (Retd. on 31.5.2017)	Exams	01.02.2012	11.09.2015
18.	Sh. Vinod Kumar Singla , (Retd. on 31.3.2018)	U.B.S.	08.02.2012	12.09.2015
19.	Sh. Rajinder Singh Negi, (Retd. on 30.11.2015)	General	03.02.2012	13.09.2015
20.	Sh. Kamal Singh Jamwal, (Retd. on 31.3.2016)	UIHMT	03.02.2012	14.09.2015
21.	Mrs. Prem Lata	UIAMS	03.02.2012	15.09.2015
22.	Mrs. Suman Minglani nee Suman Arora	Accounts	03.02.2012	16.09.2015
23.	Mrs. Shalta Kumari (Retired on 31.08.2017)	Exams.	06.03.2012	17.09.2015
24.	Mrs. Manju Dhand (Retd. on 31.3.2018)	Secrecy	06.03.2012	18.09.2015
25.	Sh. Ashok Kumar (Retd. on 31.4.2018)	UMC	14.03.2012	19.09.2015
26.	Mrs. Chander Kanta, (Retd. on 31.5.2018)	USOL	13.03.2012	20.09.2015

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch/ Department</b>	<b>Date of Appointment as Superintendent</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
27.	Mrs. Neelam Kapur nee Neelam Jethi	Exams	15.03.2012 (A.N.)	21.09.2015
28.	Sh. Damodar Dass, (Retd. on 31.7.2016)	Accounts	15.05.2012	22.09.2015
29.	Sh. Kishan Singh (Retd. on 31.12.16)	Exams	01.08.2012	23.09.2015
30.	Sh. Ashwani Kumar, (Retd. on 31.5.2016)	Estt.-I	02.08.2012	24.09.2015
31.	Mrs. Prem Lata Joshi, (Retd. on 25.2.2017)	Accounts	01.08.2012	25.09.2015
32.	Sh. Ranjit Singh (Retd. on 28.2.2017)	CIL	03.08.2012	26.09.2015
33.	Mrs. Kiran Kashyap nee Kiran Malhi, (Vol. Retd. on 30.06.2016)	USOL	07.08.2012	27.09.2015
34.	Sh. Manjit Singh, (Retd. on 30.11.2017)	Dr. H.S.J. Institute of Dental Science & Hospital	14.08.2012	28.09.2015
35.	Sh. Surjit Singh, (Retd. on 31.12.17)	Exams	27.08.2012	29.09.2015
36.	Mrs. Kiran Bala, (Retd. on 31.12.17)	Accounts	03.09.2012	30.09.2015
37.	Sh. Rakesh Kumar, (Retd. on 31.1.2016)	Conduct	04.09.2012	01.10.2015
38.	Sh. Ashok Rampal, (Retd. on 30.4.2016)	UIET	05.10.2012	02.10.2015
39.	Sh. Surinder Kumar (Retd. on 31.3.2017)	XEN Office	18.10.2012	03.10.2015

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch/ Department</b>	<b>Date of Appointment as Superintendent</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
40.	Mrs. Kailash Kumari (Retd. on 31.5.2017)	USOL	01.11.2012	04.10.2015
41.	Mrs. Charanjit Kaur	D.S.W.'s Office	01.11.2012	05.10.2015
42.	Mrs. Sarita Sharma,	USOL	08.11.2012	06.10.2015
43.	Mrs. Dinesh Kumari Sharma	CET Cell	16.11.2012	07.10.2015
44.	Mrs. Anju.	Exams	16.11.2012	08.10.2015
45.	Sh. Mohan Bir Singh,	Accounts	06.02.2013	09.10.2015
46.	Mrs. Nisha Lakhanpal,	Exam.	22.03.2013	10.10.2015
47.	Sh. Ved Parkash Bhardwaj (Retd. on 28.2.2017)	Office of the Vice-Chancellor	02.04.2013	11.10.2015
48.	Mrs. Dolly (Retd. on 31.7.2017)	Computer Unit	09.04.2013	12.10.2015
49.	Mrs. Kailash Rani	U.B.S.	02.05.2013	13.10.2015
50.	Sh. G.J. Hardy	Estt.-II	02.05.2013	14.10.2015
51.	Sh. Ashwani Kumar Chopra (Retd. on 30.9.2016)	Secrecy	04.06.2013	15.10.2015
52.	Sh. Sanjeev Kumar	UMC	02.08.2013	16.10.2015
53.	Sh. Ravinder Trikha	R & S	05.08.2013	17.10.2015
54.	Mrs. Komal Sharma	Secrecy	02.09.2013	18.10.2015
55.	Mrs. Kiran Sharma	Exams.	21.10.2013	19.10.2015
56.	Sh. Bhupinder Singh	Computer Unit	10.01.2014	20.10.2015
57.	Sh. Hari Om (Retd. on 31.3.2016)	Exams.	15.01.2014	21.10.2015



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch/ Department</b>	<b>Date of Appointment as Superintendent</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
58.	Sh. Anil Kumar Sharma,	Accounts	20.01.2014	22.10.2015
59.	Mrs. Savita Rani Sharma,	USOL	27.01.2014	23.10.2015
60.	Sh. Deepak Kaushik,	Mathematics	04.02.2014	24.10.2015
61.	Sh. Raj Pal Rana (Retd. on 30.4.2018)	Sports	19.02.2014	25.10.2015
62.	Sh. Hans Raj	Law	28.03.2014 (A.N.)	26.10.2015
63.	Mrs. Indu Anand,	Accounts	15.04.2014	27.10.2015
64.	Sh. Sachendra Singh Rawat	Estt.-II	15.04.2014	28.10.2015
65.	Sh. Subhash Chand, (Retd. on 31.5.2016)	Colleges	01.05.2014	29.10.2015
66.	Sh. Sukhpal Singh	C.V.O.'s Office	01.05.2014	30.10.2015
67.	Mrs. Swaran Kaur	R & S	02.06.2014	31.10.2015
68.	Sh. Sanjay Kumar Bhasin	Estt.-II	02.06.2014	01.11.2015
69.	Sh. Vasu Dev	Secrecy	02.06.2014	02.11.2015
70.	Sh. Rajesh Kumar Gupta	Conduct	02.06.2014	03.11.2015
71.	Sh. Sunil Kumar Gupta	Secrecy	02.06.2014	04.11.2015
72.	Mrs. Monika Chopra	COE's Office	23.06.2014	05.11.2015
73.	Sh. Devinder Kumar	Computer Unit	01.07.2014	06.11.2015
74.	Sh. Rajan Sharma	Office of the Vice-Chancellor	01.07.2014	07.11.2015
75.	Sh. Manmohan Jit Handa (Retd. on 31.01.2018)	R & S	07.07.2014	08.11.2015
76.	Sh. Sanjay Kaul	Secrecy	04.07.2014	09.11.2015
77.	Sh. Rajinder Kumar,	Conduct	10.07.2014	10.11.2015

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch/ Department</b>	<b>Date of Appointment as Superintendent</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
78.	Sh. Ranjit Singh	Dr. H.S.J. Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital	01.09.2014	11.11.2015
79.	Sh. Vijay Kumar	Estt.-II	01.09.2014	12.11.2015
80.	Sh. Sukhdev Sharma	General	01.09.2014	13.11.2015
81.	Ms. Gunita Sharma	Accounts	22.10.2014	14.11.2015
82.	Sh. Ram Parkash	UIET	14.11.2014	15.11.2015
83.	Mrs. Sushma Khillan	UMC	13.11.2014	16.11.2015
84.	Ms. Kiran Bala	Geology	26.11.2014	26.11.2015
85.	Sh. Umesh Johar	Accounts	26.11.2014	27.11.2015
86.	Mrs. Shakuntla Kumari	Exams	05.12.2014	05.12.2015
87.	Sh. Naresh Sabharwal	UIPS	10.12.2014	10.12.2015 (Placed under suspension, w.e.f 28.9.2015)
88.	Sh. Parkas Chand, (Retd. on 31.12.2017)	Publication Bureau	01.01.2015	01.01.2016
89.	Sh. Lajja Ram Hans, (Retd. on 31.05.2016)	Accounts	01.01.2015	02.01.2016
90.	Sh. Samil Masih (Retd. on 31.10.2017)	Exams	06.01.2015	06.01.2016
91.	Sh. Parveen Kumar	Office of the DUI	05.01.2015	07.01.2016
92.	Sh. Rajinder Kumar	Colleges	05.01.2015	08.01.2016
93.	Mrs. Indu Thapliyal,	Conduct	12.01.2015	12.01.2016
94.	Mrs. Shashi Gupta,	Office of the DCDC	12.01.2015	13.01.2016
95.	Sh. Shashi Parkash Sharma	Accounts	18.03.2015	18.03.2016
96.	Sh. Sandeep Grover,	Exams	18.03.2015	19.03.2016

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch/ Department</b>	<b>Date of Appointment as Superintendent</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
97.	Mrs. Suman Sharma	Youth Welfare	18.03.2015	20.03.2016
98.	Sh. Sanjeev Kumar Kamboj	General	21.04.2015	21.04.2016
99.	Sh. Puran Chand Thakur	Sociology	21.04.2015	22.04.2016
100.	Mrs. Sunita Rani,	Accounts	21.04.2015	23.04.2016
101.	Sh. Sandeep Arora	Conduct	09.05.2015	09.05.2016
102.	Sh. Gandharv Singh( Retd on 31.03.2017)	C.O.E's Office	12.05.2015	12.05.2016
103.	Sh. Suresh Kumar	Public Administration	01.06.2015	01.06.2016
104.	Sh. Ram Nath alias Ram Singh	Estt.-I	02.06.2015	02.06.2016
105.	Mrs. Rani Mann	Re-evaluation	04.07.2015	04.07.2016
106.	Sh. Bachan Singh	R.T.I. Cell	04.07.2015	05.07.2016
107.	Sh. Bhumi Singh	Estate Cell	06.07.2015	06.07.2016
108.	Sh. Dharam Pal	Accounts	10.08.2015 (A.N.)	11.08.2016
109.	Mrs. Sunila Narang	Secrecy	09.09.2015	09.09.2016
110.	Mrs. Darshan Kaur	Exams	09.09.2015	10.09.2016
111.	Sh. Chaman Lal	Accounts	09.09.2015	11.09.2016
112.	Sh. Jagtar Singh	R & S	09.10.2015	09.10.2016
113.	Sh. Dinesh Deep Mehta	Exams	08.10.2015	10.10.2016
114.	Sh. Mahesh Kumar	CET	08.10.2015	11.10.2016

- NOTE:** 1. The date of confirmation of these Superintendant is on the basis of availability of permanent slots.
2. The confirmation of Shri Surinder Kumar Thind (Sr. No. 1) and Shri Naresh Sabharawal (Sr. No. 87) be kept pending till such time their pending court cases/enquiry cases are

finalised by the competent authorities. Their cases will be considered later on for which 02 vacant slots have been kept reserved for their confirmation.

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

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the item relates to the confirmation of Superintendents. The Item is passed and there is no problem in it. But he would want to tell the House as well as to the Vice Chancellor that the instructions and pay-scales of Punjab Government are applicable on the non-teaching staff. The Punjab Government had stopped the confirmation of employees way back for the last 15 years. He clarified that the Punjab Government did not stop the confirmation as such, but they have said that the confirmation should be done in one cadre, meaning thereby, if they are appointed as Clerks and confirmed then there is no need confirm them as Assistant or as Superintendents or as Assistant Registrar again and again. There is no need of confirmation of Superintends, the item is passed, no problem. He suggested that, in future, it should be mentioned made a part of the resolved portion that as per Punjab Government Policy and decisions, there is no need for confirmation at every stage.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what Shri Prabhjit Singh is saying, that is okay, but there is a small problem and they have to make some little changes. As per the P.U. Calender, the seniority is as per confirmation, so the employees are confirmed from the date of confirmation. He again said that they have to make a little modification in the seniority rule.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is written that seniority is as per confirmation.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that there are two ways to fix seniority, i.e. merit and date of joining. When the seniority of a Clerk is fixed in the basic feeder cadre, the confirmation is done and according to that the seniority would go on. There is no problem in it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when people come from the different cadres, only then the problem arises.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that then they should take the date of joining into consideration.

Professor Navdeep Goyal explained that if they are to promote persons as Assistant Registrars, such people come from two sides i.e. Superintendents and P.As. The P.As. may have joined earlier and became Assistant Registrar later on. Then there arises the issue of seniority between P.As and Superintendent at the time of their promotion to the post Assistant Registrar. So they have to mend the rules to a little extent.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that if the persons are appointed through selection, then there is need for confirmation, but if someone is promoted, they should take into consideration his date of joining as Clerk and no confirmation is needed on promotion. He asked if they confirm on promotion, then the person would have to be put on probation, but they do not treat them on probation. So, in the promotion cases, there is no need for confirmation.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that confirmation on promotion is done in the Government of India offices. He enquired as to why the confirmation cases of Superintendents who were promoted in 2015 and 2016 are being placed in the Syndicate in 2018. Why it has been delayed? He was of the view that accountability of Establishment Branch should be fixed in this regard so that they could put up the cases well in time so that if a person is not performing well, his probation period could be extended. There are speaking orders that if they

do not confirm a person after completion of probation period, then he is deemed to have been confirmed from the due date. But, now they are unable to take any such action.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he would like to make one thing clear that the Panjab University employees do not automatically governed by the Punjab Civil Service rules. He said that they have the option to choose Punjab Government rules or the Central Government rules. Secondly, when a person is appointed at the initial level, after probation he is confirmed. After that, there are two types of promotions, one is internal promotion on the basis of seniority and the other is higher position for which one could compete for. In the case of the former, where there is an internal seniority position, there people never get confirmed again and again nor they get probation again and again. They join at one level till they retire, if his/her new appointment is not done, then they are treated confirmed at once at the initial appointment and they cannot confirm and put on probation a person twice. Now in the case of these promotion, as these are not new appointments, they need not to be confirmed. He further clarified that if they got the promotion on the basis of seniority, the question of confirmation does not arise. For example, if a teachers become Associate Professor through CAS, he is not confirmed as Associate Professor. Similarly, he is not confirmed on his promotion as Professor. If a person has joined as Assistant Professor, but in between he gets fresh appointment as Associate Professor, then he would be confirmed. Similarly, if he is appointed as Professor afresh, then he would be confirmed.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that on page 35 of the agenda papers, it is mentioned that 'some of the persons have retired from the service, but their confirmation date falls prior to the date of their retirement...'. He stated, what is the fun of confirming them after retirement.

On the instance of the Vice Chancellor, the Registrar read out his note at page 35 of the agenda which states that 'in the first instance, please explain that why the office has delayed in processing confirmation so late when the individuals have already retired'. It was further informed by the Registrar that the Estt. Branch has further clarified it at page 36 and that has been taken note of.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know as to what has been done in this item because this need clarity. They cannot pass the item like this and it should be told as to what has been done.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that a chart of the employees to be confirmed is appended and they have to approve it to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what they have been discussing would remain as it is, if they do not take any concrete decision.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan enquired whether they can confirm them again on their promotion when they are already stand confirmed since their joining. This item should comp up on the agenda only if they have made any fresh appointments. These are not the fresh appointments and they are already confirmed in the initial stage.

The Vice Chancellor said that some members are saying that it has been happening in the past also and requested the members as to what needs to be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever has been done so far, that is okay. Now whatever the practical difficult are, they should look into that.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if they have promoted someone from a specific date on which he has become eligible, then it is to confirm that thing only and not to confirm the person on that position. He further said that the confirmation takes place only if it is a new

appointment. Once they confirm a person, then it is confirmation against a new position. If they have to confirm a person who have put in 13-14 years' service, there may not be only one person, there may be 10 persons, there may be difference of opinion among themselves. There may be some dispute of their date of joining. In order to solve such issues, the confirmation is necessary.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they can write the word 'promotion' and not confirmation.

Shri Prabhjit Singh clarified the difference between confirmation and regularization. He stated that there are many new departments of the government where recruitments are made. If that department does run only for 3-4 years, then the employees are shifted to other departments. When one is a confirmed employee, he cannot be thrown out of the job. He said that he is talking in general terms, but the item is passed. If these persons are confirmed as Clerk, Sr.Assistants or Superintendents, then how does it make any difference. What benefit they are being given? Nothing. What is the purpose of confirming them as Superintendents? What is the game? They are their employees and they cannot be thrown out of service.

The Vice Chancellor said that the persons who are officiating, they are confirming them.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that they should use the words that they are promotion from such and such date in the so and so scale as Superintendent.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they should do it as it is done in the case of teaching staff.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have given a good input, but they have to keep in mind the system which is going on since long. There may be some reason behind it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said what Dr. R.K. Mahajan has said is okay that until and unless, they put somebody on probation for six months or one year or whatever it may be, there is no question of confirmation. Confirmation is always followed by probation. This is one aspect. Another aspect is that if somebody is already a confirmed employee in a government organisation, while going from one cadre to another, not by way of selection, but by way of seniority or promotion policy. So, they have to see whether there is need of such confirmation or not as there is already a dispute on this issue among the teachers. This dispute has been lingering on for the last 20 years and it has not been solved till today. It is written in the P.U. Calendar that seniority determined from date of confirmation. There are about 80% teachers are those who have been appointed as Associate Professors under CAS and confirmation is not done in their cases. Since, they are already confirmed, there was a Committee already constituted to decide as to from which date they could be treated as confirmed, though the Committee has to confirm them. He remembered that a decision was taken in the Senate, but that was not sustainable. It was mentioned that the date of confirmation would be one year after the date of the meeting of the Senate in which such and such promotion under CAS was approved, meaning thereby that if somebody's case was approved in 2003 w.e.f. promotion from 1999, his confirmation would be deemed to be in 2004, i.e. after 5 years of his date of eligibility. UGC has now come out clearly in the latest regulations that it is from the date of joining. That rule still exists in their Calendar. So, that dispute is still there and this dispute also did not resolve. This is what the Registrar is telling them that the confirmation is done from the date when the post is available and before that officiating arrangement is continuing. It does seem that this is not sustainable in eyes of law. This is the system which has been working and he thinks that it needs to be discussed threadbare by way of Committee or whatever they may deem fit so that minimum flaws are there.

The Vice Chancellor said it would be good if it is simplified.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal said before moving in any such direction they have to take into confidence the stakeholders either they may be teachers or non-teaching employees on which it is to be implemented. They should be taken into confidence so that they could also give some more inputs.

The Vice Chancellor said that it requires a lot of rigour as it is not so easy to solve this issue.

Professor Ronki Ram said that now the UGC has given clarification on confirmation. Now there is no difference of seniority between the direct appointee Professors or Professors promoted through CAS. They are having some posts of Assistant Registrars or Deputy Registrars where 25% of the posts are filled from within the system through promotion and the others are filled through selection. The Deputy Registrars who come through promotion, they are not required to be confirmed and those who would appointed through direct recruitment, those would require confirmation. So, clarity is there.

The Vice Chancellor said it would be looked into.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said interpretation of rules is job of Establishment Branch. The Vice Chancellor should ask them to put up a note. There are two aspects of this confirmation process, one is, the confirmation of the post, whether probation period is prescribed or otherwise. If it is prescribed, it is fine. If it is not prescribed, it is fine. If it is prescribed, they should confirm him many times. There is another aspect of confirmation, i.e. availability of a regular post. Sometimes, they are promoted, but the regular posts are not available and they cannot be confirmed. So, these two aspects need to be checked at all times by the Estt. Branch whether the posts are available to confirm them. So, these are the things which the Estt. Branch should be able to do. They do not need committees or anybody else. These are natural law and they should follow it. These are only two things that they should check up. So, they should do their job and do it on time.

**RESOLVED:** That the following Superintendents (enlisted at Sr. No. 1 to 114 (except Sr. No. 1 and 87), be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Branch/ Department	Date of Appointment as Superintendent	Date of Confirmation
1.	Sh. Surinder Kumar Thind	VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur	26.08.2014	26.08.2015 <b>NOTE:</b> An enquiry is pending against him in a fraud case.
2.	Mrs. Veena	Re-evaluation	28.06.2011	27.08.2015
3.	Sh. C.S. Rahi (Retd. on 31.1.2017)	Estt-I	05.07.2011 (A.N.)	28.08.2015
4.	Sh. Balbir Singh (Retd. on 28.2.2017)	Accounts	06.07.2011	29.08.2015
5.	Sh. Madan Gopal Singh (Retd. on 28.2.2018)	Exams.	03.08.2011	30.08.2015
6.	Mrs. Mamta Kumari Ghai (Retd. on	R & D (R & S)	14.10.2011	31.08.2015

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch/ Department</b>	<b>Date of Appointment as Superintendent</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
	30.6.2016)			
7.	Mrs. Santosh Kumari	UIET	01.08.2011	01.09.2015
8.	Sh. V.K. Mahajan (Retd. on 31.12.2016)	R & S	03.05.2011	02.09.2015
9.	Sh. Prit Pal Singh, (Retd. on 31.3.2016)	Exams.-III	07.09.2011 (A.N.)	03.09.2015
10.	Sh. Dhara Dutt	Accounts	08.09.2011	04.09.2015
11.	Sh. Omesh Verma	Conduct	08.11.2011	05.09.2015
12.	Sh. Kamal Kumar, (Retd. on 30.6.2018)	Research Promotion Cell	16.11.2011	06.09.2015
13.	Sh. Mohinder Singh (Retd. on 31.3.2018)	Exams.	17.11.2011	07.09.2015
14.	Mrs. Pawan Kumari Aneja	Accounts	09.01.2012	08.09.2015
15.	Sh. Hari Din (Retd. on 31.8.2016)	Exam.-II	09.01.2012	09.09.2015
16.	Sh. Arvinder Singh, (Retd. on 30.09.2016)	Dr. H.S.J. Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital	09.01.2012	10.09.2015
17.	Sh. Surinder Kumar, (Retd. on 31.5.2017)	Exams	01.02.2012	11.09.2015
18.	Sh. Vinod Kumar Singla , (Retd. on 31.3.2018)	U.B.S.	08.02.2012	12.09.2015
19.	Sh. Rajinder Singh Negi, (Retd. on 30.11.2015)	General	03.02.2012	13.09.2015
20.	Sh. Kamal Singh Jamwal, (Retd. on 31.3.2016)	UIHMT	03.02.2012	14.09.2015
21.	Mrs. Prem Lata	UIAMS	03.02.2012	15.09.2015
22.	Mrs. Suman Minglani nee Suman Arora	Accounts	03.02.2012	16.09.2015



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch/ Department</b>	<b>Date of Appointment as Superintendent</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
23.	Mrs. Shalta Kumari (Retired on 31.08.2017)	Exams.	06.03.2012	17.09.2015
24.	Mrs. Manju Dhand, (Retd. on 31.3.2018)	Secrecy	06.03.2012	18.09.2015
25.	Sh. Ashok Kumar, (Retd. on 31.4.2018)	UMC	14.03.2012	19.09.2015
26.	Mrs. Chander Kanta, (Retd. on 31.5.2018)	USOL	13.03.2012	20.09.2015
27.	Mrs. Neelam Kapur nee Neelam Jethi	Exams	15.03.2012 (A.N.)	21.09.2015
28.	Sh. Damodar Dass, (Retd. on 31.7.2016)	Accounts	15.05.2012	22.09.2015
29.	Sh. Kishan Singh, (Retd. on 31.12.16)	Exams	01.08.2012	23.09.2015
30.	Sh. Ashwani Kumar, (Retd. on 31.5.2016)	Estt.-I	02.08.2012	24.09.2015
31.	Mrs. Prem Lata Joshi, (Retd. on 25.2.2017)	Accounts	01.08.2012	25.09.2015
32.	Sh. Ranjit Singh (Retd. on 28.2.2017)	CIL	03.08.2012	26.09.2015
33.	Mrs. Kiran Kashyap nee Kiran Malhi, (Vol. Retd. on 30.06.2016)	USOL	07.08.2012	27.09.2015
34.	Sh. Manjit Singh, (Retd. on 30.11.2017)	Dr. H.S.J. Institute of Dental Science & Hospital	14.08.2012	28.09.2015
35.	Sh. Surjit Singh, (Retd. on 31.12.17)	Exams	27.08.2012	29.09.2015
36.	Mrs. Kiran Bala, (Retd. on 31.12.17)	Accounts	03.09.2012	30.09.2015
37.	Sh. Rakesh Kumar, (Retd. on 31.1.2016)	Conduct	04.09.2012	01.10.2015

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch/ Department</b>	<b>Date of Appointment as Superintendent</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
38.	Sh. Ashok Rampal, (Retd. on 30.4.2016)	UIET	05.10.2012	02.10.2015
39.	Sh. Surinder Kumar (Retd. on 31.3.2017)	XEN Office	18.10.2012	03.10.2015
40.	Mrs. Kailash Kumari (Retd. on 31.5.2017)	USOL	01.11.2012	04.10.2015
41.	Mrs. Charanjit Kaur	D.S.W.'s Office	01.11.2012	05.10.2015
42.	Mrs. Sarita Sharma,	USOL	08.11.2012	06.10.2015
43.	Mrs. Dinesh Kumari Sharma	CET Cell	16.11.2012	07.10.2015
44.	Mrs. Anju.	Exams	16.11.2012	08.10.2015
45.	Sh. Mohan Bir Singh,	Accounts	06.02.2013	09.10.2015
46.	Mrs. Nisha Lakhanpal,	Exam.	22.03.2013	10.10.2015
47.	Sh. Ved Parkash Bhardwaj (Retd. on 28.2.2017)	Office of the Vice-Chancellor	02.04.2013	11.10.2015
48.	Mrs. Dolly (Retd. on 31.7.2017)	Computer Unit	09.04.2013	12.10.2015
49.	Mrs. Kailash Rani	U.B.S.	02.05.2013	13.10.2015
50.	Sh. G.J. Hardy	Estt.-II	02.05.2013	14.10.2015
51.	Sh. Ashwani Kumar Chopra (Retd. on 30.9.2016)	Secrecy	04.06.2013	15.10.2015
52.	Sh. Sanjeev Kumar	UMC	02.08.2013	16.10.2015
53.	Sh. Ravinder Trikha	R & S	05.08.2013	17.10.2015
54.	Mrs. Komal Sharma	Secrecy	02.09.2013	18.10.2015
55.	Mrs. Kiran Sharma	Exams.	21.10.2013	19.10.2015
56.	Sh. Bhupinder Singh	Computer Unit	10.01.2014	20.10.2015

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch/ Department</b>	<b>Date of Appointment as Superintendent</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
57.	Sh. Hari Om (Retd. on 31.3.2016)	Exams.	15.01.2014	21.10.2015
58.	Sh. Anil Kumar Sharma,	Accounts	20.01.2014	22.10.2015
59.	Mrs. Savita Rani Sharma,	USOL	27.01.2014	23.10.2015
60.	Sh. Deepak Kaushik,	Mathematics	04.02.2014	24.10.2015
61.	Sh. Raj Pal Rana (Retd. on30.4.2018)	Sports	19.02.2014	25.10.2015
62.	Sh. Hans Raj	Law	28.03.2014 (A.N.)	26.10.2015
63.	Mrs. Indu Anand,	Accounts	15.04.2014	27.10.2015
64.	Sh. Sachendra Singh Rawat	Estt.-II	15.04.2014	28.10.2015
65.	Sh. Subhash Chand, (Retd. on 31.5.2016)	Colleges	01.05.2014	29.10.2015
66.	Sh. Sukhpal Singh	C.V.O.'s Office	01.05.2014	30.10.2015
67.	Mrs. Swaran Kaur	R & S	02.06.2014	31.10.2015
68.	Sh. Sanjay Kumar Bhasin	Estt.-II	02.06.2014	01.11.2015
69.	Sh. Vasu Dev	Secrecy	02.06.2014	02.11.2015
70.	Sh. Rajesh Kumar Gupta	Conduct	02.06.2014	03.11.2015
71.	Sh. Sunil Kumar Gupta	Secrecy	02.06.2014	04.11.2015
72.	Mrs. Monika Chopra	COE's Office	23.06.2014	05.11.2015
73.	Sh. Devinder Kumar	Computer Unit	01.07.2014	06.11.2015
74.	Sh. Rajan Sharma	Office of the Vice- Chancellor	01.07.2014	07.11.2015
75.	Sh. Manmohan Jit Handa (Retd. on 31.01.2018)	R & S	07.07.2014	08.11.2015
76.	Sh. Sanjay Kaul	Secrecy	04.07.2014	09.11.2015
77.	Sh. Rajinder Kumar,	Conduct	10.07.2014	10.11.2015
78.	Sh. Ranjit Singh	Dr. H.S.J. Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital	01.09.2014	11.11.2015

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch/ Department</b>	<b>Date of Appointment as Superintendent</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
79.	Sh. Vijay Kumar	Estt.-II	01.09.2014	12.11.2015
80.	Sh. Sukhdev Sharma	General	01.09.2014	13.11.2015
81.	Ms. Gunita Sharma	Accounts	22.10.2014	14.11.2015
82.	Sh. Ram Parkash	UIET	14.11.2014	15.11.2015
83.	Mrs. Sushma Khillan	UMC	13.11.2014	16.11.2015
84.	Ms. Kiran Bala	Geology	26.11.2014	26.11.2015
85.	Sh. Umesh Johar	Accounts	26.11.2014	27.11.2015
86.	Mrs. Shakuntla Kumari	Exams	05.12.2014	05.12.2015
87.	Sh. Naresh Sabharwal	UIPS	10.12.2014	10.12.2015 (Placed under suspension, w.e.f 28.9.2015)
88.	Sh. Parkas Chand, (Retd. on 31.12.2017)	Publication Bureau	01.01.2015	01.01.2016
89.	Sh. Lajja Ram Hans, (Retd. on 31.05.2016)	Accounts	01.01.2015	02.01.2016
90.	Sh. Samil Masih (Retd. on 31.10.2017)	Exams	06.01.2015	06.01.2016
91.	Sh. Parveen Kumar	Office of the DUI	05.01.2015	07.01.2016
92.	Sh. Rajinder Kumar	Colleges	05.01.2015	08.01.2016
93.	Mrs. Indu Thapliyal,	Conduct	12.01.2015	12.01.2016
94.	Mrs. Shashi Gupta,	Office of the DCDC	12.01.2015	13.01.2016
95.	Sh. Shashi Parkash Sharma	Accounts	18.03.2015	18.03.2016
96.	Sh. Sandeep Grover,	Exams	18.03.2015	19.03.2016
97.	Mrs. Suman Sharma	Youth Welfare	18.03.2015	20.03.2016
98.	Sh. Sanjeev Kumar Kamboj	General	21.04.2015	21.04.2016
99.	Sh. Puran Chand Thakur	Sociology	21.04.2015	22.04.2016

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Branch/ Department	Date of Appointment as Superintendent	Date of Confirmation
100.	Mrs. Sunita Rani,	Accounts	21.04.2015	23.04.2016
101.	Sh. Sandeep Arora	Conduct	09.05.2015	09.05.2016
102.	Sh. Gandharv Singh ( Retd on 31.03.2017)	C.O.E's Office	12.05.2015	12.05.2016
103.	Sh. Suresh Kumar	Public Administration	01.06.2015	01.06.2016
104.	Sh. Ram Nath alias Ram Singh	Estt.-I	02.06.2015	02.06.2016
105.	Mrs. Rani Mann	Re-evaluation	04.07.2015	04.07.2016
106.	Sh. Bachan Singh	R.T.I. Cell	04.07.2015	05.07.2016
107.	Sh. Bhumi Singh	Estate Cell	06.07.2015	06.07.2016
108.	Sh. Dharam Pal	Accounts	10.08.2015 (A.N.)	11.08.2016
109.	Mrs. Sunila Narang	Secrecy	09.09.2015	09.09.2016
110.	Mrs. Darshan Kaur	Exams	09.09.2015	10.09.2016
111.	Sh. Chaman Lal	Accounts	09.09.2015	11.09.2016
112.	Sh. Jagtar Singh	R & S	09.10.2015	09.10.2016
113.	Sh. Dinesh Deep Mehta	Exams	08.10.2015	10.10.2016
114.	Sh. Mahesh Kumar	CET	08.10.2015	11.10.2016

**RESOLVED FURTHER:-** That, for future, in order to look into the issue threadbare regarding confirmation of employees at the initial stage of their joining the service, the Vice Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Committee, the stakeholders be also taken into confidence before taking a final decision.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 13.06.2018**

**6.** Considered recommendations dated 13.06.2018 (**Appendix-V**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that:

- (i) the amount of Rs.80,000/- deposited by M/s Sudama Pariwar, Sports club, Mohali, for booking of Gymnasium Hall, P.U, for organizing veteran Badminton tournament namely Sudama Cup on 26, 27, 28 & 29 October, 2017, be refunded to them, as one time exemption; and

- (ii) In future any agency cancel the booking of any of the infrastructure which comes under the office Director of Sports, five days before the date of booking then the concerned agency will be refunded the booking charges after deducting 25% of the total amount, and if 10 days before the date of booking the agency will be refunded the booking charges after deducting 10% of the total charges.

**NOTE:** 1. Secretary, M/s Sudama Pariwar Sports Club vide letter dated 04.05.2017 (**Appendix-V**) had requested for booking of Gymnasium Hall for Badminton tournament on 26, 27, 28 & 29 October, 2017.

He was informed vide letter dated 22.05.2017 (**Appendix-V**) that the club had to deposit @ Rs.20,000/- per day in the Amalgamated fund as booking charges of Gymnasium Hall for the purpose. Accordingly, the amount of Rs.80,000/- was deposited by the Club vide receipt dated 03.06.2017(**Appendix-V**).

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.06.2017 (Para 21) had revised the rent of Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues of the P.U. and a circular in this regard was issued by the D.R. (Estate) vide dated 07.07.2017 (**Appendix-V**).
3. Director, Physical Education & Sports, vide letter dated 09.09.2017 (**Appendix-V**) had informed Secretary, M/s Sudama Club about the revision in rates of Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues of the P.U. and requested to deposit the balance amount of Rs.1,20,000/-.
4. M/s Sudama Pariwar Sports Club, Mohali, vide letter 14.09.2017 (**Appendix-V**) had requested to refund the deposited money.
5. The audit had made the following observation:

‘that there are no rules/regulations for refund of Booking Charges of Gymnasium

Hall and refund cannot be made on the basis of refund policy of Community Centre. It is therefore advised that the Rules for refund of Booking Charges of

Gymnasium Hall be got framed from the Competent Authority and the then put up to the audit’.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that M/s Sudama Pariwar, Sports club, Mohali got booked the Gymnasium Hall, but before the booking date, they changed the rules and enhanced the rent. Then they got the booking cancelled. So, in such a situation, if somebody has deposited the money that needs to be refunded.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that M/s Sudama Pariwar, Sports club, Mohali has got booked the Badminton Hall for a period of four days @ of Rs.20,000/- per day and deposited a sum of Rs.80,000/- according to rates prevalent at that time. But in the meantime, they enhanced the rates to Rs.50,000/- per day, so rates cannot be implemented retrospectively. They should not ask for the enhanced rates from them. It is a mistake which occurred on their part. Now, they are asking them to deposit a sum of Rs.1,20,000/- more, which is not right. They have deposited the money in June and the function was scheduled in July 2017. Now, they have not any other option but to refund the money as they did not use the Gymnasium Hall. It is a lapse on the part of the Department and it should be dealt with only at that time. In the month of September 2017, they were asking them to deposit the enhanced money even when they had not used the Gymnasium Hall. The date of the event has already passed. This is very unfortunate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Mahli said that they have to look into two basic things. One is whether the entire amount is to be refunded to them or the 90% is to be refunded.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that first they committed one mistake followed by other.

Continuing, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they have to see that the rules which are applicable to other halls should also be applicable to the Sports Department. They have to take these two decision.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to give some more information on the issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that deduction from the principal amount is not possible at all, rather they could ask to refund their money with interest as this case is pending since 2017. The money is lying with them. They cannot change the rules once the game has started. Suppose, they get some accommodation booked in Delhi and after some days the agency demand from them to deposit a sum of Rs. 2 lacs more which was not applicable on that date, which is not fair.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the issue of refund of entire amount is resolved and he do agree with it. But the second question is that they should adopt the rules which are applicable to other auditoria.

Shri Navdeep Goyal asked which are the rules?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there are no such rules.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said though there are no rules for this hall, but there are rules for other auditoria. That is why the audit has pointed out to frame rules. Now the Committee headed by Professor Emanuel Nahar has suggesting that the Sports Department should adopt the rules as are applicable to other auditoria. They should adopt those and they agree with it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that rules have been made for refund of the amount.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to have more deliberation on the issue.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that with the amount of Rs. 2 lacs they would be able to conduct the whole badminton tournament. So, they should refund the entire amount.

Professor Ronki Ram said that after the booking is done, they should be told clearly about the rules. But after revising the rates, they are asking them to deposit the enhanced money. But instead of depositing the money, they rather preferred to ask for refund of the entire amount. So, in this case the rules of deduction do not apply which mention that if the accommodation is cancelled before 5 days of booking, then the concerned agency will be refunded the booking charges after deducting 25% of the total amount and if 10 days before the date of booking, the agency will be refunded the booking charges after deducting 10% of the total charges. This would be applicable only if the client requests to cancel the booking. But in this cases, it is not so. Rather Sports Department has asked for the enhanced amount from him. He requested that the rules of refund applicable to other auditoria should be applicable here also, this was also endorsed by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they agree with the recommendation of Nahar Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that by deciding so, the problem would not be solved. If they go through the last para, this item has come to the Syndicate keeping in view the objection of the audit. They have to take the decision keeping in view audit objection which says that in the absence of any refund rules, the money cannot be refunded. Now, how in the absence of such rules, they can take the decision. If the Vice Chancellor is not competent, then how the Syndicate/Senate is competent to do. So, here they will have to give the reasoning. In the instant case, since the rates were hiked after the booking was done and there was no such clause while booking that these rents to be charged will be, subject to change from time to time by the competent authority till the date of use. Since the booking clause did not mention any such thing, the University was not in a position to enforce the enhanced rent and these applicants are very much in their right to withdraw the booking and ask for refund keeping in view the peculiar circumstance of the case. The Syndicate has taken the decision to refund the whole amount of Rs. 80,000/-. This is one part which relates to audit objection. As far as the other part is concerned, that is only about the refund rules to be applicable in future. If there are already rules for other halls and not for gymnasium hall, that should be seen if it practically possible to implement the same rules for gymnasium hall also. Mostly, the booking in the gymnasium hall is done for sports only. If it comes in the line of other auditorium, then it is okay, otherwise if there are some other specific requirements, these rules could be made applicable by supplementing rules which are relevant to the gymnasium hall. For that they have to take into confidence the Department of Sports. So, the resolved part should be made in two parts that is, one, the entire money deposited by the agency be refunded to them and other part should be the refund rules which should be made applicable to the gymnasium hall.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Committee has recommended to refund the money.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Syndicate is the competent authority for this purpose.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members are saying that this hall is being used for so many other purposes and not only for the sport activities.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the University Convocation is also held in this hall.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now it is being used for many other purposes and not only for sports. This is to be seen for what purpose it has been constructed. Tomorrow, they would start it for solemnizing marriages. They have to see for what purpose the fund was received and



for what purpose it could be used. If they are using it for some other purpose or would like to use it for other purposes to raise revenue, whatever it is, then he thinks, that should be done by incorporating in the rules. The problem arose from the time, when the convocation was started to be conducted in the gymnasium. There is no provision to hold the convocation in the gymnasium hall. He remembered that when it was allowed for the first time, there was great hue and cry by the Sports Department. They pointed out that it would spoil the whole flooring. Though that hue and cry is still there, but it is reducing now. Now nobody cares for the flooring. The purpose for which it was made, it was not used for that, rather it is being used for other purposes. That also needs to be relooked into. If it is felt that it being used wrongly, then it should be stopped.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has to be looked into.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier the flooring was made with cement, but now wooden flooring is done.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should not be used for every purpose.

Shri Ashok Goyal informed that from 1988 till 1992, the counting of votes of Senate election was being done by General Branch in its hall, but for the first time in 1992, the counting was done in the Gymnasium Hall. They made a great hue and cry that their infrastructure would be damaged. But in the 2016, the counting was shifted to the newly built Examination Hall.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members as to what has to be done. The full refund of amount has been approved by them and regarding refund rules, it needs to be looked into. The Vice Chancellor further asked as to what they suggest for the refund rules for future. The Vice Chancellor asked the members as to what has been done to remove the audit objection to which the members said that it has already been resolved.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what Shri Goyal has suggested that should be made a part of the resolved part as such and the refund rules which have been recommended by the Committee be also adopted and made applicable for future.

The Vice Chancellor asked the member, do they mean to constitute a Committee for this purpose.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a Committee could be constituted for all the purposed including the use of gymnasium hall by associating 2-3 main members from Sports Department.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should give some discretion to the Vice Chancellor if they make everything rule bound, it would become difficult.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that they should not go beyond what the Committee has recommended and they should accept it.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that earlier the rate was Rs.20,000/- per day, but it has been increased by 2½ times.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it would enhance the income of the University.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it would also reduce the booking of the Gymnasium Hall.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there would not be any problem of booking. If the gymnasium hall is booked for other purposes frequently, the students practice for sports

activities would affect badly. The enhancement in booking rates was done with this purpose in mind.

Professor Ronki Ram suggested that they should recommend that the Gymnasium Hall should be used only for sport activities/indoor games. If it is to be used for any other purpose, special permission from the Vice Chancellor should be sought.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to see to it that when they charge money for advance booking, whether the service tax is taken from them. It was informed that it is GST.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that Shri Ashok Goyal means to say that if they have taken the GST, then how it is to be refunded.

Shri Ashok Goyal has said that if they have taken the advance booking money, then they must have taken the GST. He further said that the rules made for booking various halls, these are the rules of their University. In these rules, somewhere service tax is mentioned whereas at some places it is not mentioned. Is it their discretion?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that Rs. 12000/- has been taken as GST on this amount and that amount must have been deposited. So, how it could be refunded.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the service might not have been taken as it is to be generated on the actual bill which is perhaps not generated because the money was taken as advance.

Dr. Amit Joshi enquired whether the GST was introduced in the year 2017.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that it is clearly mentioned that a sum of Rs. 12000/- has already been deposited.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the GST is charged on the actual bill which has not been generated.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that it has been written on page 46 of the agenda papers that an amount of Rs. 12000/- has already been deposited on account of GST.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they should refund the amount after deducting Rs. 12000/- deposited as GST.

The members endorsed the view point expressed by Dr. Amit Joshi.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that service tax means GST. In some cases it has been mentioned whereas in others it has not been mentioned. For example, at page 44 of the agenda papers, it has not been mentioned at No. 3.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that service tax is applicable on all auditoria/grounds etc., but the same has not been mentioned against each which needs to be corrected.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if is so, then they do not approve the chart of rents annexed with the item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the chart is old one and it needs to be corrected.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that here this chart is placed before them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this chart is old and it relates to June 2017. This has been approved, but it has to be corrected.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal said, then they should not say, whatever has been received, is correct.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members that their query was regarding GST on all the auditoria and grounds etc. It would be looked into.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have to minus the GST while refunding the amount.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha enquired if it is to be made applicable on the grounds also.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if they are providing service to anyone, the GST has to be taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that while framing the refund rules, they have to mention in those rules clearly that if the booking is cancelled five days before the booking date, 25% of the principal amount would be deducted, and if 10 days before 10% would deducted plus any tax applicable would also be deducted. This has to be mentioned in the rule.

The Vice Chancellor said that the F.D.O. would look into it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that GST should not be deposited until the auditorium is not used.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the GST is generated on the actual bill, but here it is an advance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that actually they should not deposit the tax until the auditorium is not used.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they cannot decide as to when the tax is to be deposited. If they have deducted TDS, it is not their will as to when it is to be deposited.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could take the advance.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they deposit the tax after providing the service, then it is okay. If it is so, then they should amend their rule that the tax would not be deposited until the service is provided.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it is job of the Finance & Development Officer, so let him do his job.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that F.D.O. has to do the job according to the decision of the Syndicate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that these are the laws of the government.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is because of the laws of the government that an objection has been raised by the audit on it. He was of the view that rules should be clear. He feels that if the rules of the government are clear, then this item should not have come to them.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is very clear about the GST that when they actually generate the bill, GST would be applicable and it has to be deposited upto 20<sup>th</sup> of next month. For example, all the bills generated in the month of September, GST on them would have to be deposited by 20<sup>th</sup> of October. If they have generated any bill, then they have no liability.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that they should name it as 'advance booking charges'.

The Vice Chancellor said if they do like this, then there would be no question of tax.

It was informed (by the F.D.O.) that in the University the instance of transaction are very scattered. As a measure of caution, as there are very heavy penalty of GST, if they give some leverage to someone to deposit the GST upto use of the auditoria etc. it would create a great problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the amount of tax could be taken from the user in advance.

It was informed (by the F.D.O) that after taking the GST amount, they deposit it immediately.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know as to how they could generate the bill when he has not used the auditoria.

It was informed (by the F.D.O) that they can generate the bill. It is their contract with the user.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the bill is generated, then the GST is payable and it has become their liability. That is why he is saying that amount to the tune of 25% or 10% plus service tax would not be refunded. It should be included in the rules so that the user should be aware that if he cancels the booking, such amount would be deducted.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said when the bill is generated, they have to deposit the tax.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if someone has got the booking done and they have deducted 18% GST and after that he cancels the booking, then the University could stop to deposit the GST.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what F.D.O. is saying, that is right.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations dated 13.06.2018 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor be approved as under:

- (i) the amount of Rs.80,000/- deposited by M/s Sudama Pariwar, Sports club, Mohali, for booking of Gymnasium Hall, P.U, for organizing veteran Badminton tournament namely Sudama Cup on 26, 27, 28 & 29 October, 2017, be refunded to them, as one time exemption after deducting GST; and
- (ii) In future, if any agency cancels the booking of any of the infrastructure which comes under the office Director of Sports, five days before the date of booking then the concerned agency will be refunded the booking charges after deducting 25% of the total amount, and if 10 days before the date of booking the agency will be refunded the booking charges after deducting 10% of the total charges.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That rules for booking, refund and use of various auditoria, seminar halls, lawns and other venues on the University campuses be framed and the same would be made applicable on the Gymnasium Hall with the liberty to make minor changes keeping in view the special status of the building.

**Guidelines with regard to Child Care Leave to the University employees.**

**7.** Considered minutes dated 17.07.2018 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to look into the recommendations of the Sub-Committee dated 10.07.2018

**(Appendix-)** to issue clear cut guidelines with regard to Child Care Leave to the University employees.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.03.2015 (Para 9) **(Appendix-VI)** while approving the minutes dated 16.01.2015 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to prepare Regulations/ Rules for adoption of 'Child Care Leave' to the University female employees (teaching and non-teaching) in principle had also resolved that a Committee consisting of Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean University Instruction; Professor Nandita Singh and Professor Rajesh Gill would examine/made necessary corrections in the wording of the proceeding of the Committee as well as *pro forma* appended with the proceeding.

It was further resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to approve the minutes after modifications, on behalf of the Syndicate and it be placed before the Syndicate in one of its meeting as an Information Item.

2. The above recommendations of the Syndicate were approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 29.03/26.04.2015 (Para XXII) **(Appendix-VI)**.
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.08.2016 during General Discussion (No.1) **(Appendix-VI)** agreed to on the suggestions of Dr. Ajay Ranga, that instead of during examinations, the Child Care Leave should be admissible for preparation of examinations and to take care of the child and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision which was supported by the members.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the clear-cut guidelines would be issued.

4. Pursuant to the General Discussion mentioned under note 3, a Committee met under the Chairmanship of DUI on 27.12.2016 and the office was asked to circulate the DOPT guidelines to all the Committee members and decided to meet again to discuss the issue.
5. The Committee again met on 09.02.2017 and constituted a Sub-Committee to frame the draft policy for Child Care Leave.

6. The Sub-Committee in its meeting dated 10.07.2018, considered the existing CCL, Rule **(Appendix-VI)** of Panjab University, DoPT guideline for CCL, Central Govt. Rules for CCL and given its recommendation.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that whatever is mentioned is illegal.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they see the decision, it is very strange.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that 'strange' is a right word.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that in this recommendation there no instructions of the government. There is provision of only 15 days earned leave and that too can be availed of only for two times. He further clarified that as per the Child Care rule, 15 days earned leave is deducted.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it is for the male employees only.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that, being a member from the elected constituency, before giving a benefit to the employee, they have to think whether the University would run properly or not. The Punjab Government has adopted the CCL and 99.9 decisions of the Punjab Government are adopted by the University and corporations, but the old corporations have not adopted the CCL because they are not in a position to do this. In the Government departments, there is good number of employees and if out of those 5-10 people go on leave, it does not make much difference and the work does not suffer. As far as the University is concerned, it is directly related to teaching. He, being in the Education Department, in spite of a decision of Punjab Government regarding CCL, they used to reject 99% of the applications. He pointed out that in the recommendations, they have also mentioned male. He said that they should see the members of Sub-Committee, incidentally he is does not belong to anyone. They all belong to the University. They are interested party. He read out some portion of the minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee Page 52 of the agenda, which states, "the Committee considered the existing Child Care Leave (CCL) Rules of Panjab University, DoPT guidelines for CCL, Punjab Government, Central Government Rules for CCL". The whole material from those rules which suits them have been mentioned here. They should either adopt the Punjab Government rules or Central Government rules or DoPT. Moreover at point No. 4 page 51 of the agenda papers, it has been written that 'in case both husband and wife are employees of Panjab University, then the Child Care Leave will be admissible to either of them, one at a time, subject to the limit of maximum upto 2 years (730 days)'. Suppose the husband and wife both are working in the University, it means two years leave would be taken by both of them separately. He is not against it. If they have two thousand non-teaching employees, on the day it is adopted, three thousand persons would go on leave. It is not practically possible.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that besides that they have been making lot of hue and cry regarding High Court cases, rules of Government of India, or regarding shortage of funds. Salaries of teachers would not be paid etc.etc., why such a hue and cry. If they are so rich as to allow people to go on 2 years, they have four months of leave in a year for teachers. This is too much, who will pay for this. If somebody outside the University is going to pay, he has no objection. But if the University is going to pay, they cannot afford to pay to make the person to sit idle at home. Child care is meant for everybody, it is meant for him and it is meant for Vice Chancellor also, it is not only for the teachers.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said the office in which Shri Prabhjit Singh is working, people do take leave when their ward reaches in +2 class. They give leave when the child attains the age of 18 years. The application keeps on lying in the office and they do not give leave to anybody.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said, let they should assume that a Principal is having only one teacher of a subject and he wants Child Care Leave, how the Principal would run the college.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is a noting at page 71 of the agenda where it is written, it has been decided to remove the requirement of minimum period of 15 days. On the same page it is clear in point number 3 which states, 'it is reiterated that the leave is to be treated like Earned Leave and sanctioned as such'.

Shri Prabhjit Singh and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is written that it should be treated like earned leave, but it is not deducted from the earned leave.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is written very clearly that it cannot be deducted from any leave.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said, that is why the those people who have earned leave and medical leave in their credit, they are not taking earned leave because after retirement, they want to get money. The employees take Child Care Leave even if they are not in need of it. He has not seen anywhere where Child Care Leave is given to male employees, but here male employees have also been included.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the biggest flaw in these recommendations is that how they can afford to give this leave to the male employees.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should appreciate the work done by the Committee.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if he says that an IPS retired who is member of the Syndicate, he should be given pension, is it right?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that should not accept those things where the Committee has gone beyond the rules of the government. The Committee has said, considered the existing Child Care Leave rules of Panjab University, DoPT guidelines, Punjab Government and Central Government for CCL. If these things are available in these rules, then why not they should give the benefits to the employees of Panjab University also. Some day they could say that they have not money, so they should reduce the salary of employees. So, they should not go into all that. But whatever is available, as per government instructions, that benefit should be given to their teachers as also to the non-teaching employees. If Child Care Leave is there for male employees, that should be given to which the Vice Chancellor said that it is not there in the government rules. Professor Malhotra then said, that if it is not there, it could be excluded. There are single parent cases who help the child and they should do it. It is a Child Care Leave and it is not only the duty of the women to take care of the child, it is also the duty of a male.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said if there is single parent, the provision for Child Care Leave for him can be considered. He would just giving one input which has not been given by the Committee. This is his suggestion only. It would be granted in the case of single parent, otherwise not.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that first of all they should understand that there is a difference between Maternity Leave and Child Care Leave. These are two different things. It is also there in the LTC rules that if both husband and wife are serving, both of them cannot claim the LTC.

They have to give a certificate that either of them will get the Child Care Leave. So, she said that she disagrees with two things that it should not be given to male employees. But she agrees that if there is a single parent or if the family situation could be considered thoroughly, in such cases the leave could be considered for male employee. They should consider such things where the children has to be dropped for tuition classes etc. etc. They should not refuse the leave to male employees blindly. He said that she is totally disagrees with the idea that the child care is totally the responsibility of the mother. She is totally disagrees with this concept. It is a family and it is the responsibility of both father and mother. They are reinforcing something which is gender bias.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they should not say that both could claim leave for 2 years each. It cannot be four years.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said only one person either mother or father would claim the leave.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he has talked out of his practical experience, whosoever is doing this, he is doing wrong.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that this issue is a bit complex. This is not an issue which could be passed immediately. He suggested that a sub-committee should be formed which should read each and every rule and only after that it could be implemented.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to read page 90 of the agenda and then say something.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that by and large the purpose behind adopting these rules by the Central Government or various other government was that theirs is a family oriented society and not an individual oriented. So, this was done for the employees, specially for the female employees so that they come in jobs, participate in the economic activities, take care of their family. Most of the females do not join the job thinking what would happen to their children. So, just to encourage the female talent to participate in the nation building. This CCL was started keeping in view this big objective. So, if the talk in lighter vein, it is not correct. So, they should understand the purpose behind it. He is specially talking in the of female, they should understand the situation. If they think that they are not having enough money to pay or how the University would run, they should not think like this. They should think that the nation is running. They would like to involve the 50% population in the nation building. How the female population would involve in this. They cannot say that they should leave the family. They all have families, they all have mothers. So, they should adopt the Child Care Leave so they should whatever benefit they could give to their female employees so that they could take care of their children. Suppose, a child falls ill, for the University authorities, the university work could be important, but for her, her child is important. How they can ask her to surrender her salary or job, but the University work should run? If she does not come for 15 days, which heaven is going to fall in 15 days. They should understand all these concerns. So, he is totally in favour of adopting the CCL leaves. They should only think whether they have to adopt the Punjab Government rules or the Central Government rules. This can be considered. He also endorsed the view point of Shri Prabhjit Singh and Dr. Ameer Sultana that where there is single parent, he should also be given this leave because the child is equally important for him. Even if the family conditions are such, then anyone of the two could have the CCL. They have to give some flexibility and they cannot be so rigid. They should not say that this cannot be done. It has also been recommended by the Central Pay Commission. The University as well as the governments are having sufficient funds. The families of the employees are equally important. If her family and children remain alright, she would be able to do work properly. But in case her child is not well, she would not do any work, then what they could do.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he hundred percent agrees what Dr. Subhash Sharma has said. The Central Government has made CCL for female employees and he is sure that while



taking this decision, the discussion must have been there about the male employees also. To start with, they have done as has been rightly explained about the female participation in nation building and their handicap should at the minimum, so it should be done. It is also very good that they are in Panjab University and the Panjab University is much more progressive than the thinking the people have in the government. By overstepping, they are saying that once they are adopted, then let them should do it for the male employees also. The idea is very good, but at the same time, he thinks, that they should start only with what the government has done. If in a fix to grant this leave to the male employees, would they deprive the female employees also from this benefit? So, for the female employees, they should see whether to adopt Panjab Government rules or Central Government rules.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said CCL is already being given to the female employees which was also supported by many other members. Much has happened in this case but it is not being given. Had that been the case, then the item should have been that the CCL is already being given to the female and the item should have been to consider to include males.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that one of their colleague has availed this leave for six months.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that leave is being given to the non-teaching employees (female) also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has seen recommendation of the Committee. Some difficulties are there as the clear-cut guidelines are not there. That is why the Committee was constituted.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that some problems have been coming up at the level of audit such as they need documents relating to the examination was held, when the result was declared etc. etc.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when this was passed here and authorized the Vice Chancellor, this was discussed at that time. The audit asks about whether the examination was held on the date of leave. Examination also means that if the examination is on 11<sup>th</sup>, the mother will take leave from 1st, but the audit did not accept it. He (Vice Chancellor) would be surprised that these things were discussed here and it was said that these things should be clarified, then it was said at that time that they will see to it. Now the same thing is coming back. That is why, he said that let them should not leave it to the officials who face the difficulty later on in the absence of clear cut guidelines. This Committee was made for that. But they recommended that the leave should also be given to the male employees. The spirit which Dr. Ameer Sultana has mentioned about, for that a separate Committee could be constituted as to how to extend the benefit which is available to female employees to the males also. All different aspects of this issue could also be discussed. The guidelines for which the Committee has been made, at least they should clear those guidelines that the examination means, 10 or 15 days before examination as if the maternity leave is given for three months, there is no date from which it is to be given. Some may go one month before or some may go two months before the delivery. If somebody says to show the certificate for delivery as the maternity leave is not to be availed on the day of delivery. The audit says that examination means, the day of examination. So, it was said earlier by him that such things should be made amply clear that where the leave is applied for her child who is appearing in the examination and according to the date the examination would continue for fifteen days. The date sheet is not available and the examinations are to continue for fifteen days. The audit says that date sheet should be shown to them and they would be given leave only for the days of examination. The audit says that if the actual examination is to be held on five days, then the leave would be given only for those five days and she would not be given any leave for the days lying in between the actual examination days. So, this Committee is constituted to clarify all these things. Whatever the Committee has done, it is a very good work, what there are certain other problems cropping up which the Committee has also taken into consideration. There are cases

where the female employee may not be taking care of the child and in such cases the husband may say that his wife does not take care of the child and even then she is availing leave.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to listen to the Finance & Development Officer in this regard.

It was informed (by the F.D.O.) that when the CCL rules were framed, very harsh provision were included. There is no confusion in it and these provisions were included very consciously. The rules framed by the Panjab University are more harsher than the Central Government rules. In the Central Government rules, it is very clearly mentioned and the word 'during examination' is written. But they have included in the rule, the words, 'only for the examination period'. So, there was lot of resentment. They have desired that the University should in line their rules as per the government rules. The additions which have been made are aberrations.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that in case 2-3 applications for grant of CCL are received in a department, the preference should be given to a single mother having single girl child.

Professor Keshav Malhotra endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Inderpal Singh Sandhu.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan was of the view that these leave rules should be made amply cleared so that there should not be any confusion.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that some ambiguities have left and due to that the people are facing problems. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to form a Committee for this purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the members that in order to conclude the issued what would they want to do?

Shri Prabhjit Singh suggested that the Panjab University should adopt the Punjab Government Policy in respect of CCL rules in toto. They adopt the Punjab Government rules for grant of Casual leave and not of Central Government. This would create a confusion. If they adopt the Punjab Government rules for everything, then there would not be any confusion. He further requested to adopt the Punjab Government policy for Child Care Leave to Panjab University employees. In this way, there would not be any problem.

The Vice-Chancellor concluded by saying that as per their opinion, they are adopting the Punjab Government rules for CCL, in future. The Vice-Chancellor further asked the members whether they are agree to it, the members nodded in the affirmative and it was endorsed by all the members in one voice. The Vice-Chancellor further requested the members to think about the suggestion put forth by Professor Keshav Malhotra regarding extending the benefit of CCL to male employees and also the issue to give priority to the mother of single girl child etc.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that provision of CCL for male employees is not available in Government rules. They could be the innovators of new ideas only if they are financially well off. The Government of India as well private companies are also not giving CCL to male employees. The kind of situation what Dr. Ameer Sultana has pointed out is everywhere though one is postman or police man or a company employee. It is not happening only to teachers.

Professor Keshav Malhotra informed that 15 days paternity leave is admissible to the male of the University.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is talking about the practical difficulties in its implementation as to how this benefit would be extended to the colleges also. He also pointed out that some colleges are not even giving maternity leave. He again suggested that the Panjab Government rules with regard to CCL should be followed in toto.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they plunge in the net of words. If this item is not passed, it would mean the CCL would not be given to the male employees. This benefit would be given to male employees only if they approve this item. They do not want to shut the doors for male employees for ever. These innovative ideas should always be open and as and when after taking paternity leave, they should also see as to after how many years the paternity leave is granted. The situation may come when they may think of CCL for male employees. It is not right to say no. Let they should discuss for future, but as of today, they are not in a position to approve the CCL benefit to male employees. Thus the Committee was constituted to issue clear cut issues with regard to Child Care Leave to the University employees keeping in view Punjab Government rules should be made clear. He does not know whether the CCL is not given 'during examination' days and it is given 'on the examination days', and if it does seem to us that it is ambiguous, then they should not say that they should adopt the rules in toto. Then they have to clarify in their rules by adding the word 'during examination'. The basic structure for this should that of Punjab Government, but the language should be in such a way that there is no ambiguity. That should be resolved. He said that he and Shri Prabhjit Singh would also help the University in this regard.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should remove the ambiguities.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Shri Prabhjit Singh in a lighter vein has pointed out that some colleges do not give even maternity leave, but 15 minutes prior, he has himself said that the University should adopt the Punjab Government rules but they themselves do not give CCL to their employees.

Shri Prabhjit Singh clarified that if the leave is not granted there is reason behind it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this leave is not normally given by the Punjab Government, but the rules should be clear.

At this point of time Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu pointed out that the circular regarding paternity leave has not been sent to the affiliated colleges. He requested the Vice Chancellor to advise the Dean College Development Council to issue this circular at the earliest.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Dean College Development Council to issue the circular as desired by Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu.

**RESOLVED:** That the rules for grant of Child Care Leave framed by Punjab Government be followed in letter and spirit for the University employees.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the Vice Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Committee to sort out the practical difficulties arising while implementing the above rules so that there is no ambiguity.

### **Item Nos.C-8 and C-11 were taken up together for consideration.**

**Request of Dr. Resham Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi (temporary basis), from one Constituent College**

**8.** Considered request dated nil of Dr. Resham Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi (temporary basis), with regard to his transfer from Shaheed Udham Singh, P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Sahai Distt. Ferozepur to Baba Balraj P.U., Constituent College, Balchaur.

**NOTE:** The University has framed a policy of transfer of faculty within the P.U. System, according to which, it has been decided that it is not advisable to transfer the faculty from one place to other. In case, a person appointed at an Institute/place in Panjab University wants to move to another Institute/Place in Panjab University, he/she has to apply for that Institute/place in Panjab University and compete with other applicant in open selections and at the time of interview his/her application should be considered, strictly on merit, without any bias. A copy of circular No. 8836-8936/Estt. I dated 26.8.2016 issued by D.R. Estt-I is enclosed.

**Request of Ms Monika, Assistant Professor in Commerce (temporary), from one Constituent College to another**

**11.** Considered if, Ms. Monika, Assistant Professor in Commerce (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, be transferred from PUCC, Nihal Singh Wala to Baba Balraj P.U. C.C., Balachaur on the humanitarian grounds.

- NOTE:** 1. A copy of letter dated 03.05.2018 received from Superintendent, Department of Higher Education, Education-I Branch forwarding therewith the request of Ms. Monika is enclosed.
2. The University has framed a policy of transfer of faculty within the P.U. System, according to which, it has been decided that it is not advisable to transfer the faculty from one place to other. In case, a person appointed at an Institute/place in Panjab University wants to move to another Institute/Place in Panjab University, he/she has to apply for that Institute/place in Panjab University and compete with other applicant in open selections and at the time of interview his/her application should be considered, strictly on merit, without any bias. A copy of the circular No.8836-8936 dated 26.08.2016 is enclosed.
3. Both the Principals of the constituent Colleges were requested to give their comments on the issue vide orders No.4350/Estt. I dated 15.06.2018.

Accordingly, the Principal, Baba Balraj PUCC, Balachaur vide email dated 01.07.2018 has written that "he has no objection if the representation of Ms. Monika is considered for transfer as the workload

exist to accommodate the candidate in this College.

Principal PUCC, Nihal Singh Wala, vide e-mail dated 17.07.2018 has recommended and forwarded the case of transfer of Ms. Monika from PUCC Nihal Singh Wala (Moga) to Balachaur on humanitarian grounds.

4. An office note is enclosed.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that Item No. C-8 and C-11 are similar, but only the names are different and so they could be taken up together.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said these items are not covered under the rules.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan, however, said that these items are covered under the rules.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should see to it thoroughly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if this item is not covered under the rules, then why it was brought here.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they talk about the rules, a Committee was formed and the Committee recommended something, which was not been approved by the Syndicate, however it was approved by the Vice Chancellor to be placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor requested to see as to how it has come to the Syndicate and asked the members to see page 99 of the agenda.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the rule about which they are talking is in respect of transfer of regular employees. He informed that in the Constituent Colleges, only the Principal is a regular employees and all others are temporary or guest faculty. Similar is the case in respect of non-teaching employees as some of them are on temporary basis and others on daily wages basis. The rules of which they are talking were actually made for the regular employees. The case under Item No. 11 had also come earlier in the Syndicate. The case was discussed at that time also. There was one issue that the recommendation of both the Principals was not there. So, if there is any problem to one Principal if an employee leaves the college and the other College may not be having that subject and the Syndicate approves it, that would become a mockery. So for that reason it was argued that NOC from both the Principals is must and in the absence of this, the item could not be considered. This provision is in the case of contractual employees only and not for the regular employees. The temporary teachers, if they want to join the other college, they could compete as and when the regular posts are advertised as it is not necessary that the persons who are already working there could be appointed there on regular basis. In the absence of rules, Syndicate is the competent authority to allow or not to allow such transfer. So, to his mind and keeping in view the difficulties and also both the Principal do agree for their transfer, there is no problem in allowing their transfer.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to see page 229 of the agenda papers.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they do it, there would be nothing wrong. As for as he knows, that in both the cases, NOC is there, though the office has not mentioned it. If there is recommendation of both the Principals, then they should do it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if this is allowed, it would open a Pandora box. They have received such a request from Mr. Rajesh for transfer, but they did not allow him. As the transfer was not allowed, he left the job where he was getting a salary of Rs. 50,000/- and joined Department of Evening Studies as Guest Faculty on a meagre salary of Rs. 20-25 thousands. He said that if they want to allow such transfers, then a notice should be issued that whosoever has some approach or can do lobbying, his/her transfer could be done. He pointed out that earlier the transfer of one Mr. Negi was done which was also wrong and the PUTA has also took the same stand that transfer from P.U Regional Centres to Panjab University Campus is wrong. He had raised slogans in the well of the House against this transfer. If any transfer has to be done, it should be done with justice. If one is allowed, then all should be allowed. A notice should be put asking them their will about transfer. They should make a policy. But it should not happen if someone is allowed by the Principal for transfer even in the absence of any policy, he would get his work done and those who do not have any approach, their case would linger on. Such a thing has happened with Mr. Rajesh who has to leave the job.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to say something and added that there cannot be any pick and choose policy.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University has taken a decision that there is no transfer policy in the case of permanent employees. Is there any organisation in the world where there is transfer policy for contractual or temporary employees? There is no problem where there is a transfer policy. But here it is said that the Committee has recommended and the Vice Chancellor has approved it. They have, in principle, decided not to transfer permanent teachers, they are thinking of transferring temporary teachers. Can there be any such policy even if they want to do. Now, what is happening is that someone may send two persons to Ferozepur with the assurance that after six months he would bring them to the P.U. Campus. What type of this contract/adhoc employment? If the post is advertised for Ferozpur and the same falls vacant, then why a person from Chandigarh should go there? Why the post is not advertised again? If someone has joined at Ferozepur on adhoc/contract basis and due to some odd circumstances, he is not able to continue his job at Ferozepur, then he should leave the job as has been done by Mr. Rajesh. In a lighter vein he said that the transfer policy for contract/adhoc employees, to his mind, is a very innovative idea, but he has not seen this in the global system. Secondly, this is a transfer policy on request. He pointed out that the colleges have appointed teachers on contract/temporary basis and they themselves got transferred those persons to Chandigarh. The persons were transferred here without any request from them. He had been raising this point as to under which policy, exigency, administrative reason or this and that, they were transferred. Now, he (Vice Chancellor) told him (Shri Ashok Goyal) to see page 99 of the agenda papers where the former Vice Chancellor is saying "strongly recommended" and take it to Syndicate. His simple query is that when there are no rules in place, then why it has been brought to the Syndicate. The irony of the situation is that what is not within anybody's powers is brought to Syndicate, indirectly meaning that whatever is illegal is to be got done and let the Syndicate be held responsible. At least they cannot become party. So, he does not know any A,B,C. He knows that (DVD-3 T-1) tomorrow people will blame him the item would have gone through and why he has opposed it. But he is not anyone to oppose it. But, what he is saying is that they should make a transparent policy which should be in the public domain, whosoever is covered under that policy, let an opportunity be given to them to apply. Whosoever is covered under that policy, transfer should be allowed but not by pick and choose like what Professor Keshav Malhotra has pointed out. He has named a particular person. He was transferred without any policy from Regional Centre to P.U. Campus. At that time, it was also said that a transfer policy is not there and so it should be made. It was decided that the transfer of the person be done and for future a policy be made. After doing his transfer, a policy was made that no transfer is allowed. They can dig out the record where it was written that this transfer is subject to the outcome of the transfer policy and if it is not covered as per the transfer policy, then he would have to go back.

But if his transfer is allowed as per the transfer policy, then his transfer would be endorsed. So, they should avoid such a thing and it should be looked into in the light of the decision which had been taken at that time.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he would like to discuss this particular case. It is very obvious and do not think that they need to reinvent the wheel now. If a policy is there, it could be for any regular or temporary employee. Now the point is that if a person is recruited for particular place 'B' where is certain amount of completion. Now if they want to transfer him to place 'A' where the competition is much higher. So obviously by getting recruited at a simpler place where the completion was nil, the cannot transfer him conveniently by transferring to another place. So, they should not agree with this transfer otherwise they would be cheating everybody else who would apply for place A. He has to apply for place 'A' and compete with hundred other candidates. So, the policy is there and they do not need to make a policy again. If they do it, a logic would come that earlier they have done it. The fact that earlier they committed a delinquency earlier, it does not mean that they should continue to do that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the University has issued some instructions that for the constituent college, the transfer could be done from one college to another. In the case of constituent colleges, it is not there that the appointment would be made only for a particular constituent college. But when these persons were appointed, their appointment was made college-wise, but later on, rather the University has made a policy that employees of one constituent college could be transferred to another constituent college. It is not only applicable to teachers or non-teachers but also for Principals.

Professor Ronki Ram said that a Committee for the purpose was made and he was a member of that Committee. In that Committee it was felt that there was problem and how to tackle this problem. They are having Regional Centres at Ludhiana, Muktsar, Kauni and Hoshiarpur and also constituent colleges. In that Committee it was decided that all the constituent colleges should be considered a unit and if anybody from these colleges would like to come to the University or from the University to these colleges, that is not possible. Because if he would like to come to the University, he would apply for the fresh appointment. So, it was decided that inter-university from the constituent colleges or Regional Centres is not possible. But in the case of constituent colleges, it was decided that the University would not transfer the persons at their own will, but if it is done on mutual basis, then it could be done because there is much distance in the colleges. So, anybody within the constituent colleges can apply for this. This was done as per the recommendations of that Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the post is advertised for constituent colleges, it is written there that the post is liable to be transferred within the constituent colleges. But there is nothing like this that they can apply for transfer.

Professor Ranki Ram said that the Committee was made later on.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee may have been made, but such rules have not been made.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that one thing is written here in the case of Monika Sharma (Item C-11, Page 228 of the agenda papers) that 'accordingly the transfer policy has been framed by the Syndicate' and its circular No. 8836-8936/Estt.1 dated 16.8.2016 was conveyed to Ms. Monika. But this circular is not available here. He requested that they should check whether such a transfer policy has been framed by the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra told the members that the circular is available at page 100 of the agenda papers.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that according to the transfer policy which was framed, it is written that transfer cannot be done. So, after giving the reference of this transfer policy, they said that they apply for transfer. He said that one thing he would tell the Vice Chancellor here as to what does mean the mutual transfer. Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi has enough know-how about the mutual transfer. He has also some experience about the mutual transfer. Generally, they treat the mutual transfer very lightly. Actually, this is to be probed in detail and depth. So, they should not approve the item like this.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan and Dr. Subhash Sharma said that virtually it is not a mutual transfer.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that mutual transfer means, mutual consent by two Principals.

Dr. Subhash Sharma while clarifying this said that mutual transfer means that one person is going to one college and the other person is coming to the college from where one person is going. On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal, Dr. Subhash Sharma said that here no person is coming to that college from where one person is going.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if one Principal has consented to relieve the teacher and the other Principal has consented to take that person, then the question is that they should ask the Principal who has consented to relieve that person as to why that teacher was engaged.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this is not like this. The present Principal has not appointed these persons. When the posts were advertised for the constituent colleges, let they should assume that he is a candidate and Balachaur station suits to him. He is teacher in the subject of English and he is NET qualified or Ph.D. he can go upto Balachaur and not to Sikhwala or Guru Harsahai. Suppose, he is rejected here as more person higher in merit were available, but he is selected as non-NET and non-Ph.D. in Guru Harsahai college. In both the colleges, merit is different. When the merit is different, this would be backdoor entry. Thus, all the teachers, after 2-3 years, would come to Balachaur because Balachaur is near to Chandigarh. They meet the members of the Syndicate and Senate and request them not to oppose their item. If this is allowed once, then all the teacher would come to Balachaur. Both these candidates want themselves to be transferred to Balachaur. As has been said by Professor Keshav Malhotra, the persons who have not approach, their applications were not even placed before the Syndicate and so they have to resign. They went to either to the Private colleges or joined in the Department of Evening Studies or they started working on part-time basis. This is a matter to be looked, but as such he does not know anybody and he has no objection if they want to do it. In future, its repercussions would be very bad. He suggested that in future also when they would recruit regular faculty, there is lot of difference between the merit of two places. Either they should advertise the posts together, but if they advertise the posts college-wise, then the transfer is not possible.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should see how the posts were advertised. If the advertisement was such that the posts are for the constituent college and after selection, the candidates could be posted anywhere, then the person could be transferred. But if the appointment is made for some particular constituent college, then the transfer could not be done in any case.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the office has also written the same thing.

Principal Anita Kaushal said that if it has been mentioned in the Advertisement that the post is for a particular college, then it cannot be transferred, but if the posts are advertised for filling the position in all the constituent colleges and it has been mentioned that after recruitment, they can be assigned any college, then it is transferable.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

The Vice Chancellor asked the view point of the members to which all the members said that their requests for transfer are not accepted.

At this stage some general discussion took place which has been made a part of the general discussion.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the request of Dr. Resham Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi (temporary basis), with regard to his transfer from Shaheed Udham Singh, P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai Distt. Ferozpur to Baba Balraj P.U., Constituent College, Balchaur, be **not** accepted.
- (ii) the request of Ms. Monika, Assistant Professor in Commerce (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, with regard to her transfer from PUCC, Nihal Singh Wala to Baba Balraj P.U. C.C., Balachaur, be **not** accepted.

**Enquiry Report  
submitted by Shri P.L.  
Ahuja, Enquiry Officer  
against Shri Balbir  
Singh, Superintendent,  
(USOL) (under  
suspension)**

**9.** Considered:

- (i) the enquiry Report (**Appendix-VII**) submitted by Shri P.L. Ahuja, Enquiry Officer against Shri Balbir Singh, Superintendent, University School of Open Learning (USOL) (under suspension), Panjab University, Chandigarh, be accepted.
- (ii) If the above enquiry Report is accepted the penalty to be imposed on the delinquent official- Shri Balbir Singh, Superintendent, University School of Open Learning (USOL) (under suspension), so that he be asked to explain his position as to why the penalty proposed may not be inflicted upon him.

**NOTE:** 1. As per rule 1.1 (II) appearing at page 74 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, the post of Superintendent held by Shri Balbir Singh, Superintendent, University School of Open Learning (USOL) is a Class A' post.

As per Regulation 3.1 (a) appearing at page 117 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the Senate is appointing authority of Class 'A' employees.

- 2. Regulation 3.3 appearing at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 speaks that the appointing authority shall be the punishing authority.

3. The minor and major penalties stand defined under rule 3 at page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
4. A detailed office note is enclosed **(Appendix-VII)**.

**RESOLVED:** That for taking a decision in respect of Shri Balbir Singh, Superintendent (under suspension), University School of Open Learning, the Enquiry Report be referred to the Senate, being 'A' Class Officer.

**Request of Dr. Suresh Sharma, Professor, Department of Statistics regarding taking over the**

**10.** Considered request dated 08.08.2018 of Dr. Suresh Sharma, Professor, Department of Statistics and Coordinator, Centre for Systems Biology & Bioinformatics, that he be allowed to take over the charge as Honorary Director, Population Research Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

- NOTE:**
1. Professor Suresh K. Sharma, Department of Statistics, PU, was appointed as Honorary Director of PRC vide letter No. 5799-5803/GP dated 15.03.2018 w.e.f. 01.04.2018 till further order.

In continuation of the earlier letter and revised orders No.6175-81/GP dated 27.03.2018 was issued that Professor Suresh K. Sharma's appointment shall be for the duration of three years w.e.f. 01.04.2018. In the meanwhile the Vice-Chancellor had ordered that the DUI to retain charge of Honorary Director, PRC as per present arrangement until further orders in view of the fake e-mail dated 27.06.2018.

2. Brief summary of the events related to the case is enclosed.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the request has been received from the concerned person.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the appointment has already been done.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that Dr. Suresh Sharma is a Professor in the Department of Statistics. He is requesting the ex-Vice Chancellor that he be made the Director of Population Research Centre. He wanted to know whether the Population Research Centre is related to science subjects or biology etc. or it is related to some arts subjects.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that Population Research Centre is related to both Science and Arts subjects. They have to collect the epidemiological data and also to do the statistical analysis and then comes the inference part which is taken by both.

Shri Prabhjit Singh wanted to know whether any circular has been issued asking the people to apply. Suppose, one person has requested to give charge of that Centre and that item is brought before the Senate or the Syndicate. At least it should be done that if the charge should be given to some senior-most Professor. He asked the Vice Chancellor if he knows the person. If any other person could do good work than him (Dr. Suresh Sharma) then he (Vice Chancellor) should check. There may be some other more competent person in the departments of Psychology or Sociology and also Dean like Professor Ronki Ram or some other senior Professor. But here the candidate is requesting himself.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the appointment of Dr. Suresh Sharma was already done, but after his appointment some mail was sent. So, his appointment was deferred and the charge was given to the Dean of University Instruction. Then a letter was received that the email was fake. So, he requested that since the email was fake, so he should be given the charge of P.R.C. Dr. Subhash Sharma reiterated that his appointment is already done.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is right what Dr. Subhash Sharma is saying. His appointment was already done and since a mail was received, so his appointment was put on hold.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that issue of fake mail is a serious one. It was enquired from the department and they said that they have not sent this mail. So, it is necessary to investigate this issue as to who has sent the mail to the University. It could be ascertained from the IP address of the computer as to from where the mail was sent. It could be known if they request the cyber crime department. The other issue is regarding the handing over of the charge of P.R.C. At most of the times, the charge of this Centre was given to the teachers of Sociology Department, but it is also not true that the charge was always given to Sociology Department, it was also given to the teachers of English Department and Statistics Department.

Dr. Ameer Sultana added that the charge was also given to teachers of Psychology Department.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that to give charge to someone is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor. Earlier, it is of the former Vice Chancellor and now it is the prerogative of the present Vice Chancellor and so he has to see to it now. He said that as members of the Syndicate, they would not like to do much interference in this matter. The Vice Chancellor could see to it as he deems fit. But the issue of fake mail should also be seen as to who is doing this mischief. If it has been done from the University, then they have to take a serious view of that.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that there are 2-3 issues in the agenda relating to this fake mail. It is very sorry state of affairs that a fake mail is sent in respect of a Professor and he was degraded. In such things manpower and resources are also used. He said in order to judge whether it is a fake Identity, to start the procedure, they should first demand an affidavit, it would help to establish the authenticity. If he gives the affidavit, then they should start the process. It would save their lot of efforts such use of manpower and resources.

Professor Ronki Ram said that there are two issues. As has been said by Professor Navdeep Goyal that the Director of P.R.C. should be close to the specialization of the Centre. It is correct that data is collected there in Operations Research. The work of statistics comes later on when the data has to be processed. Basically, the data which is collected with regard to population, it belongs to the departments of Sociology, Economics and Psychology, but mainly it of the Sociology Department. Mostly, the Directors have been from the Sociology Department. He does not go into the issue as to how a person of other department is made the

Director. As far as the Department of Statistics is concerned, he would say that Statistics is not that much connected to this Centre as that of Sociology Department. The issue of email is quite a separate issue. The University has got an email which was a fake email as has been said by Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Amit Joshi. That is a separate issue.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that in the last years lot of time of the Syndicate and Senate has been wasted on such issues. He suggested that a clear cut rule should be made that such letters may not be entertained without an affidavit from the concerned person. If they receive such type of mail, they should first verify it whether it is authentic or not. On some of the complaints, even the address or phone of the senders was also not mentioned. Sometimes the people used to write to the Vice President or the President. So, he suggested that before taking any action, they should first verify it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that as regard the issue of fake email, they need not to take any cognizance of such mails until and unless some affidavit is not given by the concerned person because such a mail is otherwise unauthorized as they do not know on whose complaint they are taking action. As regards the second issue, he would like to say that he does not know any person whether someone belongs to Statistics Department or Sociology, but the Population Research Centre without statistics is nothing. The implementation comes later on, first they have to do everything in the design of the study as to what is the power of study, how much sample size is required. So, just to claim the post for any department, somehow it was existing in that department, it is not justified. He thinks it is for Statistics also as it may be important for some other departments. The Population Research Centre may be in the field of medical sciences, it may be in the field of animal sciences.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that basically it was in the Department of Sociology and by and large the teachers from Sociology have been chairing this Centre. This trend is running for the last 40 years. He said that the Vice Chancellor should enquire about it from some other places and after using his own wisdom, take a decision.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they authorize the Vice Chancellor to take a decision on this issue.

Continuing, Dr. Subhash Sharma said that whatever has been done earlier by the former Vice Chancellor, they should leave everything. But now he (Vice Chancellor) he should think afresh as to who is the appropriate person for this post.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is alright and they authorize the Vice Chancellor for this.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that his colleagues have raised three issues, one is the appointment of this person. On that appointment, he thinks that the Vice Chancellor is the authority to decide whether he is the most suitable person and they are nobody to guide him on that issue and persons from Sociology or Statistics can be appointed. So, it is for the Vice Chancellor to decide on the issue. If he (Vice Chancellor) does not want to interfere in the previous Vice Chancellor's selection, let he be appointed straight away. Second is the issue of fake email Id. Fake email Id has been investigated, but so far nothing has been found, so some more efforts should be put in to investigate from where it came so that they could discuss it. Third issue is, that in future, no action should be taken on such information. He would beg to disagree with this because he had been Director General of State, Anti-corruption Bureau also. Now he is Chief Executive Council of the Tata Group. There has been debates during all of his life. The Supreme Court, Central Vigilance Committee, everybody has debated. At times they have asked for affidavit and sometimes not. Ultimately, in the wisdom of everybody, the conclusion has been reached when somebody gives information against some corrupt practices

or illegal practices or something wrong in a department. If an anonymous, synonymous, whatever, complaint is received, the complaint must be read and carefully examined. It does not matter whether anybody has given the affidavit or signed it or not signed it, if there is a verifiable information, for example, 'X' claimed false TA whereas he was actually attending the classes. This is verifiable information. It does not matter whether there is an affidavit or not. They must investigate. So, he is reluctant to say that only because of this, the action should not be taken because people do give information. When they want to give information, if there is such a rider, then nobody will come forward.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that it is, otherwise, the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor to appoint a person there, but she would like to say that she has good association with the Population Research Centre because they are located in the same building. For the studies which are undertaken in the Population Research Centre, sometimes they have to stay outside even for a month. If some particular Chairperson of a Department appointed there goes in the field for a month, they have to take care of that thing also. As regard the appointment, it is correct that senior Professor from the allied departments should be appointed there. It is not the criteria the Chairperson of a particular department i.e. Sociology, should be appointed. She has been in this University for the last 30 years and she has never seen it that the Chairperson of a particular department should be the Director of the P.R.C. It may have happened in very rare cases, normally senior Professors from Sociology, Psychology and Statistics have been the Directors of P.R.C.

The Vice Chancellor said that it means that it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Prabhjit Singh also said that it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor and they authorize him (Vice Chancellor).

Dr. Amit Joshi while endorsing the view point of Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they authorize the Vice Chancellor to choose the best person irrespective of affiliation of some department.

Dr.R.K. Mahajan said that they should see how the appointment was done and how it was stopped after the receipt of the fake mail. They should check as to how many candidates were there when the appointment was made.

Dr. Subhash Sharma clarified that there was not advertisement.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the whole case is made like this that after making the appointment, the appointment was postponed after the receipt of the fake mail. But this is not the fact. The fact is that his appointment was made and after making the appointment, it came to the notice that he was already holding another post and two posts cannot be given to him. The term of first post has to end on 30<sup>th</sup> June and when on 29<sup>th</sup> June, as per the appointment, he reached the office of Dean University Instruction, who was given the charge of Director P.R.C. in the meantime. He requested that he be given the charge, the Dean University Instruction told him that this charge cannot be given to him because the Vice Chancellor has given him (D.U.I.) the charge. But from where, the orders had come that due to fake mail, the charge is not to be given to Dr. Suresh Sharma. Though it is written in the office note, but there are no such papers annexed where the earlier Vice Chancellor kept the orders in abeyance keeping in view the fake mail or whatever. He (Vice Chancellor) can see that this Syndicate has taken a very very serious view that if somebody has written directly to the Chancellor or the higher authority, even if the copy has been routed through proper channel and advance copy has been sent. But to his understanding, in this case, this teacher has himself written to the Ministry on 29<sup>th</sup> June itself, asking whether any such mail has been sent by them and a reply has been sent to him that they have not sent the mail. He is not going

into the details, they can see it. Keeping in view the tradition, the background of creation of the Centre and the sentiments of the people of the Department of Sociology and other social sciences. So, the Vice Chancellor may think afresh whether he (Dr. Suresh Sharma) needs to be appointed or somebody else needs to be appointed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that some paper also relate to this case which were circulated afterwards.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is in his knowledge and he asked to circulate it to the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that without going into as to what has been written, they say that it should also be considered.

The Vice Chancellor said, that is why he has asked to put these papers before them.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they should get the resolved part noted that whatever appointment has been made till date, the Syndicate has deliberated upon the issue and taken a holistic view and has authorized the Vice Chancellor to take a call on this appointment, irrespective of all these representations. The Vice Chancellor should select the best person for this post as Director of P.R.C.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should not be irrespective of the representations, but keeping in mind all the representations.

Dr. Amit Joshi said they may write like this as this would also mean the same to which Shri Ashok Goyal said, no, it is not the same thing. Dr. Amit Joshi further said that then they could deliberate on the representations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are not to deliberate on the representations, they have authorized the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have taken the holistic view.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would like to talk about one point informally. If appointment of someone is made, it means some documents must be there.

Dr. Amit Joshi and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever has been done, that is done. They have now authorized him.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they stand by him (Vice Chancellor).

The Vice Chancellor said Shri Ashok Goyal, if he is also with him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is a translator and said that the Vice Chancellor has to make the appointment as authorized by the Syndicate.

**RESOLVED:** That after having a holistic view of the issue, the Syndicate authorised the Vice Chancellor to take a call on this appointment keeping in mind all the representation submitted by the faculty of the Department of Sociology.

minutes of the meeting dated 05.04.2017 (**Appendix-VIII**) regarding method of accepting diet charges against the Mess/Canteen bills of various hostels, in light of communication received from the office of the DSW dated 16.05.2017(**Appendix-VIII**):

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 29.04/26.05.2018 (Para 7) (**Appendix-VIII**) while approving the recommendation No. 2 of the committee dated 16.03.2018 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss the minutes of the meeting dated 05.04.2017 with regard to evolving guidelines for future handling of Hostel Purchases and Audit/pre-audit etc., in the light of communication received from the office of the D.S.W. dated 16.5.2017 be approved and recommendation No. 1 be referred back to the Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal while giving a brief description of the item requested the members to see page 244 and 245 of the agenda papers. He informed that these recommendations were earlier also placed before the Syndicate. At page 244, there are two recommendations. The recommendation at Sr. No. 2 was accepted at that time. As regards recommendation at Sr. No. 1, it was said the GST would be levied on the hostel canteen mess, but at that point of time, the students would not like to pay the GST. So, there was an issue. The way out of it was that they should make it a cooperative mess, then the GST would not be imposed. Of course, different people have different viewpoints. One was that whether the students would like to run the cooperative mess or not because it requires a lot of labour in running the cooperative mess. Till the time this issue came here, it was made known that most of the students are not willing to run cooperative mess. So, they decided to refer back the first part of the recommendation and asked the DSW office to send data about it. The DSW then held a complete census and it was found that in most of hostels, most of the students were not in favour of cooperative mess. So, finally they said that where majority of the students agree to run cooperative mess, this system should be started there and where the students do not want it, the old system should continue.

The Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Subhash Sharma to suggest something as this issue relates to the students. It might affect the price of their diet.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said it is not necessary that with the imposition of GST the rates would increase. It may be there that in the cooperative mess, the diet may be more costlier even without GST.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the main issue is to avoid GST. At present the GST is being imposed and the students are paying. It does not mean that the rate of the diet would increase. The purpose of running the cooperative mess was that if the students run the cooperative mess themselves, there could be reduction of 5% in the rate. Opinion was sought from the students, but the students are reluctant to run the cooperative mess themselves. Now nothing would happen. So the system would run as it is already running and there would not be any increase in the rate.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they are not having any other option.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it has been written that where majority of the students want to run cooperative mess, they would run it. He informed that in one of the hostel

it is running. As there has been one canteen in a hostel and if majority of the student do not want to run cooperative there, it would not run. In the case of mess if one hundred plus students are interested to run the cooperative mess, then it could run. Those students could be allowed.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor whether it is okay, Professor Ronki Ram said it is alright.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the meeting in this regard was held on 16.3.2018 (page 232 of agenda papers), many months have passed, was it not an important item. However, it was clarified by some members that the meeting was held on 17.7.2018 and not on 16.3.2018.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it has come in the Syndicate meeting of May. There were two recommendations out of which one was accepted and for the other it was decided to send it back and after that no meeting was held.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that some contractors sublet the canteen/mess, that should also be taken care of. If somebody applies for Canteen/mess from outside, he is not given any attention. Many top class people from Chandigarh had applied this time for the mess contract, but they taken as if they are nothing. They were having the experience of running good clubs and good institutions. They came to me and he told them that in their University such things are done on merit and perhaps they may not fall as per that merit. When later on he enquired, it came to his notice the people have got the contract with their approach, this he is talking about the last December. Immediately, they sublet it at 10-15 thousand per month. He requested that a Committee of independent persons, who are not connected to hostel, be constituted. He said it is a very big issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as and when such complaints were received, those were dealt with, but he also cannot deny that fact that such things do happen in the hostels.

Dr. Ameer Sultana suggested to include this in the guidelines that subletting is not allowed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the system should be transparent. If there is 400 students and if he says that one students has a mess bill of Rs. 1000/-per month then the business of one hostel for one month comes to Rs. 4 lacs. and for one year it comes to Rs. 48 lacs. if it is counted for 10 months then it comes to 40 lacs. and and total of 4 crore business in the University. Why it is not given through tender to some good firm. This is a very big business. The figure of Rs. 4 crores is his conservative figure. The hostel canteen/mess are changed at their own behest.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the DSW give an advertisement. There is an interview. The DSW office sends an internal notice in the University departments. They invite people and claim their position that they are the better one. There is an interview kind of thing happens within the members from the DSW office wardens and all. They Identify and select the persons. It is a Committee which does it, it is not only one Warden or anyone.

The Vice Chancellor asked whether any tender is given?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that from the last 3-4 years, they have developed the system of students feedback. Their feedback about contractor is taken. That is kept in mind. It is seen that whether some specific percentage of students are dissatisfied. Some students also make complaints about these things. Professor Keshav Malhotra has given the figures, but to his mind the bill of one mess is not more than 1.5 to 2 lacs per month out of which he has to give a salary of 9-10 employees besides so many other things. If they talk about the salary of



10 employees, if he gives full pay to them, then it would be more than Rs. 1.5 lacs. He thinks it is not right to name it as business because as and when efforts are made to change it, they found that they met with failure in 30-35 percent cases. They found that the Contractor leaves the Canteen/Mess within 3-4 months. Then it creates a problem. So, there are so many such things which are also taken into consideration, but what has been said by Professor Keshav Malhotra, he agrees with it and that is very serious and it has to be really looked into properly. They should talk to the Warden to check whether that Canteen is run by the Contractor or by someone else. As regards the formation Committee, that is right and nothing wrong in it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what Professor Navdeep Goyal is saying, it is exactly contrary to what the Registrar has said. Professor Navdeep has told is hundred percent correct that there is no objectivity because of their experience, they do not intend to change, as the experience about change has proved to be a failure. All the other things are formalities that they call for the applications and select the best persons. Three months back, he spoke to the D.S.W. on a query made by someone as to how the contract for Mess is given in the University. He told him that he would tell him enquiring from the office. He rang up to the D.S.W. and the D.S.W. told him that, please do not ask anyone to apply. He told that if they took a decision to change some Contractor, then he would tell him and only then ask the person to apply. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) asked, do they already take this decision? He said, yes. Such a decision is taken if they receive a complaint against some Contractor, then they make up their mind to change him, otherwise they continue those who are already working, whether anybody applies for it or not. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) said that it is not right and with this matters ended. Then he rang up to Professor Keshav Malhotra who told me that how they can say this, hostel number 10 is a newly built hostel. In spite of his asking, the D.S.W. did not tell him that one contract for one newly built hostel is to be given. It means that before asking applications for that hostel number 10, it was already decided to whom the contract is to be given.

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

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that some objectivity should be there.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes dated 17.07.2018 of the Committee regarding method of accepting diet charges against the Mess/Canteen bills of various hostels, in light of communication received from the office of the DSW dated 16.05.2017, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That subletting of hostel mess be not allowed in any cost and if any contractor is found guilty, strict action be taken against him.

**Conferment of Honorary Professorship on Dr. Ved Parkash Kamboj in the Department of Zoology, P.U**

**13.** Considered recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Dr. Ved Parkash Kamboj in the Department of Zoology, P.U., pursuant to the letter dated 30.07.2018 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Joint Secretary, Vice President's Secretariat, New Delhi.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2015 (Para 5) (**Appendix-IX**) had considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor and resolved that the designation of Honorary Professor in the Department of Zoology be conferred on Dr. Ved Parkash Kamboj.

2. Pursuant to the above decision of the Syndicate, OSD to the Hon'ble Vice President of India and Chancellor, P.U. was requested by the former Vice-Chancellor vide letter dated 03.03.2015 to get the approval of the Hon'ble Chancellor but the same was not received, hence the former Vice-Chancellor wrote another letter dated 21.07.2018 in this regard.
3. The Joint Secretary to the Vice President of India, Vice President's Secretariat has endorsed the letter of the Vice-Chancellor that it is felt appropriate to place the matter before the Syndicate again for their consent.
4. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-IX**).
5. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.08.2018 (Para 14) (**Appendix-IX**) has agreed principle for designation of Honorary Professor to Dr. Girish Sahni, and has also constituted a committee to frame the guidelines for the conferment of designation of Honorary Professor.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that this is a very simple item. He informed that they have already made a Committee and it should be referred to that Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should not refer it to the Committee, but after the recommendations of the Committee it has to be discussed here.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi again reiterated that a Committee has already been constituted to see as to who is to be made Emeritus/Honorary Professor, so let the recommendations come and after that they would look at this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal asked the Secretary to Vice Chancellor to hold the meeting at the earliest as he is the Convener of the said Committee.

Shri Prabhjit Singh that as per the regulations the Honorary Professor has to deliver the lecture in the University. He suggested that first they should take the consent of the person whether he could come or not and secondly his age factor should also be kept in mind. He informed that Dr. Ved Prakash Kamboj is already 82 years old and living in Lucknow. He doubts if he could come from Lucknow.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said it should be left to the Committee to see to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this issue is not so simple. It has serious connotation and implications. He said that the recommendations of 2015 of the Syndicate were sent to the Chancellor and after 3<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> years the Chancellor has not given approval. Now, see that it is pending since January 2015. On a holiday, on July 21, 2018, a reminder is sent to the Vice President and Chancellor P.U. to send his approval for the request which was sent to him on January 25.1.2015. In reply to that letter, a letter from the Chancellor's office is received that consent of the Syndicate a fresh is required. Now they should understand the meaning of this in between the lines. This means that they have to be very careful and examine it minutely whether after recommendations or framing the guidelines by the Committee or otherwise, in

this case, probably, they will have to say that the recommendations already made in 2015 stands withdrawn.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it means there are some reservations there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was told that they need the consent of Dr. Ved Prakash Kamboj, but indeed they are asking for the consent of the Syndicate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should withdraw the recommendations which was also endorsed by Principal Anita Kaushal.

The Vice Chancellor said that since it has come from the Chancellor's office, they should see to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is better to give reason for this. He further said that then how those guidelines would applicable on the recommendations of 2015.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have to recommend it again to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are not recommend it again. Professor Navdeep Goyal further said that they will do it as per the guidelines of 2015.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have asked for their consent in respect of the recommendations of 2015.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that then they could frame the guidelines for future.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this case is an old case.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan asked, has he sent a request to make him an Honorary Professor to which Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he has not sent any request. Dr. Mahajan said that when he has not sent the request, why they are doing it. Earlier also they have deferred as case. If he gives the request, then they could do something. Suppose, they appoint someone as Honorary Director, but if he has not sent his consent, how they can ask him to join. So, first they should get the consent.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they have already sent the recommendation.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that last time they have withdrawn a case as there was no consent from that person. How they could do it now.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are withdrawing it which was also endorsed by Dr. Subhash Sharma.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they should write that after considering the issue, the Syndicate withdraws the previous recommendations of 2015.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to see to it as the matter relates to the highest office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to read in between the lines.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not giving some more input and leaving it in between.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is leaving it in between because in the light of what they have written, he thinks that there is no need to discuss it in detail.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he has read it. The reply they should give is that the case was placed before the Syndicate and the Syndicate has decided to file this case and no further action may be taken.

The Vice Chancellor asked Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi that they may ask, why?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said why they should tell them the reason.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the Vice Chancellor did not send the letter for four years, but two days before the expiry of his term, he sent the letter to the Chancellor's office. There may be something fishy.

As desired by the Vice Chancellor, the Registrar read out a line from the letter received from the Chancellor's office which states, 'it is felt appropriate to place the matter before the Syndicate again for their consent'.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it means that the Syndicate has to give consent afresh. They had given the consent in 2015, now they are saying that the consent should be given today. That means they also think that the Syndicate might have thought of revising its opinion. So, they should write that the Syndicate after considering the letter and the Syndicate recommended that the recommendation already made in January 2015 may please be treated as withdrawn or may be filed.

It is said (by the Registrar) that they may write that the Syndicate has consider the matter and is reluctant persuade it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they may write that as no action is called for in the matter, the recommendation of 2015 may be filed.

Before going for lunch Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu requested the Vice to discuss the issue relating to Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce & Management, Ludhiana as the teachers are standing outside since morning.

**RESOLVED:** That after considering the issue threadbare, the members were of the unanimous view that the previous recommendations made by the Syndicate in its meeting on 21.1.2015 be treated as withdrawn/filed as no action is called for in the matter.

When the meeting started after lunch, Shri Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the issue of Aurobindo College is pending and they have to look into that, as the College has already dismissed two teachers.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have to complete the agenda of today's meeting and thereafter they would look into the other issues raised by Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu.

**Representations dated  
02.05.2018, 03.05.2018,  
09.05.2018 and  
02.06.2018 of Professor  
(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill, Fellow,  
PU**

**14.** Considered representations dated 02.05.2018, 03.05.2018, 09.05.2018 and 02.06.2018 (**Appendix-X**) of Professor (Mrs.) Rajesh Gill, Fellow, Panjab University, Chandigarh, pursuant to letter No. VPS/15/1/2016-Vol. III dated 11.07.2018 (**Appendix-X**) of the Under Secretary, Vice President of India, Vice President's Secretariat, New Delhi, regarding her complaint against Professor Arun Kumar Grover in the case of Sexual Harassment.

**NOTE:** 1. The Under Secretary, Vice President of India, vide letters dated 30.05.2018 and

06.06.2018 had forwarded the representation of Professor Rajesh Gill dated 02.05.2018, 03.05.2018, 09.05.2018 and 02.06.2018 for placing the same before the Independent Internal Committee approved by the Vice President of India and Chancellor, P.U.

2. The Chancellor, P.U. has approved the Independent Internal Committee vide letter dated 20.03.2018 (**Appendix-X**)
3. The Independent Internal Committee in its meeting dated 25.06.2018 (**Appendix-X**) considered the said representation of Professor Rajesh Gill and unanimously decided that these letters dated 30.05.2015 and 06.06.2018 may be returned to the office of the Vice President's Secretariat for appropriate action at their level.

Accordingly, a detailed office note was sent to the Chancellor's Office by D.R. (Estt.) vide No.3763/D.R. (Estt.) dated 06.7.2018 (**Appendix-X**), for appropriate action at their level as decided by the Independent Internal Committee, but the Under Secretary directed that the said representations be placed before the Syndicate/Senate for perusal since the Independent Internal Committee was formulated on the basis of decisions of these governing bodies is enclosed.

4. Professor Rajesh Gill has challenged the constitution of Independent Internal Committee by filing CWP No.22684 of 2018 in the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court.

Initiating the discussion, some of the members were of the opinion why this item has been placed before the Syndicate when the matter is pending in the Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has withdrawn this item.

Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. Anita Kaushal abstained from the discussion as they were members of the Committee constituted for this purpose.

Dr. Amir Sultana said that since the case is pending the Court, they need not to discuss the issue. It is violation of the Act also. She was of the view that this issue should not come here.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that for what purpose it is placed before the Syndicate and what they want from them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the case is already pending in the Court and they should give their views on Item **C-15**.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that no. If they do not know what is the case. Simply saying that the case is pending in the Court and nothing can be discussed is wrong. They have to see what has been written and what the case is and what the stand of the University in the Court is? He wanted to know the case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he wanted to know about the case.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has not gone through any of the papers, but what he understands is that the case has been filed against the decision of the Syndicate and Senate and how the University has filed any reply without taking Syndicate and Senate into confidence. They do not know what is the case and what is the reply filed by the University. When the item has come from the Chancellor's Office on the complaint against the former Vice-Chancellor, for creating circumstances under Section 3(2) the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace Act 2013 and the item is for consideration and they say that no, the matter is sub-judice and they cannot discuss it. Now do they expect that the Syndicate and the Senate would ultimately to be pulled up by the Court why the case has not been resolved at their level, they have been denied the opportunity even when the item is before them for consideration, just by saying that the case is pending in the court when so many such cases are pending in the Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he should tell the cases.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is specifically referring to consider representation of Professor (Mrs.) Rajesh Gill, VPS/15/1/2016-Vol. III dated 11.07.2018, he simply like to ask because he does not know what decision believes but he does not want that the Vice-Chancellor, the Syndicate and the Senate is to be mislead by the anybody howsoever important he may be. Now, it is written that the case is pending in the Court and after the decision of the Court; it will be placed before the Syndicate. That is what the objection. The University received a letter and a case has been filed in the court and today they are saying that since the case is pending in the Court and today that is the position and they are withdrawing it. They have given the reference of the letter dated 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018. The letter which was received on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018 is being placed before them on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2018. Is there any meeting of the Syndicate was not held after 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018? Why this letter was not placed before the Syndicate? He referred to page 56 of the appendix of this item and read out that this letter is written by name to Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh which is reproduced below:

“Please refer to your Note No.3763/DR Estt. dated 06.07.2018 seeking Orders on this Secretariat's letters dated 30<sup>th</sup> May, 2018 and 6<sup>th</sup> June, 2018 in view of the observations made by Independent Internal Committee constituted to enquire into the case/allegations made by Professor (Mrs.) Rajesh Gill against Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University.

2.In this regard, you are requested to place these representations before the Syndicate/Senate for perusal since the Independent Internal Committee has been formulated on the basis of the decision made by these governing bodies”.

The allegation of Professor Rajesh Gill in the case is that it is not the Chancellor who has constituted this Committee. This Committee is constituted by the Syndicate and Senate and he (the former Vice-Chancellor) has merely approved it. Here the Chancellor's Office itself is saying to place these representations before the Syndicate/Senate for perusal since the

Independent Internal Committee has been formulated on the basis of the decision made by these governing bodies. The Chancellor's Office is saying that this Committee has been formulated on the basis of their recommendation. In this way, they are misleading the Office of the Chancellor. Now, they wanted to know what is the case in the Court and what is the reply filed in the Court by the University? He pointed out at page 56 of the appendix on letter dated 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018, it was written 17.06.2018 which may be wrong and if he presumed that it is 17.07.2018, then it is not a bonafide mistake. Dr. Sahib, it was reached to him after two months on 19.09.2018. Why? Is this letter's reference has been mentioned in the reply filed by the University in the Court? Is the Syndicate and Senate are not responsible for the stand taken in the Court? He was pointing out this thing not today but pointing out since 2015 and he had never said that the complaint of the complainant is right. He was saying that he was not the right to say that the accused is right. He was supporter from the day one that the matter should be settled or enquired into. He was being blamed that he is helping the complainant. He was simply saying that without bothering for this thing, he was of the view that when they are sitting in the House and it is not looked like that they are this side or that side. He asked the Vice-Chancellor to tell him how to proceed further in this case. The University has already engaged a Counsel for this case. He has remembered that the Registrar in December 2015, regarding the decision in this case, the University had taken a legal opinion from three Legal Retainers of the University. The House should be told that the advocate hired for this case is one of them as he has been associated with this case or someone else is hired for this case who knows nothing and on what ground he was hired to file a reply on behalf of the University. He was of the view that what the reply has been filed in the Court by the University? Is it not the duty of the University to take Syndicate and Senate into confidence before filing any reply in the Court? Is it not the fact that according to his knowledge, the reply/affidavit which was filed in the Court was under the signatures of the Registrar in the High Court? Is it not the fact that the Registrar by name is a party in the same Writ Petition? Is the former Vice-Chancellor by name is a party in the same Writ Petition? When the Registrar and the former Vice-Chancellor are respondents/party in this case, how they could file a reply on behalf of the University without taking the Syndicate and Senate into confidence. Are they not the right to provide a copy of the reply which was filed on behalf of the University? In spite of that it is being told that the case is pending in the Court. In this way, they are not afraid and not of the persons afraid from such things. Their right as per the Act of the University should be given to them (Syndicate members). He pointed out that a letter of 11.07.2018 should be placed before the Syndicate on 27.08.2018, when one meeting of the Syndicate held. He again pointed out why it was being placed before the Syndicate in its meeting on 23.09.2018? He presumed that the Vice-Chancellor has no knowledge of this case and requested him (Vice-Chancellor) to talk to the Registrar privately or ask him (Registrar) to update him. The Vice-Chancellor can take update from the Registrar and tell them why the letter of 11.07.2018 was not placed before them earlier, on what grounds the advocate hired for this case and what the reply was filed in the High Court? He pointed out on what papers the reply was prepared and why the letter of 11.07.2018 was placed before the Syndicate on 23.09.2018. Is it submitted in the Court? There are other so many papers about which he will tell the Vice-Chancellor later on. His meaning to say that in this office manipulations were there and he has concrete evidences and one such concrete evidence is letter of 11.07.2018. He wanted to know under what rules the Registrar or the Vice-Chancellor can keep this letter pending with them when the Office of the Vice-President of India/Chancellor of this University has said that it should be placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said the members to hear what Mr. Ashok Goyal is saying. He asked Shri Ashok Goyal whether his viewpoints concluded.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would say further only after taking the required reply.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Shri Prabhjit Singh said due to that the lunch was taken earlier and discussion on this item would prolong.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice-Chancellor) should not take it otherwise. Their interest is not in the accused or in the complainant, but their interest is in the well-being of the University.

Dr. Amir Sultana wanted to add that as far as she knew that on the basis of a letter from the Office of the Chancellor to propose few names for the Committee and they had also taken that letter to the Senate where they proposed/added few names. Later on, Ms. Kasni Anand withdrew her name from the Committee. Again it was placed before them and they proposed for adding new names in that Committee. According to her, proposing of names is different from forming/appointing of a Committee. In the letter of 11.07.2018, the Chancellor's office is saying that the Independent Internal Committee has been formulated on the basis of the decision made by the Governing bodies of the University, means Syndicate and Senate. She wanted to tell that the decision of forming an Independent Internal Committee was not taken at their level, rather it was taken at the level of the Chancellor's Office. According to her there is a big mistake in this letter of 11.07.2018 received from the Office of the Chancellor and they have to rectify it. They had only proposed name and Committee was not formed by them. It is not all the decision of the Syndicate and Senate.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that letter of 11.07.2018 was received on 17<sup>th</sup> July 2018 and instant it was marked to the D.R.G. for placing it before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired who was marked the letter to D.R.G.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that it was marked by the him to D.R.G. and after that the General Branch prepare an item for consideration and after approval from the Vice-Chancellor, it is placed before the Syndicate. It is the standard practice. He again said that he has recorded in the file that this communication was received on 17.7.2018 and this item should have been taken up in the August Syndicate meeting. The office has overlooked in bringing this item in last Syndicate meeting. This letter may be brought to the notice of Syndicate about the Petition filed by Professor Rajesh Gill against Vice-Chancellor and this is also brought to the notice. These are his remarks.

Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to the Vice-Chancellor said that is it satisfactory that a letter is marked to D.R.G. on the same date, as and when it was received by the Registrar. How and under what circumstances, he is not ready to believe, the D.R.G. would ready to keep in his chest. He is not ready to believe that. He wanted to see that how many letters marked by the Registrar on 17.7.2018 and thereafter to the D.R.G. and let him see how many items he has kept pending and not put up to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor. These are the things which need to be looked into. If the office has overlooked the instructions and is not aware of the instruction of the Registrar, what is the action he has taken in the meantime? Alright, he can give all concessions to the D.R.G, the Registrar and Office of the Vice-Chancellor that due to bonafide oversight, it could not be included in the Syndicate agenda. He wanted to know have they mentioned about the letter in the reply filed by the University in the Court that this letter of 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018 was received on 17.07.2018 and marked to the Syndicate and due to bonafide oversight, it could not be placed before the Syndicate on 27<sup>th</sup> August 2018. Whose duty it was? It is the duty of the person whosoever has filed the reply and specially the one who has given notings in this file that it should be placed before the Syndicate on 27<sup>th</sup> August. Is this fact mentioned in the reply submitted in the Court? Who is responsible for that and tomorrow if any stricture is passed, do you think that the Syndicate and Senate will be spared. Nobody is going to give them any concession that it is not placed before the Syndicate. So, by simply saying that he has written that it will be placed before the Syndicate, he has kept it with him, accountability should be fixed is not suffice. This case is so sensitive and about which



they have been discussing here in the House since the last three years and the new Vice-Chancellor has said immediately after joining that they have to decide this case on priority, due to which the name of University is defaming and they are treating such case so casually. He was wondered why the Registrar did not take this letter immediately to the then Vice-Chancellor that this is the letter, tell him what is to be done as has been done in the past. The letter has come today and next day the person is going to take the reply by hand and the same persons is coming back after taking reply of that. Such case is treated like this. They do not say anything to anybody but they can seek reply from the Vice-Chancellor. The interesting thing to say is that the letter of 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018, the Chancellor's Office said that it be placed before the Syndicate. It is not so simple. Instead of placing it before the Syndicate, its deliberations there and sending reply to the Chancellor's Office, this letter is coming to them for the first time, this letter is come to the University on 11<sup>th</sup> July and on 19<sup>th</sup> July the Chancellor office is writing to the complainant that the Independent Internal Committee is alright and she has to appear before them. On 24<sup>th</sup> July, the Chancellor's office is writing to the Internal Complaint Committee to go ahead. When on 11<sup>th</sup> July, the same office is asking to place these representations before the Syndicate/Senate for perusal because the Internal Committee has been formulated on the basis of the decision made by the Governing Bodies. What meaning of this letter he think? Bhai Sahib kept this letter in basket and they will arrange another letter so that the chapter of constitution of this Committee is not open. He is not saying that it is done deliberately but in today's date, no other meaning can be found by seeing that the same person who is writing a letter on 11<sup>th</sup> July that this representation be place before the Syndicate/Senate, is writing on 19<sup>th</sup> July to the complainant that the internal committee is alright and on 24<sup>th</sup> July to the Internal Committee to go ahead. He does not know, but he is sure that these letters would have been appended with the reply filed in the Court. Why the letter of 11<sup>th</sup> July was not appended? It means that they have appended the letters in the court which suit to the accused and not appended the letter which suit to the University. When they are representing the University, they should have to keep in mind the interest of the University and not their personal interests. Now, what is the fault of the advocate, the advocate would have to prepare and file a reply according to the papers handed over to him. The reply is to be filed by the advocate if he has prepared the reply, but here the accused are preparing the reply. Doctor Sahib he will not hesitate to say that during the pendency of the Court case, the files have been going to the house of the accused. How they can take it lightly? If after that they are saying what is to be done further, then they have to see after serious deliberations that who advocate will represent the University in this case and they have also to see if there is any mistake in the reply which had already been filed in the court and they should review that. If it is okay, then it is very good and it is only possible if that reply is placed before them. Then they will see what is omitted from there. He said that it is his presumption that the letter of 11<sup>th</sup> July may be missing from there. He is presuming so that the letter which is for placing before the Syndicate and Senate and it was not placed before them how it could be appended in the Court. He said that in December 2015 when Senate has taken this decision that the Chancellor be asked to constitute an Independent Committee, preferably by including members who are in no way connected with Panjab University and Chandigarh. Instead of sending this decision to the Chancellor, the then Registrar preferred to take a legal opinion on the legality of the decision taken by the Syndicate and Senate and reply was in the capacity of Secretary of the Syndicate and he is empowered to take such legal opinion. He is very much sure that as a Secretary/Registrar does not have any authority over and above the decision taken by the Syndicate/Senate. Similarly, the Vice-Chancellor does not have any authority to over step when something is decided by the Syndicate/Senate. Similarly, it does not lie with the Chancellor. He pointed out that legal opinion was sought from two Legal Retainers of the University and it was sent and when the legal opinion was sought from the third legal retainer, he remarked that unless and until it was sought by the Chancellor's Office, he will not give any legal opinion. They do not understand the meaning of saying this. They are nobody to intervene in such a case. He pointed out that when legal opinion was sought from three legal retainers then why one of them cannot be appointed University Counsel in this case. On this basis of which the University proceeded further in this case, then

why the case was not given to one of them. Why who was appointed University Counsel in this case, who is in no way associated with this case?

Intervening, Shri Prabhjit Singh said, who was the Counsel in this case?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that Shri Greesh Agnihotri be appointed in this case. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is no doubt about the Counsel. He is a very competent counsel. But here he is talking from the point of view of the University. But they are talking about Committee, which was not constituted by the Syndicate/Senate. When this issue was placed before the Syndicate/Senate, some of the members were of the opinion that names should be sent and others were of the opinion let the Chancellor be requested to constitute a Committee. Some people who were attending the Senate meeting at that time under the Chairmanship of Dr. Ronki Ram were of the opinion that some names should be sent to the Chancellor and he is authorized to pick any names from them and include other members as per his discretion. He is remembered that when this decision was taken, it was decided that it should be written in the letter when it was sent to the Chancellor's Office that at the time of discussion on this item only 16 members were present in the Senate and out of those 16 members, 7 were of the opinion that names should not be sent to the Chancellor's Office and 9 were of the opinion that names should be sent. It was specially decided that it should be sent to the Chancellor's Office. It should be told to them whether it was sent to the Chancellor's Office. The Chancellor's office presumed that it was the decision of the Senate by majority and only 7 members give their dissent. They had also not seen that they had to constitute a Committee but they approved the Committee. Now, there is a difference that out of 16 members 7 were against the and out of 56 members, 7 were against and 49 were in favour. They can see/verify the same from the DVD. This request was specifically made to Dr. Ronki Ram by him and he had given his consent for the same. In spite of that it was not written. He has come to his knowledge that when the complainant has given his representation, a legal opinion is being sought whether the complaint is right or wrong. What they are doing? It was being said that the Committee was formed by the Chancellor and it was also being said that the Committee be formed by them. Now the Court has passed only one line order that how Chancellor has constituted this Committee and how it was sent to the Vice-Chancellor and what was sent in its reply, they do not know. Now when the case is pending, more replies would go and more deliberations are required. He was saying that there is no doubt and who is guilty out of them and what punishment is to be given should be given to the guilty. If the complainant is guilty, she will be given the punishment and if the other person is guilty, punishment should be given to him. First of all, they were of the opinion that Panjab University should not be punished for that. Now the Panjab University at any cost should not bear it. The Panjab University Syndicate/Senate at its own level has tried to resolve this issue, not one time, two time, three time, four time, five time but for six times, but the issue was not resolved and it is not meant that they will stop the University. He was saying too much because the Vice-Chancellor is not known much about this case and slowly he will understand the whole issue. He was of the view that it should be brought to their notice how this case is handled because the Registrar or the Vice-Chancellor cannot handle this case at its own level as the Office of the Chancellor and Syndicate/Senate involve in it. He requested the Vice-Chancellor that the following facts relating to this case be brought to the notice of the Syndicate so that these could be considered in one of the next meetings:

- (i) What reply was filed by the University in the Court?
- (ii) Who has filed the reply and by whom the authority was given to the Registrar?
- (iii) Whether that reply could be considered as the reply of the University?
- (iv) When a letter dated 11.07.2018 was received, then why after that contradictory letters dated 19.07.2018 and 24.07.2018 were received?

- (v) Under what circumstances the current advocate was engaged for this case.
- (vi) From whom the reply was got vetted and should it be not placed before the Syndicate/Senate.
- (vii) It should be ensured that the reply filed in the Court is strictly in terms of the University record.

These are the things which they wanted to know. About these papers he would talk to the Vice-Chancellor later on. He said that the Vice-Chancellor had apprised them about one thing that 11.07.2018 letter was missed by mistake.

He has come to know whether what was discussed in the Syndicate/Senate was submitted in the Court or not. He was told that it was submitted in the Court in the form of a story by way of it was done on this date and it was done on that date and what does not suit to the Story man was removed from the story. He was of the view that they wanted to see the reply and what needed to be changed, should be changed and if there is a need to change the advocate, then advocate should be changed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all these things should be done by taking the Syndicate into confidence.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that all these things should be told to them.

Shri Prabhjit Singh proposed that a Committee should be constituted to look into the whole issue as Shri Ashok Goyal has pointed out and he has all the information and some of the members did not have this information. .

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they do in this way, it will be wrong and Registrar is sitting here and if the Vice-Chancellor wanted to seek some information from him, he can take. There should not be a feeling in his mind that they had said everything and he (Registrar) has not given a chance to give his viewpoints.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are here and the Registrar is also here.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that when this complaint was made, initially it was marked to PUCASH.

The Vice-Chancellor said about whom the complaint was related to.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they were asked by the Ministry of Human Resource Development that second internal committee should be constituted and it was placed before the Syndicate on the direction of MHRD. They deliberated upon it and finally it was decided that they recommend a Committee. If they talk of constituting an internal complaint committee, the right of constituting internal complaint committee lies with the employer. At that time, the issue relating to employer was also discussed that who is the employer or who is not the employer. That Syndicate approved few names and that was also placed before the Senate and lot of discussion took place on this issue in the Senate. What Shri Ashok Goyal has said is right? About the meeting of which Shri Ashok Goyal is talking is another meeting which was chaired by Dr. Ronki Ram and he is talking of other meeting which was chaired by Shri Jarnail Singh. When the Committee was constituted in the Syndicate and from the viewpoint of the Chairman, there was some doubt that the Committee recommended is as per Sexual Harassment Act or not. Because there was a difference of opinion that the Senate should recommend the names or not and difference of opinion continue and finally it was decided that the names should be sent to the Chancellor and it should also be written that

he can choose names out of them or include others as per his discretion. It is right that the Chancellor approved that Committee. That time the Chairperson was Mrs. Kesni Anand and when she demanded a copy of the Act and after going through it, she refused that as per Act she could not become a Chairperson of this Committee. In the Act, it is specifically mentioned that Chairperson must be an employee. After that the matter was again brought to the Syndicate and Senate. The Syndicate discussed only one name but in the Senate four names were discussed and approved and sent to the Chancellor Office all the four names and asked him to appoint anyone out of them as the Chairperson of the Committee. The Chancellor picked up only one name out of them and he did not know at what stage. There was one name that was changed also. The Chancellor made few changes in the Committee. There was a University's communication in this regard or not. He did not know about this. After that it has come to the University. According to him, the process of constitution of internal complaint committee was started on the directions of the Ministry of Human Resource Development. Firstly, the Chancellor refused to constitute a Committee by saying that it is the duty of the University to make a Committee. It is all about the background of this case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be noted that the Chancellor has refused to constitute the Committee.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that since they has come in the Senate, the discussion on two issues, i.e. financial crunch and sexual harassment were taking place.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that what Shri Ashok Goyal has told is alright and is based on the facts. But he wants to give one suggestion that 90% members who are sitting here do not have the record and due to that they cannot contribute much. He suggested that Syndicate and Senate should not be involved and the matter should be looked into by Shri Ashok Goyal and SVC because the Registrar by name is a party in this case as Shri Ashok Goyal has told as he has not seen any such document. If they had already hired advocate for this case and there is a need to change the advocate, it should be seen at the level of the SVC. He again suggested that this matter should be looked into by Shri Ashok Goyal, SVC and the Vice-Chancellor is authorized to add any name to this.

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

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that had already told about the background of this case and they cannot refuse that the University has no role in it. The Committee was constituted/proposed on the direction of the MHRD and now they should prepare a letter that under what circumstances and how this Committee is formed starting from the letter of MHRD. He was of the view that may it be not available at one place and they have to collate the same. A reply is to be gone from the University starting from the MHRD letter.

The Vice-Chancellor said does he conclude.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to tell the House that she was not Mrs. Kasni Anand but she was Meenakshi Anand Choudhary. Along with her refusal that she cannot not become Chairperson of this Committee, she had also pointed out some illegalities and the Court has not spoken anything about that. One or two more persons resigned, it was also not brought to the Syndicate and Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has appointed Shri Ashok Goyal and SVC to look into the whole matter and to prepare the summary of the facts of the case. Thereafter, it should be brought to the Syndicate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that Vice-Chancellor is authorized to take decision on this issue and it should not be brought to the Syndicate.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as the Committee has to do a lot of work and keeping in view this, if need be, a date in the Court should be taken accordingly.

**RESOLVED:** That Shri Ashok Goyal and the Secretary to Vice Chancellor would collect the facts relating to this case to update the members of the Syndicate and take them into confidence before taking further action.

**Representation dated  
20.07.2018 of Ms.  
Anuradha Jaidka**

**15.** Considered representation dated 20.07.2018 of Ms. Anuradha Jaidka, #289, Milk Colony Dhanas, Sector-14 West, Chandigarh-160014 forwarded by Under Secretary, Vice-President's Secretariat vide No. VPS-15/2/R/PU/2018 dated 02.08.2018 regarding complaint against Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Ex-Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh for creating circumstances under section 3(2) the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace Act 2013 to favour the accused (Sahir Sharma).

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 28.05.2017 (Para - 22) examined the report of PUCASH on complaint of sexual harassment and resolved that the Ph.D. registration of the student be cancelled and DDR be lodged against her making a false complaint of sexual harassment. The candidate Ms. Anuradha Jaidka was informed vide office letter no 10932-dated 14.06.2017.

2. Ms. Anuradha Jaidka has challenged the decision of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 by filing CWP No. 24688 of 2017 of Hon'ble Punjab & Harayan High Court vs. Panjab University and others. The Hon'ble Judge Amol Rattan Singh passed the following interim order:

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

Notice of motion be issued to the respondents, returnable on 23.2.2018.

3. Accordingly, she was informed that cancellation of her Ph.D. enrolment/registration has been kept in abeyance vide office letter No.ST-21483 dated 5.12.2017.
4. Legal opinion of Girish Agnihotri, Legal Retainer is enclosed.
5. A detailed office note along with brief update of the case is enclosed.

Initiating discussion, Shri Prabhjot Singh said that he wanted to brief in respect of this item so that much time cannot be wasted on this item. The item is relating to one Ph.D. Scholar. She had met with an accident at the Campus and first of all she filed a complaint of accident and later on she filed a complaint of sexual harassment. He told that the former VC of the University marked this complaint to the PUCASH without taking into count that neither the boy nor the girl is the employees of the University. So, this case was not in their jurisdiction. He was summarizing the case. This matter was placed before the Syndicate and Professor Navdeep Goyal was a member of the Syndicate at that time and he said that if the complaint is found fake and on the basis of that they cannot cancel her Ph.D. Registrar and the Vice-Chancellor said that her Ph.D. Registration is to be cancelled. Professor Naveep Goyal again suggested that it should go to the Students Grievances Committee. Her Ph.D. Registration was cancelled. After the cancellation of the Ph.D., it is very very unfortunate decision of the Vice-Chancellor or it may be the decision of the Syndicate. He was of the view that if someone has not been able to prove her allegations, then it is not the right decision to cancel her Ph.D. After that she knocked the door of the Court and Court had provided stay to her and on the basis of that in the months of December, they allowed her to continue. Now, there is a question of her extension. Now, there are three things. Firstly, they have to change the earlier decision of cancellation of her Ph.D. as there is no problem and she can continue. Secondly, her scholarship should be opened. Thirdly, her complaint against Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Ex-Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh for creating circumstances under section 3(2) the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace Act 2013 should be forwarded to the Chancellor Office being his employer.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he was of the view that this case should not be pushed to the Chancellor's Office. He is not agreed with it. He suggested that either they resolve this issue here or mark it to the Sexual Harassment Committee of the University as the student of the University involves in it and she has just said that circumstances under section 3(2) the Sexual Harassment of Women were created. He again suggested that the case should be referred to the Sexual Harassment Committee of the University and it would not be in the fitness of things that everything is forwarded to the Chancellor's office and rest of it as Shri Prabhjit Singh is suggested is okay.

Dr. Amir Sultana said that this case should be decided at the earliest as both the students are young scholars and their career should not be put at a stake and they should have a Committee. The Committee should hear both of them and take the decision at the earliest. If they are able to make an understanding between them and try to solve the issue at their own level without any further delay. The name of the Panjab University in sexual cases reached everywhere.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the item is to consider the complaint against the Ex-Vice-Chancellor of the University for creating circumstances of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace. He was of the view that PUCASH has the mandate to hear this case of not as the appointing authority of the Vice-Chancellor is Chancellor's Office. He further said that if the PUCASH has the mandate to hear this case, then it should be sent to them; otherwise, it

should be referred back to the Chancellor's Office as the complaint is forwarded from there. The Chancellor's Office can constitute a Committee and see the case at its own level. Other two issues are separate from the agenda to settle her Ph.D. and scholarship.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that, in this way, they are not right to burdening the Office of the Chancellor and keep on sending things there. They have the responsibility to check the veracity of those allegations. Secondly, PUCASH is not under anybody. It is being misinterpreted by his colleagues. PUCASH is constituted under the law and has the Court's power. It does not matter what status the Vice-Chancellor has. The PUCASH has power to summon him or even pass orders to arrest him if he does not come. The PUCASH has wide powers and he is not agreed with the viewpoints of his colleagues on this issue and they should not send everything to the Chancellor's office.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that when this incident has happened, the ex-Vice Chancellor was totally vindictive. They can see the video of that Senate meeting where he (Ex-Vice Chancellor) very clearly has stated in front of all the members that now she will face the circumstances and he had done it and spoiled the career of the student. This issue has not so far been cropped up in the Students Union, but if it reached in their hands, there would be great harm.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that this is also one of the episodes. In this case an accident took place and the girl was admitted in the hospital. The mother of the boy went to meet her. But after that, one mistake which happened that the girl got under the impression that she was not treated, the way she should have been treated. But how the matter got off the track, (he should not speak as the ex-Vice Chancellor is not here), when the he (Ex-Vice Chancellor) took it upon himself to prove that this girl is wrong which was not warranted/required at all. He just went out of the way in support of that boy, otherwise, they will not say that the boy is responsible. He does not go into it whether he was responsible or not. He said suppose if a person speaks to someone that he would suffer, he stated in the Senate that this Girl will suffer and she will face the consequences.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that when this case came up for discussion in the Senate, he was also present. As Dr. Amit Joshi has said that the Ex-Vice Chancellor is not present here, he would not talk much about him. This issue was discussed in the last in the evening. That girl was the student of Shri Jagdish Mehta who is a Fellow of Panjab University. When he quoted, that the he (Vice Chancellor) has also threatened him on phone to leave this student. If they see the recording when he stood by in support of that girl, he just said a very simple thing to the Vice Chancellor that the 90 days period of enquiry is not yet over, so he should not comment upon this issue. Then he uttered three times that her career is already finished. Then he told him that he is on recording. He said it second and then third time. Not only that girl faced the consequences of it, but he himself and Dr. Jagdish Mehta has also to bear its consequences for a year or so.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested the Vice Chancellor that if call both the students to his office and ask them to wash their differences, he thinks, only this much of counseling would be enough. The Vice Chancellor could dispose of the issue like this. This was also endorsed by Dr. Ameet Sultana.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is right that an accident took place. After the accident, their D.S.W. (Women) with whose son the accident took place, took her to the hospital for providing her medical attention. When someone take the accidental case to the PGI, information to the police is sent. The police has also recorded the statement of the girl. What Dr. Amit has said that is alright. Though the mother was taking care of the girl, but the girl thought that she was not being given proper treatment there. She also had the insurance policy, so she thought that she can be treated well at Forties Hospital. Then she got her

treatment in the Forties Hospital. After that, he believes, there was some argument on some issue. After the argument, the accident case was already there, but the case of sexual harassment was also added. The sexual harassment case was not only put to the Vice Chancellor, Panjab University but also with the police. The report which the PUCASH had given, there was a report from the police. The police has also very clearly found out, perhaps that report may be with the Vice Chancellor, but he has having a copy of that report. He could also read that report or he would give a copy of it to the Vice Chancellor. They have also said that there is no issue of sexual harassment at all. They presented the challan for the accident and they have also refused about the sexual harassment. When the PUCASH report was received, it was marked to Syndicate. They were thinking that somebody is guiding the girl to write all this, but he can say that the girl has not claimed any time that there is something like sexual harassment and so they were also thinking that there was not need to take any big action on the girl. When it came to Syndicate, he said about it, not only in the Syndicate, but also said to the Vice Chancellor several times not to take such a harsh action of stopping ones studies or her fellowship. Not only he (Shri Ashok Goyal) but many other persons have requested the Vice Chancellor about this, but somehow that did not materialize. This was one thing, but besides that that girl was also in NSS, the girl also used to talk to him also. Both the girl and the boy were advised to sink their differences. Ultimately, it was also talked that action which has been taken against both of them should also be nullify and both of them had agreed to it also. But somehow, they could not do it officially. So, he suggested that they should form a small Committee or sit with the Vice Chancellor and he thinks that this could be solved very easily.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the case is already solved. He wanted to know what the position at present?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at present they are talking just under sentiments. Currently, the agenda is only about a complaint made by the complainant under Sexual Harassment Act by mentioning specific section against the then Vice Chancellor of the University. That is the only item which has come to them through the office of the Chancellor. He said that he entirely agrees with Dr. Subhash Sharma, they have no alternative, except to send it to the Hon'ble Chancellor for constituting a Committee to enquire into it. He just want to, of course, he would like to be corrected also. In an earlier complaint, she has complained under Sexual Harassment Act against that boy also and the complaint which did not lie with PUCASH, the Vice Chancellor, he does not know, marked it to the PUCASH. The PUCASH, no knowing that it was not within their jurisdiction to enquire into, they enquired into it and submitted the report. But before they could submit the report, as has been reported, the Vice Chancellor made public comments that her career is finished, this or that. People said to him, do not do it till the report is submitted. The stage came where PUCASH did not submit the report to the Vice Chancellor saying that since he is already biased by giving the statement that she is guilty for filing wrong complaint, so they would not send the report to the vice Chancellor. The situation has been made like this and everything is on record. What was the quarrel, whether the complaint was false or true. The complaint for which the report was submitted, even after the biased statement of the Vice Chancellor and also even after saying it by the members of the Syndicate that this is not in their jurisdiction, as a personal prestige, the Vice Chancellor has to cancel it. But unfortunately, in spite of the fact that majority of the Syndicate members were not in favour of it, there was not even a single dissent. Though they said it, but they have not given dissent.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to say that , let he should correct it. There was only his opinion to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that then he should not say that others have also said it. Professor Navdeep Goyal said the others did not say it.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that now that decision is to be cancelled by the Syndicate which was challenged in the Court. Now that decision of cancellation was not of the



Vice Chancellor which was challenged, that was the decision of the Syndicate, that was stayed by the Court. Even after the stay, the University was hesitant in granting the benefits what were due to her. Enrolment was done. A legal opinion was taken from the same Legal Retainer, Mr. Girish Agnihotri, though his legal opinion is dated nil, but from the chart he has come to know that it was of 13<sup>th</sup> May, 2018 that the opinion was received. In that it was written that it is an operative case. But in the meantime a letter was written to the UGC that her fellowship be stopped. Now she has 3-4 grievances, one is that the cancellation of her Ph.D. registration is wrong, second, her fellowship has been wrongly stopped, which can be undone by the Syndicate. The decision which they have taken in 2017 have to be reviewed and the cancellation has to be undone. As far as release of her scholarship is concerned, they will do that also. But the item which is under consideration, it cannot be dealt with here as per the Act. It is not the Chancellor or Vice President of India, even the President of India or Prime Minister of India cannot go beyond what is mentioned in the Act. The Act says that the Sexual Harassment Complaint always lies with the employer of the accused. So, this complaint would go there. Now the fourth question, which is also not in their preview, but people are saying that whether that quarrel which is still lingering on, how that can be solved. For that, he thinks that instead of making it an issue of the Syndicate, they should form a small Committee where Professor Keshav Malhotra may also be made a member.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said what is need for them to solve the issue which is between two parties.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is saying that it is not an issue of the Syndicate, but for that if they could do these 2-3 things, it would create a ground for that. The issue which is in the purview of the Chancellor, that should be sent to him as he is his employer and the rest of the things could be solved at their level.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the termination of her Ph.D. is otherwise in abeyance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that why she was to be entrapped in the case.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that after getting her into the case, now they are themselves doing it undone.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that she is already continuing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that she is doing her Ph.D. under the orders of the Court.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan and Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they undo the cancellation of her Ph.D. the case would withdraw.

Dr. Subhash said that the University has requested to vacate the stay and final orders have not yet been received. If the stay is vacated and the final order is received, then her Ph.D. is finished. The Court may give the verdict in anyway.

The Vice Chancellor said that first they should first solve the issue of cancellation of her Ph.D. registration and then the release of her scholarship.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested the Vice Chancellor to do it.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that it is true that they are not talking under emotion, but the reality should also be kept in mind. The suggestion that both the parties should be given counseling to resolve their issue amicably, but at the same time they should also think that by giving this thing or that thing to one person, they might not be giving this feeling to the society that the University is with person 'A' and not with person 'B'. So, this feeling could also go to the society. This would create a very serious problem.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what Dr. Ameer Sultana has said, it is quite okay. Such an impression should not go that they are with some person or they are against some person, but the Syndicate has every right to be wiser any day. If they have taken some wrong decision, they should do that but dispassionately not for the purpose of favouring student.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that they understand it, by the general message which would go to the society, they should also take into consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the complaint did not lie with the PUCASH, if the Vice Chancellor would like it, he could read it. He may also tell the Vice Chancellor that when the PUCASH submitted the report, he asked them as to how they have submitted the report, as Professor Malhotra has said that the girl is a student. The PUCASH has nothing to see from where the complainant belongs to and they just took into account as to from where the accused relates to.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it was not in the jurisdiction of PUCASH, whatever was done that was wrong.

The Vice Chancellor asked to Dr. Ameer Sultana as to what should be done.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that she would like to submit that whatever decision is taken here it is okay, but she would like to say that they should not send a message that they are with person 'A' or person 'B'. Time to time the additions are coming. First she made a complaint regarding accident and then added sexual harassment, now it has been given to understand that a new case of attempt to murder has been added to it. What is going on step by step, they have to be careful about it. The second thing is, it may be possible that the girl was being exploited by someone. So, they have to take care of it also.

The Vice Chancellor asked to how it could be solved.

Dr. Ameer Sultana suggested to make a Committee to sort out the issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not right to make Committee on every issue.

Dr. Ameer Sultana suggested to make a Committee unofficially and give responsibility to someone.

Shri Prabhjit Singh requested the Vice Chancellor that they all are authorized so they should take a decision. There is nothing unauthorized. The Vice Chancellor may authorize someone unofficially and let that person/s settle their issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said why they should indulge in their issue as it is their individual concern. This was also endorsed by Dr. Subhash Sharma.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the decision is to be taken by the High Court and not here. The cancellation of Ph.D. registration is in abeyance.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that final order of the High Court has not yet come.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that she has just given a representation to discuss. The complaint is regarding Professor Arun Grover and they are proposing something else.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said then they should decide on that issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that then why they are discussing all other things which are out of context.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal said this is what he is saying.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that then they should discuss the agenda to the point.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is what he is saying. they are talking on something else.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to give some suggestion to the point.

Shri Ashok Goyal said they cannot bargain/mix one official thing with the other unofficial. In the official thing they have written that the decision of cancellation of her Ph.D. and her scholarship be reviewed and the complaint be sent to the Chancellor.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said if anybody thinks that he settle this issue, then he should do it.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that any compromise could be done by involving the guide of the girl Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that either they should have the discussion on this issue or they should come to the agenda.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that this issue is not on the agenda.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that this is what he is saying. Where from that agenda has come on which they are taking the decision. Item number 15 is just going on and four hours have already spent.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members as to what is the way out.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said, that is not there in today's agenda. The issue in today's agenda is this that a complaint was sent to Chancellor against Professor Arun Kumar Grover and the same was sent by the Chancellor office to the University. So, regarding that complaint, they have written that since the employer of Professor Arun Kumar Grover is the Chancellor, so Chancellor office should see to it or make a Committee. So, the agenda is over. Whatever is being discussed, it is beyond the agenda. All these things would come separately in the agenda. In the meantime, they should try to find out a solution.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to see page 259 of the agenda, if it could help on this issue.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this is the office note and it is not the part of the agenda.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 (Para-22), the Syndicate has already accepted the PUCASH report. But now they are saying that it is not in its jurisdiction. If they record it today, then the whole earlier decision of the Syndicate would become wrong.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the complaint is against the other person.

It is informed (by the Registrar) that it is not there in today's agenda. So, he does not think it fit to go into that. They should only discuss what is there in the agenda.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should restrict themselves to the complaint regarding Professor Arun Kumar Grover and the issue regarding review of the cancellation of Ph.D. registration and release of scholarship could be brought in the next agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be brought separately in the agenda in view of the interim order passed by the High Court.

**RESOLVED:** That a separate item maybe brought to the next meeting of the Syndicate in regard of reviewing of the decision already taken by the Syndicate vide para no. 22 of meeting 28.05.2017 regarding the cancellation Ph.D. registration of Ms. Anuradha Jaidka.

**Report of Chief Vigilance Officer dated 2.4.2018 regarding Ph.D. Viva Voce of Atinder Pal Kaur, Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, P.U.**

**16.** Considered report dated 02.04.2018 (**Appendix-XI**) submitted by the Chief Vigilance Officer and representation dated 24.07.2018 (**Appendix-XI**) of the faculty members of the Department of Sociology, in respect of complaint dated 25.08.2017 (**Appendix-XI**) made by D.K. Gill, Research Scholar, Panjab University against Ms. Atinder Pal Kaur, Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, P.U. regarding submission of her Ph.D. thesis

- NOTE:** 1. Ms. Atinder Pal Kaur, JRF, Department of Sociology was enrolled for Ph.D. on 29.03.2012 under the supervision of Professor Kumool Abbi. She completed the data collection by 10.05.2016 and submitted the first draft of her Ph.D. thesis in August, 2016. Later on she submitted her final thesis on 19.06.2017.
2. A copy of the observation dated 20.07.2018 of the former Vice-Chancellor with regard to Viva-Voce is enclosed (**Appendix-XI**). He had also made the following remarks (**Appendix-XI**):
- a. The Viva-Voce was held on 20.07.2018.
  - b. The supervisor and staff of the Department (also, Chairperson, Sociology) choose to remain on leave on 20.07.2018.
  - c. DUI was requested to assume responsibility as Chairperson, Sociology. Dean (Arts) was requested to assume responsibility as to be prepared by the Supervisor.
  - d. Professor Ronki Ram (Former, Dean, Arts), who works in the area, related to the topic of the thesis, was requested to attend the same and viva voce as V.C. Nominee.
  - e. Viva Voce Proceedings were recorded.

In addition to above the Vice-Chancellor has also passed the following orders:-

“DUI: Please forward the CVO report to the Syndicate on my behalf. Please also attach a note giving background of the above”.

3. The Vice-Chancellor while accepting the report dated 02.04.2018 has also passed the following orders:

“DUI: Please study the report and documents. We need to discuss issues arising out of it in detail”.

“Discussed with DUI

1. Let Viva Voce be scheduled at the earliest possible.
2. Two observers to be sent for the Viva, namely Professor Pam Rajput (Dean, Arts Faculty) and Professor A.S. Ahluwalia.
4. As per orders of the Vice-Chancellor as mentioned under Note 2, an office note containing the background of the case is enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that in this case the Viva of a girl was held and in which conditions it was held, she is not aware and a complaint was lodged against it. He said that when the viva is held, how they could say that the viva should be held again.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he would tell about this case. Let they should put the record straight. He asked as to what the University Calendar says about the viva. He said the they should just certify it that her viva which was held, that was in consonance with the laid down provisions of the Calendar. Then he would stop discussion. He asked the Registrar and Controller of Examinations if it was in consonance with the Calendar to which the Controller of Examinations said, ‘No’. He asked Dr. R.K. Mahajan as to what has to be done now.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that if the University has done something wrong, if the University has got the viva done, then what is the fault of the student. Why they conducted viva, that is the fault of the then Vice Chancellor. He again asked, why the viva be conducted again?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he does not know body, but this is a very strange case, which has happened in the University for the first time. He said that they conducted the viva-voce where neither the Supervisor nor the Chairperson of the department was present and in that viva they arbitrarily fixed a Supervisor and the other person was asked to act as Chairperson.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked as to who did this to which Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the former Vice Chancellor did it. The then Vice Chancellor asked two persons to sit there and act as Supervisor and Chairperson of the Department. He asked, what is the legal sanctity of the viva. He asked the Controller of Examinations if it is tenable.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that the item was not for viva, it is the CVO report. He said it is before the conduct of viva. That is regarding the case of 2016 regarding plagiarism. The report is regarding that case.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the viva was held on 20.7.2018. On page 260 of the agenda it is written that the DUI was requested to assume responsibility as Chairperson, Sociology. Dean (Arts) was requested to assume responsibility as to be prepared by the Supervisor.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that first they should give the background of this agenda item and nothing is understandable.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are both the things. The report of CVO is there and there is also a representation of the department people.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examination) that after the circulation of the agenda when he read this item, it was conveyed to the Registrar that it was the CVO report where as the second part is already in the C.O.E. Office. Viva is conducted, C.O.E. Office is not involved as per the procedure in Volume-III, as well as the regulation which is prescribed in Volume-II. He brought to the notice of the Registrar. He discussed on 17<sup>th</sup> of September that the file is with the Vice Chancellor, that these are points which are missing as per the procedure. One, Supervisor must be there, Chairperson should be there and one external examiner should be there. But when he read the file, it was not routed through the C.O.E. office. He came to know that on 20<sup>th</sup> of July, the viva was already conducted. Neither the Chairperson nor the Supervisor was there. Incidentally, in this case the Chairperson and the Supervisor are the same. The external examiner came, reports were submitted, these were not given to the C.O.E., the reason was that the original file was with the C.V.O. The C.V.O. submitted the report to the Vice Chancellor or the Registrar whatever is the highest authority for her. That is why this item came. So, when he read these reports and the viva, he came to know that it is not as per procedure which the laid down for this. He informed the Vice Chancellor who said that he (C.O.E.) should prepare his draft and bring it to him. So, that is already in process, they are doing that. But the question which is raised by Dr. Amit Joshi, it is not as per the procedure of the University, whether viva is conducted on 20<sup>th</sup>, because the examiner gave the date of 26<sup>th</sup> July. The Viva was conducted on 20<sup>th</sup> of July and it was not conducted in the Department of Sociology, but it was conducted in the Department of University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology. It was conducted by the Dean of University Instruction as its incharge and Dean Arts supervised the viva. Few students were present there. He has read in the file that some students attendance is there. So, this is the background of the case.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Dean University Instruction is from the Sanskrit Department and the Dean Arts is from the Political Science department. Both these persons are not related to the subject, but the viva was conducted.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was not held as per the laid down procedure.

Dr. Amit Joshi said, so now they should see as to what has to be done.

The Vice Chancellor said now what is to be done, the members should tell it.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked as to what is the observation in the C.V.O. report.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the C.V.O. report says that the complaint is pseudonymous which may be filed and for rest of the things, they should act as per rules.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they can now see the discrepancy in it. The CVO has written that the complaint is pseudonymous and it may be filed. But in another case, Dr. Suresh Sharma has written that the complaint is anonymous, so why his Directorship has been stopped. Now to whom they would justify. It is not known as to what is going on. He said, it means that you show me the face, I will show you the rule'.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that at the last stage, they have to face the situation.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members as to what is to be done in this case.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that, if he is not wrong, there is another aspect that the viva of this candidate was being delayed for number of months or a year. That is why the former Vice Chancellor had to intervene. He has been told this, but he does not know whether it is a fact or not. So, that aspect has also be kept in mind. Whatever decision they take, the candidate should not suffer and, of course, the Supervisor should also be given due respect. Both the things must happen in whatever they do.

Dr. Amit Sharma said whatever delay has taken place, that is agreed and the Ph.D. viva to any student is one of the special moment in his or her career. But now the question is not of delay. The question is whether it is held as per norms and the persons who have conducted the viva belong to that subject. Even if anybody wants to favour someone, they he has to see whether the propriety issue is maintained or not by their actions.

The Vice Chancellor said that this has not happened, that is why they are devoting this much of time. Had it been happened, this issue would not have been here. He asked the members as to what has to be done, they should tell about this.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there are two things. If they have to see the interests of the student, then by making some noting that there was inordinate delay, this led to harassment and all that, so it was necessary to hold the viva and they could close the case. But there would be one very peculiar issue. The viva was conducted on 20<sup>th</sup> of July, that was his (former Vice Chancellor) last day in the office. The point forwarded by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, Dr. Subhash Sharma also, that is well taken, is accepted that the student should not suffer and because of University's action, the student should not suffer. The other thing is that the manner in which the viva has to be conducted. Now the question before them is, how to justify it. They cannot go back in time and correct that action which has been taken at that time. But now they have to think about, how to correct this wrong that has been done.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the girl has written that she has completed the thesis in 2016 and her viva be conducted.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the date for viva has been fixed many times, but no response was being given from the department.

The Vice Chancellor said that everybody has heard the discussion and he asked the members as to how this issue could be solved.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they have to blame one. If they have to favour the student, then they have to blame the department. If they blame the department, then they would reject the viva. One thing could be done that if they have accepted the submission that there was an inordinate delay in conducting the viva. The then Vice Chancellor, (if it is within the powers of the then Vice Chancellor), got conducted the viva.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not within the powers of the Vice Chancellor and that anybody cannot justify it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now they are searching ways for which they do not have power. Now when they have come in such a situation and started trying to find out ways outside the Calendar, it means that they going to do something wrong. The fault could be that of 'A' or 'B', but are they thinking in the interest of the student? These complaints would follow her even in future as to how her viva was conducted. So, they are not favouring the student even by accepting it. He said that the viva has to be conducted again as per their laid down procedure. Just to say that inordinate delay is there, rather they should also check when she submitted the thesis. They should see whether the viva examinations of those theses which were submitted before 20<sup>th</sup> July, 2018, were conducted.

Dr. Amit Joshi in reply to the question of Shri Ashok Goyal said that those viva-voce examinations were held.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said what is the purpose of holding only one viva on 20<sup>th</sup> July. Was she the candidate of the Vice Chancellor? Was she the candidate of D.U.I.? It is done in Ramleela and one would play the role of Ravana and the other would play the role of Rama. When they are having real Ram or Ravan, why they are giving the roles to someone else. So, this viva would be conducted again. Now he would come to the issue of inordinate delay. This viva was got conducted on 20<sup>th</sup> July and it is being told that the viva was already scheduled for 26<sup>th</sup> or 27<sup>th</sup> July to which the Vice Chancellor corrected that it was scheduled for 26<sup>th</sup> July. Shri Ashok Goyal said that, is it only to overcome those six days that this whole drama has been played.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that there is one logic.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that he talking about what has been published in the newspaper.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that 26<sup>th</sup> date was not reliable because what the Chairperson has done, earlier also she has fixed the date, but every time she found the excuse not to hold the viva. Either she went on leave or otherwise.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the airport is closed by Shri Malhi, would he run it?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it is one way. He is not supporting any party.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, that has been fixed.

Dr. Amit Joshi enquired whether the notification of the viva has been done to which the C.O.E. said that they have received the file now.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the viva was held on 20<sup>th</sup> July, why the delay was there, they have to avoid it, that viva report is coming for notification after two months. Are they causing the delay or avoiding it? It has been decided by the Syndicate, that on the of the viva, the notification be done on the same very day. Had it been the intention, then the Vice Chancellor should get the notification also on that very day. But the file is coming to the C.O.E. on 20<sup>th</sup> or 23<sup>rd</sup> of September. So, it means that the reason was not to avoid the inordinate delay, there was some other reason. So, the viva be held at the earliest.

The Vice Chancellor asked if it is in their purview to hold the viva again.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the viva already conducted would be null and void and the same examiner would not come. Secondly, they cannot do anything as they are helpless. Even if they are not helpless, they have not any willingness to point out where the people have gone wrong. But how all this has happened that at the last moment they are inviting the examiner. What is the purpose of calling the examiner at the last moment. The air ticket which would otherwise cost Rs. 3000/- it would have cost Rs. 18000/-. But was the emergency that he has himself monitored everything and called the examiner. There was no Supervisor, he has asked someone to act as Supervisor, there was no Chairperson, he has asked another person to act as Chairperson by proxy.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as per rules the Vice Chancellor has to appoint a person in place of the Chairperson if the Chairperson is also the Supervisor.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should conduct the viva afresh.



Dr. Subhash Sharma said that she submitted her thesis on 19.6.2017 and the UGC says that the viva should be conducted within 120 days. It is right that the Viva should be conducted in 120 days because the student who has worked hard for 5 years. The degree is awarded only after the viva is held. The viva is not held even upto one year. But when the department conducted the viva some fault may come out and then after four months they would ask the candidate that his/her viva would be conducted again. That is also injustice to the student. It would change the date of her degree.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the date would change even now as there is no notification issued so far.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said why the notification has not been issued so far.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the notification cannot be issued because the viva has not been done as per the rules.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he agrees with him on this, but what action has been taken against those due to whom her degree is delayed by one year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, they should talk on that issue.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said the University has made a mockery of the System. A student works hard for five year, but they do not hold the viva in time. If some fault comes out, then they say that the viva be conducted again. It is very difficult to appear in the viva again. They do not know how much mental pressure is there on the student.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though he has not done Ph.D., but he knows about it. They have not to do this also that the students may be allowed copying by putting him in a closed room just to avoid the tension of a student. He would not like to talk more on this issue, but it was written that a public viva was held where a large number of students from the Department of Sociology were sitting. But actually, there was one students from the Department of and there was not even a single teacher from the Sociology Department. Do they call it viva?

Shri Prabhjit Singh said because of these reasons the reputation of Panjab University has maligned.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan asked, is there any person whose viva was held twice.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they talk about the appointment of Board of Examiners. In the Board of Examiners it is very clearly ticked the name Supervisor and External Examiner. Since, the Chairperson is not there, the Vice Chancellor has to tick the name in place of Chairperson. So, now on the day of viva, if someone is absent, the student cannot be punished for that. When the appointment of Board of Examiners was done, if the name of Supervisor and Supervisor whose names were there did not come, then even if two persons are there, the viva would be considered as valid. If out of the three, two members are present the quorum would be considered complete.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that as per their normal procedure, to fix appointment with the examiner and to take date from him is the work of the Chairperson of the Department. The fixation of date for viva with the examiner is also fixed by the Chairperson. She asked whether in this case, the date was fixed by the Chairperson with the examiner to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the date was fixed by the Chairperson. If due to some emergency, if the Chairperson was not able to come, did she inform the Vice Chancellor about it. They have to see all these things. She said she may be wrong. The facts can be verified. Was it happened that not even a single teacher was not present there? Was this the reason that the teachers of

the department were on casual leave? If all the things were there, then they have to keep in mind the interest of the candidate. It may not happen that because of some differences in the department, the student has to suffer.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that in order to look into the matter, 2-3 persons may be assigned the job to study so that a decision could be taken.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when such things happen, the complete facts are not known. They do not see the things legally as the Court looks them, though they should see it. There may be so many things which they may not know from others. When one would come to know, his opinion may change. So, in this matter some differences may have been there between the student and the Supervisor at some stage. It was not there that the Supervisor was not willing to hold her viva. He informed that he and the Supervisor of the candidate went to England on 26<sup>th</sup> June and came back from there on July 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> together. She talked to him there and before that also this issue was being discussed. When she has to go, she has to take permission from the Vice Chancellor and to follow the procedure. Sometimes, it is refused by the Vice Chancellor because of shortage of time. When she went to the Vice Chancellor's office. After this Professor Ronki Ram said what he is speaking now, it is off the record. She was asked to conduct the viva when the University would open after the vacations. Earlier, there may be some reason when the viva was not conducted. The University opened on 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> July. But after that even till 15<sup>th</sup> of July, the viva could not be held. Then she said that she has sent a whatsapp message to Professor Pam Rajput. She said that she told Professor Pam Rajput on phone that the viva is being conducted on 27<sup>th</sup> of July, but Professor Pam Rajput said that she should be sent this information in writing. Then she said that she has talked to examiner tentatively, how she can give in writing. Any teacher can say this that he/she would not give in writing. What even then the Chairperson sent a whatsapp message to Professor Pam Rajput that the viva is to be held on 27<sup>th</sup> July. There was also apprehension that since the term of the Vice Chancellor was going to end on 22<sup>nd</sup> July, the viva may not be conducted after that as it is already delayed. So it should be tried to conduct it. The examiner is not coming. Someone approached her examiner to which Shri Ashok Goyal said who approached him, he should tell it clearly. Continuing, Professor Ronki Ram said that he does not know who has approached him, but if Shri Ashok Goyal knows it, he could tell.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would tell. He said that Professor A.S.Ahluwalia, the then Secretary to Vice Chancellor contacted the examiner of Pondicherry University over the official telephone to ensure that the examiner reaches here.

Continuing, Professor Ronki Ram said that the Supervisor told him that she has talked to the examiner who told her that he is not coming because of some flight problem and they say that there is some other issue. Then, perhaps, there is some conversation through email with the Vice Chancellor's Office and the Supervisor. Then the Viva was got fixed. There has been a great role of the Supervisor. She said that she talked to Professor Rajat Sandhir and Professor Mehta, Dean of Science Faculty, who told her that such viva were conducted earlier also. The Controller of Examinations is saying that such a viva has not been held earlier.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that he was talking that such a viva has not been held during his own tenure. Now they can see that nobody in this matter is trying to harm anyone. The circumstance has been becoming such that a confusion is arising. In this issue, the student thinks that injustice has been done with her and on the other hand the department says that injustice has been done with it, Supervisor says justice has been done to her. So, they have to think thoroughly in this case. It is very difficult. Sometimes they come across such situations in life when they have to take such decisions. The difficulty is not for the persons standing in the accused box, but it for the Judge to give the verdict as to how he has to decide. He said that he has explained the bare facts to them, but who is responsible, he cannot say.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are two things, one is what has to be done in this case and the other is who is responsible for it. So, there should be some suggestion for it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the procedure has been followed. The day, the thesis is submitted, panel of experts is sent to the Vice Chancellor. Six names of outside side experts are sent, one from Delhi side and the other from this side. The Vice Chancellor tick marks the nominated expert. One was Professor Mohanty from Pondicherry University or whosoever he was. The Chairperson and the Supervisor are the same persons. This is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor. Now the issue is that Supervisor did not sit in the viva. After filter downing all the things, it was given to understand that the outside expert was there. As Professor Navdeep Goyal said, irrespective of the fact, the outside expert came. He was sitting in the viva. Now the main thing is that the Supervisor was not sitting in the viva. Now the Supervisor has given in writing, she is questioning the legality of the viva which was conducted on the orders of the Vice Chancellor from which Supervisor has been excluded. If there is any precedence that any viva was held without a Supervisor that should be quoted. The external examiner did attend the viva. But now if there is any precedent regarding Supervisor, that should be quoted, otherwise how it could be done.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he has been seeing the whole correspondence that has taken place as also the letters of the Supervisor. It is a very clear-cut case. There are some differences between the Supervisor and the students since long. There is a very big conflict. The father of the student is also involved in it and they are making complaints against each other. The student is writing against the Supervisor and the Supervisor is writing against the student. So, in such a situation the Supervisor would not come next time if the viva is fixed again. He suggested that if the quorum is complete, then they should approve it.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that there is another positive. The viva was held on 20<sup>th</sup> July. If they see the correspondence, the Chairperson herself on 18<sup>th</sup> July has fixed that the viva would be held on 27<sup>th</sup> July. Some development took place in between, otherwise everything was running properly.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he would like to make only two points. One is from the candidate side. Suppose, he is a candidate and he has been called for viva. The highest authority of the University i.e. Vice Chancellor has constituted this thing. He has cleared that viva and he has done nothing wrong. If the University has made some mess up between the Vice Chancellor and the Supervisor etc., he is not responsible for this. Shri Ashok Goyal said that she cannot go to Court, but he does not agree with it. The candidate can go to Court because it is his fault. The other thing is that viva committee has been constituted including the Supervisor. Now the Supervisor decided not to come, whatever reason may be, genuine not genuine. The student should not suffer for that. Part two of the issue is that suppose he is the Supervisor and she has worked under him for long time. He has cleared her thesis and asked for viva whether on 26<sup>th</sup> or 27<sup>th</sup>. It is immaterial. So, he has nothing to say negative against her. Whether, he is sitting in the viva or not, his presence would help the student. He cannot go against the student. If he is present, it would help the student. But the student of her own, without his help has cleared the viva. What is the problem. So, let the student go through, why to punish the student. That is his point.

Dr. Amit Joshi, while he was saying that that the quorum is complete, the Vice Chancellor intervened to say that he agrees with it, but they should say if there is anything beyond it. They should tell what to do ahead.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should see that is there any precedent where the Supervisor was not present and the viva was held. If there is such precedent where the Supervisor is overlooked and even then the viva was conducted after ignoring the Supervisor, then they can do it. The fixation of date of viva without taking the Supervisor into confidence,

if such a precedence is there in the University, he would also like to be enlightened. Whether that case could be done on that date or not, that is the question of quorum. But now the question is that when they *ab inito* started the case wrongly and after that the quorum was got completed, there is no doubt that he is also on student's side that why there is such a delay after the submission of thesis by her. But can anybody from the Vice Chancellor to the Controller could confirm whether in other departments of the University the viva was conducted within the stipulated time of 180 days. Let aside 180 days they cannot conduct it in 300 days. So, nobody takes care of the students. But he is saying that the issue which is there in the Syndicate, the then Vice Chancellor had marked it to the Syndicate. Why it is marked to the Syndicate? If the situation was so alarming, why it was not brought earlier to the Syndicate. If he had thought that the student should not suffer, then why it was not brought in the Syndicate meeting of August, 2018 when the viva was conducted on 20<sup>th</sup> July. Why it has come in the meeting of September. So, he would like to say that there was no such intention that they would like to help the student, there was no such intention that they would like to avoid the inordinate delay, the simple things was that the then Vice Chancellor would like to get the viva conducted before his exit. The then Vice Chancellor had made it personal prestige to hold the viva on 20<sup>th</sup> July before his leaving the University. He has made it a personal prestige, who cared for the student. He said, now he is saying that if they want to help the student, all the teachers from the sociology field has given in writing against her, where that girl would go, they would tell under which circumstances, her viva was conducted. She would be having the certificate, but she would not have the credentials. He is only, with a view to help the student, would say that if the earlier Vice Chancellor could fix the viva within a day, the he (the Vice Chancellor) could also fix the viva within a week. If they pass the item today, then the notification would held on 23<sup>rd</sup> September, but if they do what he is saying, the notification could be issued on 30<sup>th</sup> September. Just for postponing the notification for a week, would help them to keep their system intact and the career of the student would also not be at stake for all times to come. That is what he wants to say. As regards what Dr. Subhash Sharma has said, it should be enquired into as to who is responsible for the delay in conducting the viva, if it is there.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that they are talking about the student only. The Supervisor could also be wrong. The Supervisor did not come because the viva was fixed many times earlier also. It was also not necessary that she would come now on the date of viva. The Supervisor may also not be at fault because the student and Supervisor are not having good relations. The student as well as the Supervisor could also be at fault.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the Vice Chancellor should call both of them to him and he should find out any midway solution to it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would not call any one to him.

Dr. Subahash Sharma said that the work of the Supervisor in the viva is that if the examiner has asked some more from the student, then he can help the student. But if the Supervisor cleared the viva without his Supervisor, it is okay, there should not be any problem. If the candidate has done to the satisfaction of the candidate, then where is the problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that viva was just conducted, the result was also known as there was no person from the sociology subject.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal said what type of examiner he was, who came on 20<sup>th</sup> also.

Dr. Amit Joshi said then they should ask from that person who has given his name.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that there is another apprehension in this. They have become so vindictive to the students, that they would again put her in trouble. They would ask such type of questions from the student and the student would get confused. Since this issue has become a prestige, so now it is vindictive.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the time he is in the University, nobody has failed in the viva. Perh aps, he (Vice Chancellor) remembers that an IAS Officer had become the Vice Chancellor Aligarh Muslim University. He asked to make a data whether any person has been declared fail in the viva. After looking the date, he said not to hold the viva. He said that they making them fool when they are not to fail anybody. Then what for the viva is conducted. What happens in Panjab University is that after the viva is conducted, all the cases are placed before the Syndicate. In the Syndicate, some discussion used to take place for bringing some improvement. Sometimes, the corrections were also done. But gradually, they started saying why lot of papers relating to Ph.D. are brought in the Syndicate meeting. What the Syndicate has to do. They Syndicate had already decided that the Controller is authorized to issue the notification on the same the viva is conducted. So, it cannot happen to fail somebody in the viva. If that Supervisor is doing the delay intentionally, she knows it that she could trouble the candidate till her viva and after she cannot do anything. He said that if she was doing so, but he does not say that she doing it.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what has to be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that her viva be conducted again.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the viva cannot be conducted again. It is unfair.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said if the Supervisor does not come on the next date also, what they would do.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked the Vice Chancellor, then how he would sign.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the Syndicate can take a decision on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the power is not with the Syndicate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked as to what is problem technically.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said if the Supervisor does not come, would they keep on waiting till eternity.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked, is it written in the rules that the presence of the Supervisor is mandatory.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is only written about the Board of Examiners and after that the rule is silent.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if someone from the Board of Examiners does not come, it is okay. This was also supported by Dr. Subhash Sharma. Professor Navdeep Goyal said when the quorum of two is complete, then there should not be a problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he should be shown where it is written. Earlier he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) was saying that it was written, but now he is saying if the examiner does not come, what they can do.

Shri Gurjot Malhi said that the students cannot be asked to come again and again for the viva.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is a procedure for Ph.D. The reports are sent after every six months. The persons work hard for six years. It is approved by the Research Degree Committee.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the examiner did come in viva and he cleared the viva, it is okay. He has signed the thesis.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said only the presence of examiner is required, that is all. When the examiner has cleared it, then what is the problem.

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

Dr. Amit Joshi said that in this case the only mistake which occurred is that he (the then Vice Chancellor) should not have replaced the Supervisor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is sorry that they are being misled and that too after going through the provisions. He asked, who is the expert in this case. He thought that Professor Navdeep Goyal would always read in between the lines, what does it mean. He was going to almost agree, if that is the case, if that is the thing, if the quorum is complete, it is alright. He said three members are required to be present as per regulations. Now who would be those three members. He said one is Chairperson, other is Supervisor and the third is external examiner. But if the Chairperson is also the Supervisor herself, then the Vice Chancellor has to give third expert. He asked, who is the expert of sociology in this case. In the Viva, external examiner has come, Supervisor was there, but who is the expert.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they have already discussed it that a wrong was committed.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that if the mistake has been done by the Vice Chancellor, why the student should suffer.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Supervisor is the Head of the Department, then someone else could be replaced at his place. When the Dean of University Instruction was put at her place, the matter is over. If the Head of the Department is Supervisor also, then expert has to be put in place of the Supervisor. Who would do that.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the Supervisor was put in the viva committee, but she did not come on her own. She was put in the Committee at the place of Chairperson.

Shri Ashok Goyal said when he says and one person would play the roles of Ram and Ravan, i.e. Role 'A' and Role 'B', it means that she was given two roles to play, one is that of Chairperson and the other is Supervisor.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked if it is written that expert of same subject is required.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, what does they mean by expert?

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is not necessary that the subject should of the same subject.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to to bind up the discussion.

Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi asked Shri Ashok Goyal to get his dissent noted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said he has not asked to get his dissent noted. But if they want, they should record it. He said that he is giving his opinion, but he (Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi) is converting it into dissent. Shri Ashok Goyal said that then what else it is, he (Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi) is saying to note his dissent.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said if the mistake is on the part of the University, why a person should suffer on that account. Once the viva has been held why they should conduct it again. If the Supervisor does not come again, who will be responsible for that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then, let they should think in terms of that what punishment should be awarded who has committed this mistake. How the Vice Chancellor gone out of his jurisdiction to do this nonsense. Let they should take the decision whether the Vice Chancellor took the decision within his jurisdiction and if not, what action can be taken against him. Let the matter be reported to the Chancellor that this how they have played with the Calendar. Let the Syndicate resolve this.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that for 20<sup>th</sup> July, the Supervisor had applied for leave.

The Vice Chancellor, no, they should not do this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said this is strange, if they are not to do this or that.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the student has no fault rather she is harassed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said they can neither protect the rules nor they can protect the sanctity. They have made a prestige of one week and the then Vice Chancellor has made a prestige of that he would conduct the viva before 22<sup>nd</sup> July. Why they do not go and sit in public viva? Go and ensure that the candidate is not harassed.

The Vice Chancellor said that they were talking in a very congenial atmosphere and after that they start quarrelling.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, though he did not speak about it and he did not disclosed it to anybody, his real niece, has done Ph.D. from here. How much she has been harassed and how much time it took after submission of the thesis to get the viva conducted. But he never told anybody, he never let anybody know that she was studying here because that would have also been politicized, but he ensured that after that no rule should violate after that.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the viva of his wife was also held after one year.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that here the issue is different as the viva has already been conducted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if the Vice Chancellor make prestige on some issue, then it is good. He further said that as Shri Malhi has said to record his (Shri Ashok Goyal) dissent, that must be recorded.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that Shri Malhi has asked him to leave that point.

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

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he does not know which students were sitting in the viva, but he knows that about one hundred students were sitting there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that all of those students were saying , Vice Chancellor Zindabad.

Dr. Subhash Sharma and Shri Gurjot Malhi said that they should now go ahead as the issue has been resolved unanimously.

The Vice Chancellor also agreed to it.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal said that still he has no dissent. They could hold the viva again on 30<sup>th</sup> September. It is just a matter of one week. They cannot notify to before tomorrow.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said if the Supervisor does not come next time also and the viva is not conducted, does, the whole Syndicate would be responsible?

Shri Ashok Goyal said, he will tell about that. He said that in case the Supervisor does not come, then the Vice Chancellor has the power to appoint an expert in her place.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said it means that it could be got done from any teacher with force. This is becoming a precedent.

Dr. Ameer Sultana requested that it should not be made a precedent and it should be cleared as a special case with a rider note to quote as a precedent.

The Vice Chancellor wanted to know if it is possible to clear it as a special case and that it should not be quoted as a precedent.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has no legal value. It has become a precedent and if is said that it is a onetime exception and it should be quoted as precedent in future does not suffice.

The Vice Chancellor said that they make efforts that such a thing should be repeated. They have made improvements at some places.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are improving the things, rather they are spoiling it. Such a thing has not happened earlier, it is happening for the first time and they are endorsing it.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he is also supervising five students. What is happening they do not know?

The Vice Chancellor asked the members, could it help if the Supervisor and student sit together to sink their differences.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it could be done. If they sink their differences, it is okay.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked, how the Vice Chancellor would ask them sit together.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would not ask them to do them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this issue is lingering on since January 2017.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the issue should be decided by the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested he (Vice Chancellor) should not by-pass any rule to which the Vice Chancellor said that he would not do that. Shri Ashok Goyal said then that this is not in the rules.

The Vice Chancellor said that if he has to do this, then he could do this one hour before.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is saying that they should be conducted within one week to the satisfaction of all.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan while objecting to it said there cannot be second viva. The student would be harassed again. This was also endorsed by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if she goes to Court tomorrow, what face do they have.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the students has given an affidavit in February 2017 mentioning that her thesis is ready. So, she can go to the Court.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said, that is what he is saying that what face do they have.

Dr. Subhash Sharma that the Court would ask as to why they have not conducted her viva so far. So, first they have to reply as to why the viva was not conducted, secondly they have to reply as to why they cancelled the viva.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they cannot cancel the viva.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that there was dispute between the Supervisor and the student. The student is saying to accept her thesis, but the Supervisor is saying that she should first take extension. How much wrong is there.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the external examiner would ask as what mistake he has done in conducting the viva. This cannot be done. It cannot be a child play.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that to protect one rule, they are violating the other.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that once the viva is held, it is okay, they cannot play with the career of the student.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should also give the answer to the objection of the other people also. They cannot say if the viva is held, it is held.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is proper if they do not talk about the court here. There is provision in their calendar that even if due to the mistake of the University, if somebody has taken the examination and passed it and if it comes to the notice of the University at any time, the degree is liable to be withdrawn.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the University followed another procedure in place of the proper procedure.

Shri Ashok Goyal what is that other procedure?

Shri Ronki Ram said that the student has not committed any mistake, she has not used any unfair means.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that this issue has become endless and requested the Vice Chancellor to take a decision.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu also requested the Vice Chancellor that now he has to take a decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that if he takes a decision, then something right or wrong should not be there.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the decision has to be taken by the Syndicate and not by the Vice Chancellor.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they have taken the decision to approve it which was also endorsed by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. R.K. Mahajan.

**RESOLVED:** That the Viva-voce examination of Ms. Atinder Pal Kaur, Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, P.U. held on 20.7.2018, be treated as valid.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That, in future, as per the CVC guidelines the matters having vigilance angle only be sent to the Chief Vigilance Officer and not of academic and administrative nature.

**Physical verification of purchases made by the P.U. Construction Office**

**17.** Considered if, a Committee be constituted, for making physical verification of all the purchases made by the Office of P.U. Construction (Column 1 at Sr. No.1-11 and 13) (**Appendix-XII**) as suggested by Chief Vigilance Officer, P.U. vide note dated 07.08.2018 (**Appendix-XII**).

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.11.2017 (Para 10) (**Appendix-XII**) considered the minutes dated 15.09.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 25.06.2017 (Para 6) to study/examine the summary reports submitted by the CVO Panjab University in detail and resolved that:-

- (1) recommendation of the Committee at Sr.No.1 to 4, 7 to 10, 12 to 33 of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be noted;
- (2) recommendation of the Committee at Sr. No. 5 of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be noted and it be added in the guidelines for appointment of Chief Coordinators/Coordinators of Examination Centres that they would not perform any other duty while working as Chief Coordinators/Coordinators;
- (3) recommendation of the Committee at Sr.No.6, of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be referred to the same Committee which is already looking into the case;
- (4) recommendation of the Committee at Sr. No. 11 of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be noted; and information from the XEN be solicited on the following points:
  - (i) information about the supplier (Dwivedi Furniture) who had

- supplied the items in the University during that period;
- (ii) the list of competitors for the tenders;
  - (iii) the details of the specifications of the tender and the specifications of the items supplied;
  - (iv) the names of the persons who approved the tenders and received the material;
  - (v) legal opinion be sought on the possibility of filing a police complaint against Dwivedi Furniture.
- (5) the complaints which have already been recommended by the CVO as 'filed/withdrawn' be not placed before the Syndicate; and
  - (6) an additional column be created in the status and summary report table showing the action taken on the issues.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has already talked about it when the CVO was made. The CVO is made as per the CVC guidelines. He wanted to know whether it is the same CVO or they have just given it a name. Here they give the complaint of 'Rehriwala' to the CVO. He said that CVO should be given only vigilance cases. They have given the CVO the domestic or preliminary investigations. But they have given him the name of CVO. As the Vice Chancellor himself has said that the vigilance cases should be taken care of seriously. The CVO has herself said that they send every report of the CVO to the CVC, whereas he knows that it is a wrong statement. Their CVC has connection with the CVC. When the CVO has to be appointed then they have to get his/her name approved from the CVC. He/she is appointed as per the CVC guidelines, but here they have appointed one person and then second and so on. Some cases are referred to the CVO, but some cases are sent and some are not sent. Four months back a decision was taken to send a matter to the CVO and it be got investigated on priority. As per his knowledge, it has been sent to the CVO, but the CVO did not investigate it as case was not good in the eyes of CVO. But after 2-3 months a case was sent to the CVO, that was a good case, and it was investigated. So, he suggested that there should be some guidelines as per the CVC, what is its perview, what cases has to be sent to the CVO. The CVO should be sent minimum cases which involved vigilance angle and not that of leaves of employees, cases relating to absence of employees etc.

The Vice Chancellor said that there should be some screening Committee for sending the cases to the CVO.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are guidelines for this.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the CVO should be left only for the anti-corruption cases and the normal administrative work, academic work etc, should not be sent to the CVO.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members whether it should be recorded to which the members nodded in the affirmative.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Ronki Ram has suggested that there were some cases where enquiry was going on and there were some other Court cases also, all such cases should be clubbed. But he does not know as to what is this.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that when this issue came up last time, the comments of Dr. Subhash Sharma and other members were also recorded. It was the report of Shri S.S. Lamba and the charges were leveled against Shri S.K. Sharma, S.D.O. and the agenda was brought before the Syndicate. The charge was that the S.D.O. has used the gauge of the Supplier and not with the gauge of the department. Shri Ashok Goyal was also in agreement with the fact that the reputation of Shri S.K. Sharma is good. The responsibility of checking also lies with the J.E. The J.E. has to check the measurement and the S.D.O. has to cross check it and the S.D.O. did it in good faith. But now the J.E. has gone abroad and he is absconding, he never returned to India. Now the Charge-sheet has been filed against the S.D.O. It is said that it is the duty of the X.E.N. also because he also has to sign. So, it was clearly mentioned in the earlier decision that the scope of the enquiry should be widened and probe the role of the X.E.N. also. It should not be that only the S.D.O. or J.E. should be indicted and the X.E.N. is left. A discussion on this issue has taken many times, but they have to take a call sometime on it. If there is no corruption, the person would be given clean chit. One person is being harassed. The C.V.O. in her report has given in writing that the scope of enquiry be widened to enquire into the involvement of other persons including X.E.N. In stead of discussing it here or sending it to the CVO, they should form a Committee to widen the scope of enquiry and take it to some logical conclusion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said what Dr. Amit Joshi has said it is alright. The J.E. has signed after verifying the measurement and the S.D.O. in good faith also signed it. In the same way the X.E.N. has also signed on that paper. But the University did not ask anything to the X.E.N. but the S.D.O. was charge sheeted. If both of them have signed in good faith, then both are at fault. But the University booked the S.D.O. and left the X.E.N. If they have both signed in good faith, then either they should leave both or if they are convinced then they should hold both responsible. It was in that direction and there was not commentary after that. S.D.O. is one of those persons who commands the impeccable reputation and that person is charge sheeted and the person about whom he would not like to say anything, he has been left.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if he can recall, then he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has said that since the jurisdiction to punish this person lies with the Senate, the Syndicate cannot even add a full stop or comma. Shri Ashok Goyal has further said that by deliberating here in the Syndicate, they are denying the Senate the right to apply their mind if they would discuss and decide the agenda here., There was a second aspect also. The X.E.N. has floated the tenders and the tenders were deliberately bifurcated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the meeting of the Senate came, the case of the S.D.O. was sent to the Senate whereas it was decided here that it could not be discussed here in the Syndicate and it would be sent together, but the item relating to S.D.O. was sent to the Senate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it was decided that after holding the enquiry against the X.E.N. also, then the case would be sent to the Senate. It was also endorsed by Professor Navdeep Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said the spirit at that time was that any honest person should not be punished.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Professor Ronki Ram said that the S.D.O. is saying that if he is at fault, he should be given punishment. He has worked throughout his life with great honesty. If he has signed in good faith, the other person has signed it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that due to the University, the condition of that person has become such that he is not able to even lift a book. His hands have started trembling. It has happened due to all these things.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he was considering himself guilty as he has made the complaint. He has made the complaint against someone else, but someone else was entrapped.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the issue was to bifurcate the tenders. The decision was that the scope of enquiry should be widened. Here the tender is not floated by the S.D.O. The tender is floated by the XEN.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the tender was not only bifurcated, rather it was trifurcated. That particular tender was trifurcated. The reason was given that the steel almirahs and wooden beds were supplied by the same person. The same person i.e. Dwivedi Steels, is supplying the material i.e. steel almirahs and wooden beds since 2008.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that nothing would come out of this. He has already raised this issue that the person who has done corruption, he has gone abroad. They cannot make any recovery from him nor they can punish him. He cannot say whether he has done any corruption, but if he has done, then it was done by him, but these two people, i.e. X.E.N. and the S.D.O., they have done the negligence. They may hold any number of enquiries. Even if the XEN is brought in the ambit of the enquiry, this would not serve any purpose. Since nothing would come out of it, he suggested that they should blacklist this supplier. The supplier has given him the gauge and in good faith he made the measurement with that gauge. So, there is no need to drag it more. He suggested that the firm should be blacklisted and the S.D.O. and the XEN could be warned.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that the first person against whom the allegation has been leveled is out. So, it is difficult to prove as to what was the factual situation at that time.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the issue regarding widening of the scope is concerned is a separate issue. All the almirahs are lying in the hostel. Whether they want to do anything, they can see to it.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan and Dr. Ameer Sultana said that they should take action on the supplier.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is very clear that they should take action against the supplier.

Professor Keshav Malhotra also said that they should take action against the supplier. They should have confidence on the S.D.O. and the XEN. Whatever has been done, that done due to an oversight.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is not so easy to do all this. An enquiry was held in this case and the Enquiry Officer has taken the XEN as witness. He was not given any charge sheet. The person who has to sign, he is equally responsible.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that to issue charge sheet is not the duty of the Enquiry Officer, it is the work of the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor has charge-sheeted the S.D.O. only and not to the XEN and only on the basis that there are signatures of the S.D.O. and did not

take into the fact of signatures of the XEN. When the CVO was enquiring into the matter, she called the XEN and asked whether he has signed, then he said that he did sign but in good faith. Since there were signatures of the J.E. and S.D.O. so also marked his signatures. So, the enquiry officer could not do any thing because the XEN was not charge-sheeted. This was the observation of the Enquiry Officer. The XEN should have been charge sheeted first. Since he was not charge sheeted, the enquiry officer could not do anything. The S.D.O. and X.E.N. knew it, they were given to understand that the persons who has done this has gone abroad and nothing would happen now. He said that he has signed in good faith and it it was admitted by him. He (S.D.O.) has admitted this also that he has taken the guage of the supplier. So, the Enquiry Officer said that the charges are proved. It was said in the last meeting that this issue should be stopped here, but they took it to the Senate. Now there is only one way, that the item should be withdrawn from the agenda of the Senate, this was also endorsed by Dr. Subhash Sharma and some others. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they cannot do any more in this matter and they could think that such things should not occur in future. The supplier should be blacklisted.

The Vice Chancellor said that for this, there is some procedure.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma said that perhaps he has already been blacklisted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the supplier was blacklisted for three years, but what the XEN did that he did not circulate it and kept it with himself. He said that if someone is blacklisted he should be blacklisted for ever and not for three years. It has to be circulated to all so that the people are aware that the material has not to be purchased from this person.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the locus standi of this is that all the three has done it in good faith, but good faith on whom. It would be on the supplier, but how to define good faith.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that on the good faith of J.E., the S.D.O. did it and on the good faith of S.D.O. the X.E.N. did it.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that when it was discussed last time, it was agreed that as far as the extension of the enquiry to other parts is concerned, that is a different point, but once someone is held guilty i.e. the J.E. and the S.D.O., they need to be punished. He does not agree that one things should be withdrawn For the J.E. and SDO, it has been established that they did something wrong. If the others did wrong, the whole thing could be done again. But the persons who have done wrong, they should be punished. As regards the good faith is concerned, if they give the benefit of good faith to everybody, then the signatures are meaningless. The government system is that if he has signed something, does not matter how high he may be, one may be the President of India, then he is responsible for that. So, if they start giving benefit of doubt, then they cannot punish anybody. So, once the persons signs, he is responsible for what has been written. That is the way the law works. The law does not say that if one signs, he is not responsible.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said then X.E.N. should also be brought into the ambit of enquiry.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should first punish those who have been held guilty. He has said this last time also. It was discussed that the X.E.N. or somebody else is more responsible and action should be taken against them etc. That is right, action should be there. But the person who is held guilty, what is the logic of quitting that person or to linger on the issue. They can catch hold of any number of persons. He had made this point last time also. The person who has been caught should be punished for other they should look into the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that last time it was not decided that the S.D.O. be hanged, but it was decided that the other persons who are involved, their case should be taken together to the Senate alongwith these two persons.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it was from Shri Ashok Goyal and not from his side.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not talking whether it is from his side or not, he is talking about the decision which was taken.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that whatever was resolved, that was not written. It was decided that first the enquiry would be done and then the report of both S.D.O. and the XEN would be placed before the Syndicate and then it would go to the Senate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said this is exactly what he has wanted last time.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it has been said that Syndicate is not competent, so it must go to the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to see the resolved part as well as the report of the C.V.O. The resolve part says that the scope of the enquiry be widened to enquire into the involvement of other persons including the X.E.N. in the present case and for the purchases made for other hostels and regional campuses, etc.

Dr. Subhash Sharma read out the next point of the resolved part which says that the CVO reports on the issue be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the part relating to S.D.O., they cannot discuss it as it would go to the Senate and simultaneously it was also decided that the report of other cases should also be brought in the next meeting and all the cases would go to the Senate together. The spirit of the decision was that these cases would go to the Senate together. Now they should see the report of the CVO.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to say that the CVO has made a report of the material purchased from Dwevedi Steel. So, when the material was supplied, it should have been checked physically. But they say that for physical verification, the Syndicate should form a Committee. Otherwise, once it is given to the C.V.O., then they have to do each and everything themselves.

Dr. Subhash Sharma enquired whether they made a separate Committee with regard to the S.D.O.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they did nothing against the S.D.O. They do not dictate the resolved part.

Shri Ashok Goyal while referring to page 440 of the agenda papers read out the following:

“(iv)the scope of the enquiry be widened to enquire into the involvement of other persons including the XEN in the present case and for the purchases made for other hostels and regional campuses etc.

(v) the CVO reports on the issue be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting”

On the same page he further read out the following:

“In compliance with the Syndicate resolution item stated at Sr. (iv) above, this office vide letter No. 428/CVO/D dated 13.06.2018 requested the XEN-1, P.U.

Construction office to provide details of furniture purchased from M/s Diwedi Steel Furniture for various Panjab University Hostels at Hoshiarpur and other Regional Centres from Session 2006-2007 onwards”

He said that the word ‘present case’ has been omitted. The reply to this is that they have not purchased any furniture for the regional centre. The issue to fix accountability in the present case has been finished. So, there is no mention of the resolved part.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they have charge sheeted the S.D.O. for putting his signatures on that document. In the same way the XEN has also signed, so the XEN should also be charge sheeted. There nothing to charge sheet the XEN in that case. They have started going to some other direction.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that Professor Navdeep Goyal had made a complaint to tell that so and so person is corrupt, but they are so clever and by managing the system they entrapped the honest person. He said that they would not let him harm in anyway as he is an honest person. They have referred his case to the Senate, but nothing would happen there also. They are just twisting the things and nothing would come out of it. They are asking since 30<sup>th</sup> March to take some action, but nothing has happened against him. He read out point number (ii) of the resolved part at page 461 which is as under:-

“the Registrar be directed to initiate disciplinary action against Er. Harmandeep Singh J.E. Panjab University Construction Office”

He said that after 30<sup>th</sup> March, almost six months have passed, nothing has been done, whether he has been dismissed or not. He is absent from duty. If the culprit is absent from duty from the last six months, if nothing has been done so far against, then what action could taken against that person who is working honestly. They may discuss it, but nothing would come out of it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as stated by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi that whether he has signed in good faith or not, but he has signed, so he would be held responsible. They cannot say that it was done in good faith. So he requested that they should keep this spirit. There are so many such cases where the Vice Chancellor has signed. But when such a case comes here, then it is said that how the Vice Chancellor could see all the papers, he must have signed in good faith. So, they should keep one spirit. If the S.D.O. has approach, then he should be hanged and if some higher persons has done it then he should be left. They should not do this. Law should be equal to all.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that in Punjab, there are many Chief Engineers in different departments. They just signs the documents. Can they check each and everything with guage. Practially, it is not possible.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this work is of technical persons. They were talking about Hostel No. 10. When they purchased wooden beds, there is specification as to which board is to be used. There used to be stamp on the board. When physical verification has to be done, that stamp needs to be seen. The Vice Chancellor asked to open the bed box. He said there is no paint in it and ordered to paint it. They said that they cannot cover the stamp until the payment is made. After painting it, now the stamp is not visible. Now the audit people ask to show them stamp.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that now they should resolv it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have resolved it.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Dr. Subhash Sharm again said that this item should be withdrawn from the Senate and the CVO be asked to bring it again after enquiring it properly.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said there is no mention in the quotations as to which board is to be used.

Shri Prabhjit Singh in a lighter mode said that the best option is that Professor Navdeep Goyal should take back his complaint.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that rather he is now feeling guilty.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Enquiry Officer should also justify his action by suggesting something. He should say that he is submitting the Enquiry Report, but he thinks that disciplinary action will not complete unless and until so and so is also done. Everybody know who is guilty, but the punishment is given to someone else.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that he was in that Committee where he saw that the quality of those almirahs was very substandard. They were shocked to see that. The present CVO was not CVO at that time, she was a member of that Committee. What they could find that the bill and payment was made immediately without audit.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the payment was made within one day.

Continuing, the Registrar said that this was very serious. Since all these things happened so enquiry should be held.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to who has got the bill passed. Who has expedited the payment. The person who has expedited the payment, he is not in the ambit of enquiry.

It was further informed (by the Registrar) that whatever was enquiry was done, it is brought here. Whatever anomaly was observed by the CVO,, it was observed by the Syndicate also. So, the enquiry should be held.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they cannot bring it on record,. All the members who are sitting here, they all know about it. Nobody has the dare to reject the material. How the bills were expedited. The bills were submitted in the morning and the payment was made in the evening.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said, arising out of it, there is another XEN Mr. Padam. He has not been given work. Some case is pending against him and still there is no conviction. He was reinstated after suspension, but he is without work. So, he requested that he should be given some work.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the problem is that they cannot give him financial powers at all because of the case pending against him.

Shri Prabhjit Singh asked who says that they cannot give him financial powers. Only they are the people who are saying like this.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the Senate has taken that decision.

Shri Gurjot Singh Mahi asked if the cases is pending to which the Registrar said, 'yes' the case is pending.

It was informed (by the Registrar) the case is still running, but they have given him assignments. The responsibility of entire hostel has been given to him.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the Senate took the decision, it was in the light of the fact that the University has to give him salary without any work. It is not known for how long the case would go on, so why not to utilize his services. However, keeping in mind that the case is pending, he be reinstated subject to the condition that he may not be given any financial powers. Now once that decision has been taken, it was kept in mind that the case would end up in a year or two. So, that decision can be reviewed as there is no bar on them to allot him duties with financial powers also. That can be done in the Senate meeting.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that two years have passed and the case may go on for ten years.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma had pointed out to give him (Shri Padam) some big responsibility. So, he was given the complete responsibility of Muktsar as well maintenance of hostels. There was another public health requirement which was also given to him. Since then he is doing it. He is not under utilized. He is submitting his reports director to him (Registrar) and not to the XEN.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know as to what are the financial powers

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the financial powers include preparing of tender, floating of tender.

Shri Ashok Goyal said these are not financial powers.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that these are financial dealings.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked then how he would work.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said, financial powers means the sanctioning of some amount.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are denying him even these jobs also and thus probably they are under-utilizing him.

It was said (by the Registrar) that they can bring this item in the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said one they have to withdraw the item from the Senate and secondly a Committee should be constituted to look into the issue. This was also endorsed by Dr. Subhash Sharma. The Vice asked who should be put in the Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is the work of the CVO.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, this work does not belong to the CVO. They have to see as to what work relates to the CV.O.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that the name of Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Shri Ashok Goyal may be included in the Committee.

Shri Malhi said that he is against Committees.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they have to resolve the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said what for the Committee is to be constituted. What the Committee has to do.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said what is the need to constitute a Committee. The Syndicate is itself a big Committee.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no need to form a Committee for such things. If the Vice Chancellor needs any assistance he should take assistance from the office.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the issue should be clinched.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should suggest some name to look into it so that the issue could be finished.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma said that Shri Prabhjit Singh should be given this task.

Shri Praqbhjit Singh said that it is a technical work. He cannot take the measurement with guage.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to what they have to do in the Physical verification.

It was said (by the Registrar) that the tenders and other documents could be seen.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Syndicate had not asked to form a Committee. It means that the CVO is saying that the Syndicate should do it. This is highly unacceptable.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if the CVO has enquired in respect of S.D.O., then she should also enquire in respect of X.E.N.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said there is nothing to do anything, they should just blacklist the supplier.

Shri Prabhjit Singh also said that nothing would come out of it. They should get the measurement from some technical person. The material is under specification. Then, what they could do. They could only blacklist the supplier which they have already done. Now what they would like to do.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the item has come that the CVO has straightway told that a committee should be constituted, he read out the phrase, that a Committee should be constituted for physical verification of all purchases as suggested by CVO, meaning thereby that a Committee may be formed for physical verification of all the purchases for some hostels from this year to that year. He further said that she is very very courteously telling that it was not her duty to deal with such things. We all are also saying that this is not the job of the CVO. It was sent to her for some other purpose, but she responded in such a way that if they were assigning this job to her, let her increase the volume of the work ten times for them.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said from the year 2006, who will do this work. Since the year 2006, it is sufficient work to deal with.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that hardly it might have the involvement of the loss of maximum of rupees fifty thousand. Shri Prabhjit Singh said that since the year 2006, the loss may be to the tune of more rupees. Shri Malhi said that the amount may range to lacs of rupees.

Shri Gurjot Malhi said that the purchases also relate to other departments also, including the UIET.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that here in the case the physical verification is to be made of the purchases and they have no date and that is too from M/s Dwivedi, he asked as to if what was the purpose of it. He suggested that this item, for the time being, should be deferred.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

The Vice Chancellor said that again an another hour would be wasted on it. Upto how long this process will continue ?

The Vice Chancellor suggested can it not be such that one person is taken from here and rest from XEN or UIET could be assigned the job.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that those persons also would be involved in the net.

The Vice Chancellor again said that this was just his suggestion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the CVO without having any relevance has recommended this for the Syndicate. Let she be told as to why the CVO has sent this recommendation to the Syndicate.

The Registrar explained that this was the proposal of the Syndicate that the item be brought in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the resolution part be read and it was about what.

The Registrar read out the resolution as that the CVO report on the issue be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal again enquired as to in which connection.

The Registrar again reiterated that it has been written that the CVO report on the issue be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stressing upon the word 'the issue' enquired as to which was the issue.

The Registrar explained that the report of that has been submitted, he has not finished the work.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what was asked, that has not been done.

The Registrar explained that now the agenda is for the Syndicate.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that whatever has been asked to the CVO to be done, ask the CVO again to do that.

The Vice Chancellor asked if this will be done by the CVO to which Shri Subhash Sharma said that this is the task of the CVO and CVO will do it.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the item relating to Er. S.K. Sharma, S.D.E. P.U. Construction office, already referred to the Senate, by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 30.3.2018, be withdrawn from the agenda of the Senate ;
- (ii) the supplier, namely, M/s Dwivedi Furniture who had supplied the items in question be blacklisted with immediate effect and it be circulated to all the departments and offices of the University for their information and necessary action; and ;
- (iii) the Chief Vigilance Officer be requested to undertake the physical verification of all the items purchased by the P.U. Construction

office (2009-2013) (Sr. No. 1-11 and 13) and after the verification, the matter be placed before the Syndicate in one of its next meetings.

**Resolution proposed  
by Dr. Parveen Goyal,  
Fellow**

**18.** Considered following Resolution proposed by Dr. Parveen Goyal, Fellow :

“Agenda of the Syndicate may be circulated to all Senate members in the form of soft copy”

**Explanation:**

It has been observed that minutes of the meetings of Syndicate is circulated to the members of the Senate but the agenda papers on the basis of which the decisions are taken are not sent to the non-Syndics. In the absence of these agenda papers, members find it difficult to understand the basis and background of the decisions taken. Therefore, the agenda papers of the Syndicate meetings be also sent to all the Senate members.

**NOTE:** Kind attention is invited to Regulation 11.1 appearing at page 29 of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007:

**11.1.** Any Fellow who wishes to move a resolution shall forward a copy of the resolution to the Registrar so as to reach him not less than four weeks before the date of an ordinary meeting. He may withdraw the resolution by giving a written notice, which should reach the Registrar not less than two days before the dispatch of the agenda papers.

The Registrar shall submit the proposed resolution to the Vice-Chancellor who shall direct him to include it in the agenda provided it is in clear and in the unambiguous terms and is in accordance with the guidelines framed by the Syndicate and approved by the Senate. It shall then be brought to the notice of the Syndicate which shall refer it to the Senate with its observations, if any. When a resolution is not included in the agenda papers under orders of the Vice-Chancellor, the Registrar shall intimate the fact to the member stating the objection and also report to the Syndicate and Senate.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Professor Keshav Malhotra said what more is to be done here is that it has been written that the agenda of the Syndicate may be circulated to all Senate members in the form of soft copy. He said that the only shortcoming in it is that as and when the minutes of Syndicate are ready, they are sent to the Senators in soft copy.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the agenda would come itself in the minutes.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Prof. Navdeep Goyal is the member of Syndicate for the last three- four years. The Senators severely feel it when they read in the newspapers about the members of the Syndicate. He said that it does not mean that if they have come to the Syndicate, the Senate members are not entitled to the agenda of the Syndicate.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that the agenda does not go to all the MPs. He further said that whatever are the proceedings of the Cabinet, they will remain with the Cabinet and which are with the House, they are with the House.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is not that the agenda of the Syndicate should be with the Senators.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the issue is that this is necessary as per Act too. The regulations are not permitting to do this. He further asked the Registrar to read the regulation with respect to it.

Shri Gurjot Malhi said that everytime, there does not apply the leadership, the rules and regulations are also something.

Prof. Keshav Malhotra said that this would not go to the Senate later on. There are certain advantages of this.

On asking by Shri Prabhjit Singh, the Registrar read out the regulation as that .... less than seven days before the date of the meeting, the Registrar under the directions of the Vice Chancellor issue to every member ( it is in the Syndicate Chapter) to every member and agenda papers specifying the date hour and place of the meeting and items placed before the next meeting provided the Registrar under the Direction of the Vice Chancellor may place more items before the meeting.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this is only for the Syndicate members. He further said that certain papers are sent to them under sealed cover, if they are sent on e mail, the confidentiality would not be there.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that it does not happen anywhere. Tomorrow it could be said that let it be sent to all the Faculties. He asked Professor Keshav Malhotra to convince the Senators and sanctity of the Syndicate should not be diluted.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the Senate is Senate and Syndicate is Syndicate. How they can change it.

Professor Ameer Sultana said that the matter comes in the newspapers first and they come to know later on.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that once they should deliberate on it and Professor Malhotra suggested the constitution of the committee.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that every forum has its sanctity. The Syndicate has its own sanctity and the agenda of the Syndicate would come to the Syndicate and it would not go to the Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the agenda could be sent after the conduct of the Syndicate meeting and Shri Subhash Sharma endorsed Professor Navdeep Goyal's suggestion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when they all talk looks so nice that what was the sanctity of the Syndicate since it is the cabinet of the University and the government of the University and the proceedings of the government, or of any government whether it is the government of India are confidential, so they must mandatorily be sent to the Senate. He further added that upto 2008, the agenda of the Syndicate which was very boldly written on its front, confidential because not only the proceedings but also the agenda of the Syndicate is printed as confidential as is done in the case of cabinet of the state assemblies. The moment the agenda is to be released, even before that it was available to the media and next day ,even as one of the member has rightly been saying that before the members could get it, they used to come to know from the newspapers that this was the agenda of the Syndicate. Then it is discussed here, what was that, who breached the confidentiality, how it goes to the press. He further said that instead of making it a blame-game, the word Confidential should be cut off , because nobody have control over it and it would certainly go. This goes from the side of the office or the members give it. Why it happened so, it is because of the media persons who demanded the availability of the agenda either officially, because it was their duty to make reporting and they have to approach the Syndicate members to give them the agenda. He said that as a special case, it was decided that agenda be sent to the DPR and one copy was kept in the office of DPR and whosoever news reporter wanted to see it, he/she could do so. Now see what happens to be the sanctity. He said that without asking anyone, he wanted to remind Shri Subhash Sharma that he is hundred percent agree with him that the proceedings of the cabinet as of the Syndicate are confidential. But one Vice Chancellor came one time warning and he started inviting that Public Relation Officer in the meeting who is even today sitting in the meeting to report officially to the media that what transcribed in the meeting. This is the confidential. It was objected to that No that he cannot make DPR or anybody to make sit in the meeting of the Syndicate, because it is confidential meeting. It was discontinued and as the human nature is, the Vice Chancellor thought that it has lasted two three months and the members might have forgotten, reinstated and started calling the DPR at his own. It was the expression of the DPR that they are bound to the orders of the Vice Chancellor if he wishes, we come in and if he does not want our inside sitting, we would sit outside. Some of the members realized as to if this was a method of humiliating some one and keeps on insisting his presence in the meeting. He continued saying that the proceedings of the Syndicate as press release of Panjab University has been routed to the newspapers since the last so many years. He questioned as to whether if they have any right to make talk of the morality or that of sanctity or of confidentiality. The gradually it is being diluted, it is the conception of the Senate members that all of the world know it and why they are not aware of it and as a natural outcome of that there has been aroused demand that they should also be provided with the Syndicate agenda. Although the purpose of the resolution differs somewhat. The meaning of this is that the proceedings of the Syndicate which are being sent to the Senate members, but the Senate members have been sent of the proceedings, now what relevant of those proceedings unless and until they know, what was the agenda. That as to on what type of agenda, the decisions have been taken. They have said that as and when the proceedings of the Syndicate happened to come, the agenda of the Syndicate be also appended with it. Why it has been asked so ? He said that they are themselves responsible for that, that the agenda is somewhat else and the decision is otherwise. As has always been cited that let we see what the item is and on that item decision is not to be made, but invariable decision is got done. They question as to how this happened that the Syndicate agenda was not having this item and how it happened. They are unwise and they are careless. One says that he has the copy of the proceedings and not that of agenda and another one says he has the agenda and not the copy of the proceeding, how the match be done. He continued stating that what was the previous practice that whenever there happened to be the conduct of the Senate meeting, then the proceedings of every Syndicate, generally the proceedings of three Syndicate meeting happened

to be there, the proceedings of the Syndicate in separate binder was being delivered. Now it has started coming in this form. Now it has become rather difficult to open and read it without agenda. Now it has been suggested that it be coupled with the agenda so that it runs more thick. For that they had given suggestion that it should be supplied in spiral binding and some improvement are taking place. He said that in case the agenda is not feasible to be supplied before the meeting and what was wrong in the suggestion that agenda be appended with the minutes.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that nobody is objecting to sending the agenda with the proceedings of the Syndicate to the Senate members.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the agenda should be sent with the proceedings of the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he has been the member of the Senate for the last twenty years and member of the Syndicate three four times, he wanted to tell them that who are accountable, they are the representatives of the teachers, and others are of the colleges and University, they make a question of them that what was his/her item. In case, they have the prior knowledge of the agenda, they would be in a position to tell them something. He further said that even the minutes of the Syndicate are got ten days before the Senate meeting and suppose that now after March, the meeting will be held after six months, the minutes will not be with them and the Senate members know nothing for the duration of six months because they have no involvement in the Syndicate meeting. He furthered said that the technology is available and if the young mind wants to add something, the agenda should be sent to the Senate members in the same manner as is the case of Syndicate members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever the agenda is delivered to the Syndicate members, that should also reach the Senate members although after a month.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Shri Ashok Goyal has been having the same proposal and to his view, this was very much right too.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the suggestion of Professor Keshav Malhotra that the agenda of Syndicate should go to the Senate members simultaneously, but questioned as to how it is possible while the agenda is for consideration of the Syndicate and not that of the Senate. He cited the example that tomorrow it would be said that agenda of Academic Council should only be sent to the Academic Council members and not to anybody else while he himself is the member of the Academic Council. .

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that now it was an open world. The things should be made open. On this Dr. Mahajan said that in this way the proceedings of sexual harassment and that of selections will also be made open. They should have a thinking over it that in what way they can be more and more transparent and public user friendly.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the agenda could also be uploaded on the net and on the Whatsapp.

Dr.S.S.Sangha suggested that the minutes of the Syndicate should be made online.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that enthusiasm should be to such extent which could be controlled.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he has not given the agenda to any media person.

The members urged the Vice Chancellor that the next meeting could be held in the next week. The Vice Chancellor that he is fully packed for one month to come and he is telling them



that the period of one month would pass atleast. Then the members agreed to sit for more time to deliberate upon the remaining agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor had promised to meet after every fortnight. The Vice Chancellor said that he will comply with that.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that yet the Senate meeting is also due and the Vice Chancellor responded that it would be held and he is having promo on Senate meeting.

The members again reiterated that the remaining agenda would not be finished today. The Vice Chancellor said that they shall do it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that his position should be understood and he has also kept in his car the agenda of June, July 2018.

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor has called few members of the Syndicate at the time of prioritizing the Syndicate agenda. He pointed out that he has talked to him (Vice-Chancellor) that he had called five members two-three days ago at the time of prioritizing of agenda. It is better if they called unofficially or informally. Due to this act of him, there is a lot of heart burning among the members. According to him, all members are equal. He was of the view that this type of practice should be stopped in future.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no issue of weight-age.

To this, Shri Subhash Sharma said that everyone is aware about the intension of the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, no doubt, he has called them for an informal meeting, but it has become formal meeting. So, please keep in mind that in future it should be kept in mind. It would be better if members called at the time of agenda discussion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be kept in mind, in future.

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal said that as far as the resolved is concerned, he suggested that when the minutes of the Syndicate meeting sent to the members of the Syndicate, agenda of the Syndicate meeting should be sent to Senate members in the form of soft copy.

Dr. Inderjeet Singh Sidhu and Professor Keshav Malhotra endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that if it is to be sent as a soft copy, then it would be better to send it to all the members of the Syndicate/Senate.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that it should be sent to the Senate members after the meeting of the Syndicate and in this way there is no harm.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that minutes are already sent to the members.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that tomorrow, he will not be the member of the Syndicate and it is not looking appropriate that soft copy of agenda should be sent to every member. He was of the view that it should be sent to the members of the Syndicate only.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that hard copy of minutes of the Syndicate had already been sent to the members of the Senate. In his view without agenda, it would be like to answer the questions without the question paper. He suggested that by sending soft copy of the agenda, the practice of sending hard copy of the Syndicate meeting minutes to the Senate

members should not be stopped. He was of the view that as and when the Syndicate minutes will be sent to the Syndicate members, minutes along with soft copy of agenda of Syndicate will be sent to the Senate members.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that agenda should be sent to the members in the form of a soft copy. He suggested that tabs should be given to the members and it will help in saving lot of papers. There is a heap of agend/proceedings in their houses.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that hard copies of the agenda as well as proceedings are lying in their houses and in this way the almiras exhausted and one day they have to burn these copies.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the members who do not even read the agenda/proceedings hard copy is must for them. He said that whatever members discuss in the Senate meeting is based on the agenda of the Syndicate meetings. If the Senate members do not have the agenda of the Syndicate meeting, they will be unable to discuss on any item in the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be looked into.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should move slowly slowly towards paperless work as far as possible. Shri Ashok Goyal further said that Tabs should be provided to the members. Once the present Registrar has mooted a proposal in this regard and that was not reached to the logical end. Now, the Registrar is going. He suggested that tabs should be provided to the members.

Shri Subhash Sharma and other members in once voice endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that, in this way, lot of papers will be saved.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that inspite of providing tabs to the members, the Vice-Chancellor will see that there will be papers kept in the hands of the members.

Shri Subhash Sharma advocating said that they should move in this direction as it is successful in the corporate world.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is a lot of difference between corporate houses and the University. This is what he is saying.

**RESOLVED:** That with the hard copy of the final minutes of the Syndicate, a softcopy of the Syndicate agenda papers be also sent to the members of the Senate

**Designation of adjunct faculty to Mr. Jaswinder Singh Parmar, UIET, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur**

**19.** Considered minutes dated 27.06.2018 of the Academic and Administrative Committee of UIET, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur that the name of Mr. Jaswinder Singh Parmar be approved as adjunct faculty in the department of Mechanical Engineering.

**NOTE:** 1. Bio-data of Mr. Jaswinder Singh Parmar is enclosed.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.5.2018 vide Paragraph 11 has approved the minutes of the committee dated 13.3.2018 with regard to appointment of adjunct faculty.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should explain the background of this item.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the item is relating to appointment of Adjunct Faculty. At present, there is no provision/rule of appointment of adjunct faculty in the University. If they approve this item in the absence of any policy, the Pandorabox will be opened. He further said that a Committee has already been constituted for this purpose and that Committee would look into this matter.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi wanted to know what is adjunct faculty.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is also wanted to know the same thing. He pointed out that what is the difference between adjunct and guest faculty. It means, it will be a higher emolument post and many of the members do not know much about this and it would be passed. Adjunct, basically they can say temporary arrangement.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked Professor Navdeep Goyal to throw light on the issue of adjunct faculty.

To this, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has not read much about this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no provision of adjunct faculty in the Calendar of the University.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that Registrar will tell background of this case.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that two issues were discussed for adjunct faculty in the Committee. One issue was that one teacher of a particular department has to teach in other department. If he/she agrees, he/she will be considered as adjunct faculty only for that semester and that too without any remuneration. The 2<sup>nd</sup> issue was on the basis of U.G.C. letter regarding adjunct faculty and in that letter/proposal, there is mentioned about adjunct faculty. That issue has been referred to the same Committee and no further discussion took place on this issue. He said that the issue of teaching as adjunct faculty from one department to another, there will be no problem. But if there is some other issue that will not be done unless and until it is not deliberated in the Committee and passed by the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is very strange that no work load has been mentioned here and it should be rejected for the time being.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the issue has already been closed.

The members in one voice said that for the time being it is not accepted.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that they should see page 598 and 599 where the recommendations of the Syndicate regarding Adjunct Faculty have been given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should see the minutes of Committee dated 13.3.2018 at page 600 of the agenda papers regarding Adjunct Faculty. He read out the recommendation of the Committee which are as under:-

- “1. The Adjunct Faculty from within the University should be non-remunerative.
2. The nomenclature of Adjunct Faculty be withdrawn from those teachers who do not actually teaching or taking workload in the Department
3. The Adjunct faculty being a non-remunerative job, a certificate of appreciation should be given to them.
4. The teachers, who wanted to be adjunct faculty in some other department, must seek permission from the Chairperson of the parent department. The workload

- as Adjunct Faculty should be over and above the teaching load in the parent department.
5. The Adjunct faculty should be appointed with the mutual consent of both the departments.
  6. The appointment of adjunct faculty will be approved by the competent authority”

Continuing, he said that it is for the purpose of interdepartmental appointments and the Committee is saying that it is non-remunerative post, but by giving the reference of this Committee recommendations they are saying that he should be appointed Adjunct Faculty by submitting his biodata. So, they are rightly not approving it.

The Vice Chancellor while referring to page 600 of the agenda read out some portion of the recommendations of the Committee which states that the matter for appointment of outside Adjunct Faculty, it will be discussed later on as per enquiry report UGC guidelines for Adjunct Faculty.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not there as on today, it will be seen later on.

T

he Vice Chancellor asked as to what is to be written in resolved part to which Shri Ashok Goyal, Dr. Subhash Sharma and some other members said that it is not accepted.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes dated 27.06.2018 of the Academic and Administrative Committee of the of UIET, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur for approval of the name of Mr. Jaswinder Singh Parmar as adjunct faculty in the department of Mechanical Engineering be **not** approved.

### **Withdrawn item**

**20.** Considered proposal (**Appendix-XIII**) of certain teachers with regard to re-employment of teachers upto the age of 70 years in phase manners in Panjab University.

- NOTE:** 1. The Vice-Chancellor has observed that “Good proposal, strongly recommended, May I add that D.A. on contractual part be revised at age 65 for those who would be considered suitable for extension upto 68 years. It could review the same upto 70 years.
2. As per Rule 1 at page 132 of P.U. Calendar Volume III, 2016, the teachers are re-employed upto the age of 65 years. A copy of Rules is enclosed (**Appendix-XIII**).

Some of the members in one voice said that this item has been withdrawn.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that why withdrawn, it should be rejected

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested, not in respect of this item, which has already been withdrawn. This type of practice, they will have to stop, that one person has handed over a letter and marked to the Syndicate and four persons handed over a letter and marked to the Syndicate. He informed the Vice-Chancellor that whatever item placed before the Syndicate, is the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor. With the passage of time, it is being written to consider the request and proposal of so and so. Whatever Committee is constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, the Convener of that Committee record the proceedings and the Chairman of that Committee confirms that and after that the Vice-Chancellor approves the same. Meaning thereby, the Vice-Chancellor has constituted a Committee for his assistance. He was of the

view that unless and until the Vice-Chancellor recommends it, it should not be brought to the Syndicate. So, such things, unless and until, the Vice Chancellor wants to recommend it, they should not consider it.

**RESOLVED:** That **Item C-20** on the agenda be treated as withdrawn.

**Minutes dated 13.08.2018 of the Standing Committee to discuss the issue regarding Semester System at Undergraduate level.**

21. Considered minutes dated 13.08.2018 of the Standing Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to discuss the issue regarding Semester System at Undergraduate level.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this item needs discussion.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said as to why they are going backward rather they should adopt the Choice Based Credit System from Semester system and not to annual system. Why the annual system was stopped?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that a Committee of the Syndicate should be formed as the Standing was constituted long back.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have already started the semester system.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the practical problem which he observed is that the sports activities and youth festivals are affecting a lot due to semester examination. Now the youth festivals have started from September and they have 12 zones and for this purpose they need 48 days. Simultaneously, sports events are also started from 15<sup>th</sup> October and all these events go side by side. Sometimes a student has to participate both in dance in the youth festival and sports event. In such cases they have to miss the event at once place. The tournaments keep continuing till November end and thereafter the semester examinations start. The all India shooting event start every in the month of December, thus the student who participate in this event miss the examinations of December. Though, in their University, there is a provision that the Controller of Examinations do allow the students who have participated at the national level to appear in the examination in the month of April. Thus in such a situation, the whole system upsets. Further, the results are also not declared in time, for example, the date for admission was 31<sup>st</sup> August, 2018 with the Vice Chancellor's permission, the result of B.Ed. 4<sup>th</sup> Semester was not declared and the admission in M.Ed. has to take place. This time the results are declared very late and schedule in college became very tight and some students have to leave the sport activities. It is also affecting their other activities. The Himachal Pradesh University has also stopped the semester system and the NCTE also does not impress upon introducing semester system in B.Ed. or M. Ed.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said the UGC has asked to introduce Semester system after the annual system. Then they adopted semester system, what why they are going back to the annual system, whereas the UGC says to introduce Choice Bases Credit System. So, they have to move towards credit system and not to annual system.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that as a whole the college teaching community does not want the semester system to continue because they are facing many types of problems. They

have introduced the Semester System under National Education Policy, it would not depend upon their will whether they want it or not. So, they have to deliberate all these things. The problems linked with it such as division of odd and even semesters in the academic calendar is not proper. As that of Professor Keshav Malhotra, he was also of the view that a Committee be formed to look into the whole issue.

Professor Ronki Ram said that there was a lot of discussion as some members want to introduce it whereas the other do not want.

Shri Prabhjit Singh and Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the Committee has never said to stop the semester system.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that by and large the teaching community is against introducing the semester system, that they know, there may be any reasons, but this semester system is based on greater accountability, greater concentration of words. It is a good thing, nobody can say it is a bad thing. If somebody says that there used to be holidays and their inability to implement the system properly, it does not mean that the system is bad. So, they should find ways to implement it properly. If the teachers or the colleges feel some inconvenience, they are not going to concentrate on the inconvenience, let they be inconvenient, but they must do it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that limiting himself to the minutes what he understands from the minutes, first of all the Standing Committee, he thinks, was constituted long back. It needs to be reconstituted. Standing Committee was constituted with a view to strengthen the semester system. But whatever the recommendation are coming here, it means that the Standing Committee has become a superior most Committee even to interpret and amend the regulations also, which probably, was not mandate of the Standing Committee to recommend this or that. Not only this Standing Committee, but there are so many other such committees which were constituted for some specific time period or sometimes they say that they are automatically continuing. So, the such Committees be reconstituted so that all the people get opportunity to serve on such Committees and wider range of ideas start coming. Secondly, as far as regulations are concerned, relating to admissions and examinations, it should not be done like that the Standing Committee recommends and the same are adopted and implemented in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate. The things are finalized only at that stage which should not be done. As far he knows even the Syndicate has no right to violate the regulations. If it is recommended by the Standing Committee and even passed by the Syndicate, it has no sanctity. So, whatever Standing Committee is constituted, they should be apprised of such things. In case the Vice Chancellor would like to constitute a fresh Standing Committee, he would like to suggest one name i.e. Professor Keshav Malhotra and he be included in that Committee as he is the only person who listens to him and he could tell him his view.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that when he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is questioning the Committee, then they should constitute a committee comprising of independent members and not the teachers only as teaching community is against it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that semester system is a disaster. He (Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi) is not in the System. If, at all, the Vice Chancellor would like to constitute a Committee, then there are people sitting here from the colleges, such as Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu, Principal Surinder Singh Sangha should be included as this is not the job of one person and it is also not a joke. Let he should tell them that the last date for admission is 31<sup>st</sup> of August with the permission of the Vice Chancellor. He informed that no college has done admission by that date.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked, as to whose fault?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is their fault, it is his fault and the fault of all of them because their dates of admission are fixed like that. He (Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi) has said that if the teachers have to face difficulties, let them face the difficulties. But, do not make sweeping statements. They are teachers and he cannot imagine the type of pressure they are undergoing.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should solve all these issues.

Dr. Amit Joshi said, how he could solve those issues? Can he take a decision that he would not allow the holidays of diwali and holi and all that? If it is okay, take a decision. He explained that it happens that 31<sup>st</sup> of August is the last date for admission with the permission of Vice Chancellor. The semester starts in July. Thus, 30 days elapsed which are given to students to take admission with late fee. After that there is break in between. Then the mid-term examinations start followed by practical examination in month of November. Therefore, in view of this the total teaching hours cannot be completed and all this is a fraud. He asked, he should be told, how to complete the teaching hours? They are dealing with the totally fraud system. If there are 70 or 80 lectures, they should tell him, how 80 lectures have been delivered. It is practically not possible. It is totally a farce. The Tamilnadu State and Himachal Pradesh University and Rajasthan University has done away with this system.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked, which are the Universities running this system.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that 90% of the Universities in the country are running this system. They cannot go by the system of Himachal Pradesh University as they are appointing teachers without Ph.D./NET and also without API score. So, they should not equate Panjab University with H.P. University.

Shri Prabhjit Singh requested the Vice Chancellor to include the names of Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, Dr. Amit Joshi and Professor Keshav Malhotra in the Standing Committee to be constituted.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan suggested that the Vice Chancellor constitute this Committee himself and suggested that the Committee should include one Principal, one College teacher and one University teacher.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said the Committee should independent one.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested the Vice Chancellor to take a holistic view and make a Committee.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this is a very serious issue. On the one hand there are lots of guidelines from the UGC to implement semester system and credit system and on the other hand, as pointed out by Dr. Amit Joshi and Principal Surinder Singh Sangha, that there are lot of practical problems and due to that a mess has been created. Keeping in view these two issues, they have to take a holistic view and have a serious deliberation on the issue. So, he was of the view that a Committee should be constituted to deliberate upon all these issues and the Committee should meet all the stakeholders to take their view. The Committee should also see to it as to how this is being implemented at other places. After looking into all these things, the Committee should submit a report to the Syndicate, only then the Syndicate could deliberate upon it. At the moment, they are also not having much information about this system. So, at the moment they are not in a position to take any decision.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the Committee has to see this issue from all angles.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they have also to see as to how it is to be implemented.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that when it was introduced, the semester system was forced on the colleges, though they were not in favour of it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the colleges and students are facing lot of practical difficulties. But they have to see the reasons for those difficulties and also see whether they himself may not be responsible for this. They decided that from such and such date the annual system would discontinue, but was that system discontinued? They by sitting decide to give special chance, golden chance and platinum chance, which is still continuing. The basic purpose was to reduce the number of examinations, but it has been doubled as both systems are running simultaneously. Due to this, everything is being delayed, admission are also being delayed. Some rules have been made that those have passed 50% of the papers at undergraduate level, they be given admission in postgraduate classes. They have to streamline the system by taking into account the practical difficulties being faced by the students and colleges and how to remove those difficulties. Finally, if they reach at the conclusion that this is not possible, then whether it is stopped in H.P. University or Tamilnadu State, they can take the decision, if they have that option.

Dr. Subhash Sharma, Shri Ashok Goyal and some other members requested the Vice Chancellor to constitute a Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would constitute a Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations mentioned in Item No. 4 (Sr. No. 1-7 at page 607 of the agenda) of the minutes dated 13.08.2018 of the Standing Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to discuss the issue regarding Semester System at Undergraduate level, be approved in the larger interest of the students and the rest of the recommendations of this Committee needs thorough deliberations.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the Vice Chancellor be authorized to constitute a larger Standing Committee afresh by including the names of Professor Keshav Malhotra, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. Amit Joshi to discuss the problems being faced due to the implementation of Semester System at the Undergraduate level.

**Advertisement for two posts of 'Full-Time Medical Officers' purely on contract basis at Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, P.U. (through Walk-in-interview)**

**22.** Considered if 02 posts of 'Full-Time Medical Officers' purely on contract basis be advertised and filled up at Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh (through Walk-in-interview), on fixed salary of Rs.45,000/- p.m. with the following qualifications as suggested by the Chief Medical Officer, P.U vide letter dated 10.07.2018:

1. M.B.B.S. Degree of an Indian University recognized by the Medical Council of India or any foreign degree recognized as equivalent by the Medical Council of India.
2. The candidate must be registered with Central/State Medical Council.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.03.2018 (Para 15) has allowed to advertising & filling up 01 post of 'Full-Time Medical Officer (on contract) (alongwith some other posts of Doctor) with the following qualifications through Walk-in-Interview:



- a) M.B.B.S. Degree of an Indian University recognized by the Medical Council of India or any foreign degree recognized as equivalent by the Medical Council of India.
  - b) The candidate must be registered with Central/State Medical Council.
  - c) Minimum 01 year clinical experience.
  - d) Preference will be given to those having experience in Govt./Semi Govt. Hospital.
2. The Walk-in-Interview was held on 22.5.2018. Only 03 candidates were applied but none of them was found suitable.
  3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that before advertising the post permission from the Ministry of Human Resource Development be sought.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that where it is written that there is no need for taking permission from the Ministry for filling up the posts on contract basis. If they do not take permission, it will attract criticism from the media or later objections from audit department.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have approved but the permission has to be taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the item is not properly formulated and it should mention about the embargo of taking permission from the Ministry. He suggested that permission should be taken.

**RESOLVED:** That two posts of 'Full-Time Medical Officers' purely on contract basis be advertised and filled up at Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh (through Walk-in-interview), on fixed salary of Rs.45,000/- p.m. with the following qualifications as suggested by the Chief Medical Officer, P.U vide letter dated 10.07.2018:

1. M.B.B.S. Degree of an Indian University recognized by the Medical Council of India or any foreign degree recognized as equivalent by the Medical Council of India.
2. The candidate must be registered with Central/State Medical Council.

Arising out of it, the members suggested that permission from the Ministry of Human Resource Development be sought before advertising the posts.

**This was agreed to.**

**At this stage some discussion took place which has been made a part of the General discussion.**

**Comments dated 05.07.2018 of the Executive Engineer, P.U. Construction Office, regarding quality of construction at Campus**

**23.** Considered the comments dated 05.07.2018 (**Appendix-XV**) of the Executive Engineer, P.U. Construction Office, in respect of report

published in Newspaper Chandigarh Tribune dated 02.07.2018 regarding quality of construction at Campus.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 10/19.12.2017 (Para 12) (**Appendix-XV**) considered the status report of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate, to enquire into quality of construction over the last 16 years of the expansion of the Panjab University and it was resolved that a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Jarnail Singh, comprising of Dr. Dalip Kumar, Dr. Subhash Sharma and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma be constituted to prepare a summary status report to be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.
2. Summary status report was included in the Agenda of the Syndicate dated 07.07.2018 as consideration Item C-34 but no business was taken place on 07.07.2018.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one of the Committee constituted to look into the construction work in the University, has pointed out that seepage and leakage or maintenance related problems. They have got a chance to look over two-three buildings in the Campus, for example, International Hostel, from first day, seepage and leakage is there. If it is there from the day one, then it cannot be the maintenance problem. Such type of their answers cannot be accepted. Similarly, they are talking of the red stone and on which buildings; it is placed, now falls. Panjab University, Chandigarh has come into existence in 1956 and if this problem is not there in the old buildings why it is now coming. In this regard, he has talked to one Masson and he told that now they have started using wrong method.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that on this issue a Committee was constituted and he was member of that Committee. He enquired where is the report of that Committee?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said whether the Committee submitted the report.

To this, Shri Subhash Sharma said that they had already submitted the report and they have pointed out very serious things in the report.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that actually the report reached to the XEN Office and they have submitted the reply and if they accept it in the present form, the matter is to be closed here.

Dr. R. K. Mahajan said that what is at page 624.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that is it the same Committee in which Shri Subhash Sharma and Dr. Ravinder Nath are the members.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that where is the Committee Report and why it is not appended with this item.

To this, Dr. Inderjit Singh Sidhu said that the report is appended with Item C-34 of July 2018 Syndicate agenda.

Dr. Ronki Ram said that, no doubt, the construction works of the buildings are to be carried out by the Contractors, i.e. College Bhawan, Academic Staff College or Genome Studies, there is a seepage problem and cement is cracking, but the Contractors work under the overall supervision of the Construction Office. So, they have to fix responsibility on the Contractors and on the department of Construction Office.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that discussion on this issue will only be possible if the report is appended. He suggested that this item should be clubbed with item C-34 of July 2018 and thereafter place before the Syndicate in one of its next meetings.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the item should be to consider the report of Committee, the item is to consider the comments of the XEN on the report published in The Tribune and the same was marked to the Syndicate and item is prepared. He was of the view that the attitude of the office should not be in such a way, the item is drafted. Actually, it should be written to consider the comments of the XEN on the report submitted by the Committee (copy enclosed) and in view of the report published in The Tribune. Rather, they have nothing to do with the newspaper report as the Committee report is there.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this item should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting along with the report of the Committee.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the report is appended with item C-34 of July 2018 and it was not discussed there (page 618).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it means, they are discussing on the item which is lying pending and this new item is placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

Dr. Subhash Sharma pointed out that if they discussed and passed this item, then the relevance of that Item (Item C-34) will be over. He and few other members suggested that Item C-23 of today's meeting and C-34 of July 2018 should be clubbed and placed before the Syndicate.

**RESOLVED:** That **Item C-23** on the agenda be deferred to be clubbed with **Item C-34** of Syndicate meeting agenda of 7.7.2018 along with Report of the Committee already constituted and the same be placed before the Syndicate in one of its next meetings..

**Request dated 26.6.2018 of the Chairperson, School of Punjabi Studies and Incharge Punjabi Lexicography, for sanction of Rs. 2.56 lakhs for completion of Punjabi-English Bilingual Dictionary.**

**24.** Considered request dated 26.6.2018 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Chairperson, School of Punjabi Studies and Incharge Punjabi Lexicography, for sanction of Rs. 2.56 lakhs (tentatively) calculated on the numbers of around 800 pages at the cost of Rs.320/- per page, to utilize the services of Professor O.P. Vashisht for completion of Punjabi-English Bilingual Dictionary.

**NOTE:** 1. The Dean, University Instruction has observed as under:-

‘The project has immense values. It will of great use to the students and Scholars of the region’.

2. The Finance & Development Officer has observed as under:-

‘the proposed expenditure is covered under Clause 2(c) of P.U. Cal. Vol. III (2016) at page

49.7 with condition that the same has to be got approved from Syndicate. Needless to mention that such expenditure shall form part of cost of production of book, and accordingly the sale price of the book shall be determined”.

Initiating discussion, Professor Ronki Ram pointed out that the money allocated for the publication of this dictionary is from the Publication Bureau Funds and the same is not possible.

To this, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that now the funds are allocated from some other budget head and his (Dr. Ronki Ram's ) query is over now.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the item is okay and they should pass it. He suggested that they should use the expertise of Professor O.P. Vashisht who is going to be older now. According to him, some technical problems will be left, if they do not use his expertise. Professor O.P. Vashisht is going to be older now. The Department has also put a lot of efforts in preparing this Dictionary. So, it should be approved.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi questioned what is the benefit of this dictionary?

To this, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this is a Punjabi-English Dictionary and such dictionary is being prepared in the University for the first time. He pleaded that it should be approved.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should approve it.

The Vice-Chancellor said from where the money will come?

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that FDO's note is appended in this item and it is clearly mentioned in the note regarding the budget head.

The members in one voice said that FDO will look after this issue.

It was informed (by the FDO) that the University leaves some funds with the Publication Bureau for the publication of scholarly books and the money can easily be used from there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that there is a question of only 2.5 lacs and fund should be arranged from some other budget so that the cost of the dictionary is calculated in such a way that more and more students of rural background can be benefitted from this. It is a propaganda of Punjabi Language also.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that, if need be, the cost of this dictionary will be subsidized.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that earlier such book was sent to all the affiliated College and each Professor of the University should purchase such book.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it should be sent to the Libraries of all the affiliated Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let they publicise it as a rare thing and it should go to more and more libraries.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this work should be done on priority basis.

Professor Ronki Ram said that such a dictionary was also printed by the Punjabi University, Patiala. There was lot of discrepancies in that dictionary. According to him, this work is pending since long in the Punjabi Lexicography Department of the University and now it is ready to print and they should approve it as Rs.2.57 lakhs is not a much amount. He suggested that they should also make more and more advertisement about this dictionary so that it can become popular.

The Vice-Chancellor questioned that about which item Professor Ronki Ram is telling.

The members in one voice said that Professor Ronki Ram is telling about the English-Punjabi Directory item.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this dictionary will be released by holding a function.

**RESOLVED:** That the request dated 26.6.2018 of the Chairperson, School of Punjabi Studies and Incharge Punjabi Lexicography, for sanction of Rs. 2.56 lakhs (tentatively) calculated on the numbers of around 800 pages at the cost of Rs.320/- per page, to utilize the services of Professor O.P. Vashisht for completion of Punjabi-English Bilingual Dictionary, **as per appendix**, be accepted and the expenditure be met out of some appropriate budget head.

### Withdrawn Item

**25.** Considered recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the name of Shri Vinod Kumar Sharma, Advocate, be included in the existing panel of High Court for 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2020 already approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.03/21.04/29.04.2018 (Para 51 (R (xii))).

**RESOLVED:** That **Item C-25** on the agenda be treated as withdrawn.

### Minutes dated 20.07.2018 with regard to use of Rajbhasha in the office and the Society.

**26.** Considered minutes dated 20.07.2018 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to communication received from MHRD vide No. MS16-1/2008 (Rajbhasha) dated June 12, 2018 (**Appendix-XVII**) regarding use of Rajbhasha in the office and the Society.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.11.2016 (Para I-xxiv) (**Appendix-XVII**) had noted letter No.16-1/2008 dated 27.10.2016 received from Dr. (Mrs.) Pankaj Mittal, Additional Secretary, University Grant Commission, New Delhi.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired whether such circulars/letter from Government of India as an Advisory are required to be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh and Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that there is no need to place such things before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what is of advisory nature should be brought here and they have no other choice but to adopt it and what is mandatory, they have no choice but they have to implement it. The present one is of Advisory and Syndicate approve it.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes dated 20.07.2018 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to communication received from MHRD vide No. MS16-1/2008 (Rajbhasha) dated June 12, 2018) regarding use of Rajbhasha in the offices and the Society, **as per Appendix**, be approved..

**Items No. C-27, C-28 and C-29 were taken up together for consideration.**

**Condonation of delay in submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Sushil Kumar Narang, Department of Computer Science & Applications**

**27.** Considered if, delay of 3 years, 4 months and 24 days as on 30.09.2018 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 Mr. Sushil Kumar Narang, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Science, Department of Computer Science & Applications, be condoned w.e.f. 06.05.2015 and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision of the Syndicate, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons as mentioned in his request dated Nil (**Appendix-XVIII**).

**NOTE:** 1. Mr. Sushil Kumar Narang was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Science on 07.05.2009. He was granted three years extension upto 06.05.2015 by the DUI for submission of his thesis.

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-XVIII**).

**Condonation of delay in submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Parminder Kaur, Department of Sociology**

**28.** Considered if, delay of 3 years, 3 months as on 20.08.2018 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. Parminder Kaur, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Sociology, be condoned w.e.f. 20.05.2015 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 13.07.2018 (**Appendix-XVIII**).

**NOTE:** 1. Ms. Parminder Kaur was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Arts on 21.05.2009. She was granted three years extension upto 20.05.2015 by the DUI for submission of her thesis.

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-XVIII**).

**Condonation of delay in submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Hari Dass, Department of Instrumentation & Control, NITTTR, Sector-26, Chandigarh**

**29.** Considered if, delay of 2 years, 3 month and 18 days as on 20.02.2019 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 Mr. Hari Dass, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Department of Instrumentation & Control (NITTTR, Sector-26, Chandigarh), be condoned w.e.f. 2.11.2015 and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision of the Syndicate, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons as mentioned in his request dated 05.04.2018 (**Appendix-XVIII**).

**NOTE:** 1. Mr. Hari Dass was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology on 3.11.2009. He was granted three years extension upto 2.11.2015 by the DUI for submission of his thesis.

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

Shri Prabhjit Singh pointed out that delay condone is under exceptional circumstances. He wanted to know what are the exceptional circumstances under which delay is condoned so that he may be able to tell something? These cases are more than six, eight years and even ten years old. He was of the view that some reasons should be recorded. He read out few lines at page 645 of the agenda where it is written that after marriage, the prime responsibility is fallen on her as her mother-in-law is quite old and also got paralyse attack and due to that she has to visit the hospital very frequently. He pointed out that how they can justify it.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that Shri Prabhjit Singh is pointing out about the second person whose case is placed before them for delay condonation.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he is just submitting and if he (Shri Prabhjit Singh) has any problem, he can tell later on.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Shri Prabhjit Singh to read the above paragraph on the same page from where he is pointing out.

Professor Ronki Ram said that such things came here only after clearing all hurdles from the Departments concerned, so they should condone it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this case is of the year 2015 and is being placed before the Syndicate for delay condonation in 2018.

To this, Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that beyond six years, no extension is allowed and the delay, if any, can be condoned at the time of submission of thesis.

Shri Prabhjit Singh again said that exceptional circumstances will have to be given.

Professor Ronki Ram said that all these cases are submitted by the concerned Departments after completing all formalities.

Shri Prabhjit Singh again said that Department should have to quote the exceptional circumstances.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should have to hear Dr. Amit Joshi.

Dr. Amit Joshi told that there are clear cut guidelines in CSIR, in case of girl students and they will have to give extension of two years beyond the stipulated period of six years even with fellowship. There is a provision in the UGC or CSIR guidelines in this respect. He will hand over a copy of these guidelines.

To this, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is nothing personal.

Continuing, Dr. Amit Joshi said that last time also when Shri Prabhjit Singh raised the similar case, he suggested that a Resolution should be proposed in this regard. He further said that due to the marriage of girl students during the period of Registration for Ph.D., they have to face many problems. He further said that he himself will move a Resolution in this regard.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that these students are enrolled for Ph.D. before 2016 Ph.D. guidelines and as per those guidelines, they are eligible for this delay condonation. But after 2016, the Ph.D. guidelines are crystal clear and there is no such provision for extension. The U.G.C. has mentioned a clear date and after that date they cannot give any type of extension. There is no such bar in the old regulations and due to that they can give them extension.

**RESOLVED:** That

- (i) That delay of 3 years, 4 months and 24 days as on 30.09.2018 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 Mr. Sushil Kumar Narang, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Science, Department of Computer Science & Applications, be condoned w.e.f. 06.05.2015 and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision of the Syndicate.
- (ii) That the delay of 3 years, 3 months as on 20.08.2018 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. Parminder Kaur, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Department



of Sociology, be condoned w.e.f. 20.05.2015 and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision of the Syndicate.

- (iii) That the delay of 2 years, 3 month and 18 days as on 20.02.2019 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 Mr. Hari Dass, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Department of Instrumentation & Control (NITTTR, Sector-26, Chandigarh), be condoned w.e.f. 2.11.2015 and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision of the Syndicate.

**At this stage some discussion regarding the issue of the teachers of Chawariawali College which has been made a part of General Discussion.**

**Routine and formal matters**

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

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed following persons as Assistant Professor at P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, purely on temporary basis, for the academic session 2018-19, w.e.f. the date they start/started work, against the vacant posts of the Institute or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus allowances under Regulation 5 at pages 111 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Branch</b>
1.	Ms. Monika	ECE
2.	Shri Anish Sharma	ECE
3.	Ms. Harman Preet Kaur	ECE

**NOTE:** Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed Mr. Rajiv Kumar as Assistant Professor at P.U. constituent College, Mohkam Khan Wala, Ferozepur, purely on temporary basis, w.e.f. the date he will start/started work, for the session 2018-19 i.e. upto the start of summer vacations 2019 in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus allowances as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which he was working earlier for session 2017-18.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14 at page 36, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is reproduced below:

‘Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice-Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval.’

**(iii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to start Post Graduate Diploma in Guidance and Counselling in the University School of Open Learning (USOL) w.e.f. academic session 2018-19.

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

**(iv)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Ram Singh, Assistant Professor in Commerce (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib w.e.f. 20.08.2018 as he has given one month notice from 20.07.2018 to 19.08.2018, under Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U., Calendar Volume-III, 2016.

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

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

2. Dr. Ram Singh vide request dated 20.07.2018 (**Appendix-XX**) had written that he had been selected as Assistant Professor, Class-I, Gazetted in Himachal Pradesh and also requested to treat his request as one month notice prior resignation.

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

**(v)** The Vice-Chancellor has appointed the following persons as Part-Time Medical Specialist, (Orthopedician) and (Gynaecologist) Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, P.U., purely on contract basis on fixed emoluments of Rs.20,000/- p.m. (2 hours on working days), initially for period of one year, and further extendable with one day break after every one year on satisfactory performance & good conduct and other terms & condition notified by the University in Advt. No. 1/2018:

1. Dr. Ranjit Singh Rana- Orthopedician
2. Dr. Seema Chaudhary Kapoor- Gynaecologist

**NOTE:** The appointment letters have been issued to Dr. Ranjit Singh Rana and Dr. Seema Chaudhary Kapoor vide No. 9039-9042/Estt. dated 17.07.2018 and No. 9023/Estt dated 16.07.2018, respectively.

**(vi)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed afresh Ms. Harpreet Kaur as Assistant Professor in Mathematics at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University of Chemical Engineering & Technology, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 07.08.2018 for the academic session 2018-19, 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 Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier for the session 2017-18.

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

**(vii)** The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendations of the Committee dated 20.08.2018 (**Appendix-XXII**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has transferred and allowed the students of Law Courses, from one institution to the other within Panjab University System of Institutions, to attend the classes provisionally.

**(viii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has condoned the shortage of lectures of the following students of LL.B., Department of Laws, for the semester examination of May, 2018, session 2017-18 (**Appendix-XXIII**):

1. Abhishek Vashisht, 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester
2. Agrata Sharma, 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester
3. Shamandeep Singh, 4<sup>th</sup> Semester
4. Shazia K Singh, 4<sup>th</sup> Semester
5. Tarun Goyal, 6<sup>th</sup> Semester

**Referring to Sub-Item (R) (vii)**, Professor Keshav Malhotra, said that Professor Navdeep Goyal is member of this Committee and he should throw some light on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to page 3 or the agenda papers said that the minutes of the Committee relating to this item are placed at page 9 of the agenda. He wanted to inform that this Committee of the Syndicate was constituted last year and was only for that year. He pointed out that this year the Committee is not revised. They have raised this issue earlier with the former Vice-Chancellor but all in vain. He suggested that the Chairman of this Committee should be from the present Syndicate and include other members accordingly. He pointed out that they had made rules that no migration should be allowed in the 1<sup>st</sup> Year or in 1<sup>st</sup> Semester of LL. B. Five Year Course because they have got admission there and they should study there and migration should only be allowed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Semester. Now, people ask them such questions and put a query when such migration is allowed and they tell them that it starts from 3<sup>rd</sup> Semester. But this Committee, they can see had considered nine students of 1<sup>st</sup>

year of LL.B. Five Year Course out of 13. In this, they are died with hunger as they do not know what is happening. When last time it was enquired, they said that they do not consider the cases of students except 3<sup>rd</sup> semester and it use to 3<sup>rd</sup> Semester. He is not against the students of 1<sup>st</sup> Semester also. Further, this Committee has allowed these students, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, to attend the classes also. In this way, this Committee has also utilized the powers of the Syndicate by assuming that the Syndicate approve it. Now, at this stage, if they say no, then the Committee will say that they have done but the Syndicate has rejected the proposal. If they say yes, it means, there should not be any migration in 1<sup>st</sup> Semester and in spite of that they are allowing it. Now, they do not want to go against it. He was of the view that after revising this Committee and if request of any such student/s is/are pending or come, these should also be considered at par with the students of same classes. This type of discrimination should not be done with anyone.

To this, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is a member of this Committee and what Shri Ashok Goyal is saying is alright. He further said that if someone takes admission at a particular place/institute and thereafter on medical grounds insists for his/her migration then their cases should not be considered. He told that few rules were framed and also approved by the Syndicate for this purpose. But actually what happened is that he was out of station when this Committee approved these cases.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Navdeep Goyal was not present in this Committee.

Continuing Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he was present in this Committee meeting but in the earlier meeting of the Committee, where these cases were approved, he was not present. Three meetings of this Committee were held. He was of the view that generally he has the knowledge of the rules and if he present, he objects to it. The Committee in its meeting, in which he was not present, had cleared some cases of 1<sup>st</sup> Semester also. He further said that he faced the same situation in the last (third) meeting of the Committee as Shri Ashok Goyal said because some cases are already cleared in the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting and if they stop/object to them then there will be a problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, it means, viz.-a-viz. they have to monitor the functioning of the Committees also as to for what purpose the Committee was framed, what mandate the Syndicate has given for that matter and what rules they have been framed. It is the same thing as is happening in the Semester System and they are promoting the students according to their will.

Intervening, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that why they have constituted a Committee, this is the role of the Establishment Branch.

To this, Dr. Amit Joshi said no, it is related to multiple factors.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that these rules were made stringent to some extend; otherwise, seats shall fall vacant in their Regional Centres. But with the passage of time, it is being done in the 1<sup>st</sup> Semester as well as in other Semesters also. To avoid such things, he suggested that a condition should be imposed that it will be done only after the approval of the Syndicate. It is from the last two-three years. Earlier, such cases were not allowed until the approval of the Syndicate. In the meantime, someone has started doing these things in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and that was why it is pointing out here.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it will be done as per those rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the re-constituted Committee will keep in mind these facts and rules also. He suggested that what cases the Committee has approved up to 23<sup>rd</sup> September, those should be treated approved and they have also no problem if the pending

cases up to today or at par cases are dealt with by the Committee in the same manner, as approved earlier ones.

The members in one voice said that the pending cases will be dealt in same manner.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that Committee be constituted by giving today's reference and to consider the pending cases up till today and cases of similar nature if come will be dealt with in the same manner.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the policy, it is clearly mentioned how the Committee is to be constituted.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Committee should also frame the rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that rules have already been there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that once the rules are violated by the present Committee. He questioned did the new Committee will do the same thing?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the rules are framed by them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the new re-constituted Committee say that what the earlier Committee violates, it violated but they did not violate these rules, then it will send a wrong message that what the earlier Committee can violate, violated and no accountability is fixed and this Committee is nothing to do. He informed that another meeting of this Committee was held and they also cleared the cases of some students and allowed them to attend the classes also which is yet to be placed before the Syndicate. He suggested that they should have the same decision in respect of these cases which they have approved for earlier ones. He further suggested that the re-constituted Committee will keep in mind that what the Committee has done in the past has decided on merit.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan suggested that this Committee should be re-constituted every year. He pointed out that this Committee is continued from the last four years.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that he has received phone calls about the decisions of the Committee and enquired is it possible and he was proved wrong.

The members in one voice said that they all also proved wrong in the eyes of people to whom they said no.

Shri Ashok Goyal said now that he wanted to ask a specific question to the members that what they can do about the Committee members who had signed the minutes of this Committee. He further said that they cannot do anything as they are all their colleagues.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that all these cases should be sent back and there is no difference if the students have to attend classes there (in earlier Institutes/Regional Centres).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that by doing so, they will make a mockery of the system.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they cannot do anything as these cases are two-three months back and students are attending classes in the Institute/s where they are allowed migration.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that, if they do not do anything, then they should have to open a gate for everyone.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to open.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that this year on the same pattern all such students be allowed and from next year, they will decide as per the guidelines/rules approved by the Syndicate for this purpose.

It was suggested (by the Registrar) to put up this thing on the Notice Board and give them one month time for publishing it.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that don't think of publishing it, the Bar Council of India will take a harsh stand by saying that it is against the capacity they have given to them. He pointed out why all these things are coming to their mind today and when they suggested all such things in the Syndicate then some members and the Vice-Chancellor said after all, they are all part of the society and they have to see the practical difficulties.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that what is done is done; otherwise, Pandora's Box will be opened. He further said that Shri Ashok Goyal is very rightly said in this context in the last Syndicate meeting and the then Vice-Chancellor said 'no'. Dr. Subhash ji has said the same thing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if there is a question of son of Keshav ji, then he will not read the rules and just says do it. He further said that the precedent of *Bhai Bathija Vad* is going on in the University and due to this flood gates open.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan pointed out that this Committee was constituted four years back and why this Committee was constituted, to see all these things is the responsibility of the office.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that all the Committees which were constituted before 2018 should be re-constituted.

**RESOLVED:** That -

- (1) the information contained in Items **R-(i) to R-(vi) and R-(viii)** be ratified;
- (2) the recommendation contained in item **R-(vii)** be ratified and the Vice Chancellor be authorised to reconstitute the Committee meant for evaluating the applications of students from Law Courses for transfer from one institution to the other within the Panjab University system and from now onwards all such cases, which are in the pipeline, be dealt with, on merit, as per rules.

**Routine and formal matters**

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

- (i) To note the report dated 09.07.2018 (**Appendix-XXIV**) submitted by the Chief Vigilance Officer accepted by the former Vice-Chancellor, in respect of complaint made by Mr. Balwinder Singh R/o 4E2, Adarsh Nagar, Naya Gaon, Distt. Mohali.

**NOTE:** 1. The then Vice-Chancellor while accepting the report dated 09.07.2018 submitted by the CVO had passed the following orders that:

“DUI: Please call Chairperson, UICET and enjoin Chairperson to implement the recommendation of the CVO. Mr.

Balwinder Singh must not be allowed to visit UICET. A direction be issued appropriately”.

2. Accordingly, directions were issued by the DUI to the Chairperson, Dr. SSBUI CET vide No. 2901/DUI/I dated 13.07.2018 **(Appendix-XXIV)**.
3. An office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XXIV)**.

**(ii)** To note letter dated 14.08.2018 **(Appendix-XXV)** of Director, Research Promotion Cell, regarding selection of Mr. Pardip Nirbhavane, Senior Research Fellow, UIPS, for the prestigious “ University of Birmingham India Institute Fellowship” fully funded to carry out interdisciplinary Indo-British collaborative research in domain of ‘Lipidic Nanocarriers for the Treatment of Uveitis’.

**(iii)** The Vice-Chancellor has accepted an additional donation of Rs.75,000/- made by Mr. Vinod K Punshi (donor) to enhance corpus to Rs.1,00,000/- for existing endowment namely ‘Punshi Narain Devi Vidyawati Charitable Trust Gold Medal’.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.08.1997 (Para 2 (xiv)) had accepted the donation of Rs.25,000/- from Dr. S.K. Punshi trustee of Punshi Narain Devi Vidyawati Charitable Trust for creation of ‘Punshi Narain Devi Vidyawati Charitable Trust Gold Medal’. The FDR amounting of Rs.25,000/- will mature on 22.04.2019.

2. A copy of letter No.4822/S-IV/FC dated 12.09.2018 sent to the donor with regard to the certificate to avail the exemption in the Income Tax as also a acknowledgement of receipt of Rs. 75,000/- is enclosed **(Appendix-XXVI)**.
3. An office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XXVI)**.

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

- (i) Dr. Ramnik Aurora, Assistant Professor, Department of French, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.09.2018 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No. 18544 of 2018 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing on attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by her. The payment to her shall be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) she be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(v) The Vice-Chancellor has accepted the request dated 01.06.2018 (**Appendix-XXVII**) of Shri Surinder Kumar, Security Guard, Re-evaluation Branch, for voluntary retirement w.e.f. 31.08.2018 (A.N) i.e. the last day of three months notice period given by him and has sanctioned the following voluntary retirement benefits:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 and Regulation 17.8 at page 131 & 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

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

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

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits in respect of Late Ms. Lovely Sharma, Senior Assistant, USOL who expired on 14.04.2017, while in service, to be distributed in equal share i.e. 50% to each Sh. Anil Kumar Sharma (Brother) and Ms. Anita Sharma (Sister), who



are the nominees of the deceased employee as per nomination form:-

1. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 141 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

(vii) 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.	Dr. Vijay Prabha Professor Department of Microbiology	17.03.1981	31.08.2018	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 & 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007.  (ii) Furlough as admissible (maximum for six months) under Regulation 12.4 (B) at page No. 127 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007; and  (iii) 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 days by the Government of India.
2.	Dr. Ramnik Aurora Assistant Professor Department of French	07.11.2005	31.08.2018	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 and 15.2 at pages 131-132 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007; and  (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 days by

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

				the Government of India.
--	--	--	--	--------------------------

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

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Ms. Santosh Kumari Assistant Registrar UIET	02.03.1977	30.09.2018	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Ms. Charanjit Kaur Assistant Registrar DSW Office	08.06.1982	30.09.2018	
3.	Ms. Anita Sharma Superintendent Re-evaluation Branch	25.10.1985	30.09.2018	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
4.	Shri Jagdish Singh Senior Technician G-II) Department of Geography	19.07.1984	30.09.2018	
5.	Shri Sham Lal Daftri, USOL	23.05.1978	30.09.2018	
6.	Shri Manohar Lal Record Lifter R & S Branch	23.06.1983	31.08.2018	
7.	Shri Jagmohan Singh Security Guard Security Staff P.U.	30.07.1975	30.09.2018	
8.	Ms. Durga Devi Peon A.C. Joshi Library	07.08.1998	30.09.2018	

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

9.	Shri Badlu Ram Cleaner Department of Mathematics	03.01.1978	30.09.2018	
----	---	------------	------------	--

**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-(viii)** be noted.

At this stage Dr. Amit Joshi requested the Vice-Chancellor to take up pending **Item C-14** on the agenda of the Syndicate meeting dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2018 after the consideration of current agenda items. He pointed out that this item relates to a wrong appointment.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the members to go through the Information items so that no agenda of today's meeting remains pending.

The members said that today's agenda is completed as all Information Items are passed.

At this stage, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is very urgent issue of Aurobindo College and they should take it up.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they have to take up two items, i.e. C-14 and-38 of Syndicate meeting dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2018 which are very essential.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they have to take up the issue of Aurobindo College as the teachers of this College are waiting outside.

Dr. Amit Joshi again requested the Vice-Chancellor to take up the pending Item C-14 of the Syndicate meeting dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2018.

Dr. Inderjeet Singh Sidhu said that they should consider only two items of July 2018 meeting, i.e. C-14 and C-38.

The Vice-Chancellor said why they are taking up these items when there are so many other items in the agenda of 7<sup>th</sup> July 2018.

To this, Dr. Amit Joshi said that these are the priority items. He explained that what was prioritised, according to that, C-14 is the first item of 7<sup>th</sup> July 2018.

Shri Ashok Goyal demanded a copy of the items which are prioritised as they do not know anything about it.

Dr. Subhash Sharma also endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that this item relates to re-appointment of certain people as Assistant Professors. He told that in this regard he has also given in writing. He further said that he wanted to tell the background of the case.

**The following items C-14 and C-38 of Syndicate agenda dated 7.7.2018 were taken up for discussion.**

**Re-appointment of certain persons as Assistant Professor, Department of Biotechnology, P.U., purely on temporary basis, for the session**

**14.** Considered if, the following persons, be re-appointed as Assistant Professor, Department of Biotechnology, P.U., purely on temporary basis, for the session 2018-2019, w.e.f. the date they start the work against vacant post of the Department or till the post are filled in on regular basis through proper selection whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100 +AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007:

1. Dr. Monika Sharma
2. Dr. Baljinder Singh Gill

- NOTE:**
1. The syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 42 R (xii)) had re-appointed the above persons as Assistant Professors W.E.F. the date they start the work for the session 2017-18.
  2. A copy of the meeting of Academic and Administrative Committee dated 08.05.2018 is enclosed .
  3. Letter dated 05.06.2018 of Chairperson, Department of Biotechnology, P.U. is enclosed.
  4. An office note is enclosed.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the members to explain about item No. C-14 in brief.

Dr. Amit Joshi explained in detail about these appointments. He said that the Department has been submitting in writing from the last four-five years that they do not require persons of this specialization and this issue is pending. He wanted to know from the Registrar that when the concerned Department has submitted in writing that they have no workload why these appointments were made Under Regulation 14, meant for making emergent appointments. After that there was one thing dangerous which was never happened in the history of the University nor may be happened again. The Chairperson of the concerned department was called in the room of the D.U.I. and former SVC, Dr. A.S. Ahluwalia was present there and his Clerks were also present there. The candidate at Sr. No.1 in the item, Dr. Monika was called there. He pointed out that what was the reason to call an ad hoc or temporary employee there. He wanted to know one thing that after all he is Chairperson of the Department and she shouted at the Chairperson in their presence and said how he does not appoint her. The SVC said the Chairperson to wait outside to receive the paper. Rather, there was no prerogative of the D.U.I. and there was no Regulation to call them as the case is pending in the Syndicate. Secondly, the Chairperson has to tell the SVC that without keeping in mind the hierarchy how she is talking with him. Moreover, the Academic Committee of the Department has rejected her case and there is no workload.

Some of the members enquired about this item whether the item is under ratification or for consideration.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the item is for consideration.

Dr. Subhash Sharma enquired whether the interview was also held.

To this, R.K. Mahajan said that she has been working there from four-five years.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired what the reason was given for her appointment.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that she has misbehaved with the Chairperson.

Continuing, Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that she has been working in this Department from the last four-five years. He wanted to know if the workload was there, how it is changed now.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as per the present schedule, there should be workload of 16 hours but she has been given a workload of 22 hours. There is no question of workload, but the real reason is that what Dr. Joshi has told that there is some problem between the contractual faculty members and other faculty members. He further said that the allegation of misbehaviour is also wrong because it is all due to these differences. Secondly, the allegation that there is no workload is also wrong. Thirdly, what can they do after seeing the whole situation and the workload, there are two persons if they wanted to remove her, then first of all they have to remove the candidate at Sr. No.2 and later on the turn of Sr. No. 1. He was of the view that if the Department removes both the persons and later on the Department requires their services, then both persons are to be appointed as due to the Court case, the Court says that they cannot appoint new persons but they have to appoint them. Under the present circumstances, to keep the atmosphere of the department intact and to save the University from any unnecessary illegality, the candidate in question should be shifted to some other department where such speciality person is required, this is the one possibility. In this way, they are saved from unnecessary law bungling and the atmosphere of the department will remain intact. The differences among the faculty members are being seen from the declining communication from the department that they do not require persons of this specialisation every year. He is also come to know that the department has demanded four more faculty members as they wants that the person/s in question cannot continue. He pointed out that how it will go on?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there is no question of work load or not. He pointed out that in this Department, two INSPIRE Faculty members and one DST Young Scientist joined. The former Vice-Chancellor with his green pen marked the workload of the teachers. He further pointed out that this is not in his domain. It is purely Hooliganism. They are giving false liberage to the persons who do not have any respect of her seniors. Tomorrow someone come to the room of the Vice-Chancellor and leave from there by committing misbehaviour and they just say by sitting here what they can do, he is a Professor from the last 24 or 30 years.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan pointed out where is the complaint of the Chairperson?

Continuing, Dr. Amit Joshi said that appointment should be rejected.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that keeping in view the whole situation, there are very serious allegations. What is the necessity that the Vice-Chancellor with his own pen created the workload by bypassing the Chairperson of the Department? In the last meeting of the Syndicate he said that this appointment is made by way of corruption and he is reiterating the same.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Shri Prabhjit Singh that what action he wants in this regard?

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the appointment in question should be rejected.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Dr. Subhash Sharma to give his viewpoint in this regard.

To this, Dr. Subhash Sharma questioned whether they are talking of all appointments or for a particular appointment.

Shri Prabhjit Singh and Dr. Amit Joshi said that for a particular case in which there is no workload and the candidate misbehaved with the Chairperson.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if there is no workload, then there is no need to continue with it and they should go by the recommendation of the Department.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should see that this correction is of 28.07.2016.

To this, Dr. Amit Joshi replied that the department submits the same every year but they do not give any reply to the Department.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be looked into.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the current workload of the Department should also be called.

Dr. Subhash Sharma endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Professor Navdeep Goyal.

Shri Prabhjit Singh suggested that along with current workload as well as report from the Chairperson regarding her misbehaviour should also be called and terms are not satisfactory with the regular faculty of the department.

Professor Ronki Ram said that there should not be any impression that they are supporting one person and opposing the other. He was of the view that they should talk on the basis of clarity and facts. It is clearly mentioned that there is a different of opinion among the faculty members of the Department. However, Professor Neena Kaplash and Dr. Desh Deepak Singh did not agree with the decision of the Academic Committee and they want that she may continue while two faculty members are against her continuation in the Department. If she has misbehaved with a senior person/Chairperson, a case properly worded should come in the Syndicate which goes to the Standing Committee of the Syndicate and the same will decide in this regard.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that she is not regular employee. She is a contractual employee.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that she is not a regular employee.

To this, Professor Ronki Ram said that she is not a regular employee.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they all are giving her undue liberage.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is hearing his viewpoints.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that she is working from the last five-six years and how they can remove her when the Court is saying that they cannot remove such faculty members.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Professor Ronki Ram to summarize the issue.

Professor Ronki Ram said that there is no valid reason to say no to her. He was of the view that after considering report on her behaviour, they are able to take a decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it means you are not against her.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it is very complicated case. He suggested that they should call workload of the current year and secondly, if the Chairperson submits his complaint that should also be considered. He was of the strong opinion that appointment should be rejected

Dr. Amit Joshi Joshi said that otherwise there is no matter but it should be seen that as to whether the work load has been there or not.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that if there is an issue of work load, the Chairman has been saying that despite of not having any work load, the work load has been created, it has been a very serious issue. Besides this when this has been coming to fore the issue of new discipline, an action on priority should take place.

Dr. S.S.Sangha said that the work load should be checked. He further said that as has been stated by Dr. Amit Joshi, his eligibility is not in the department of Microbiology, if there is another department where he is eligible and work load is also there, then he could be shifted to that department.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that if her eligibility and work load are there in any other department, she could be sent to that department.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are two three things. The senior people are of concern in the matter including the DUI. He further said that he is not totally denying as to if nothing has taken place. But what happened and what not happened, that thing needs discussion. If the things actually are of grave serious concern, then matter relates as to what decision is to be taken. He said that another issue of time table, he said that if the latest time table is taken from the department, it will reveal all the facts. Usually it happens that the one say that this will not be got done and other says it needs to be done. The latest proceedings of the department should also be seen, that is separate issue. He said that at last he would come to the conclusion that this is the matter of mutual concern, it should be resolved in that sense.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he will response to that. So far as the matter of the two teachers is concerned, as has been stated by Professor Goyal of the faculty, if he will say something, it would be more harsh. He said that the former Vice Chancellor, was very smart. He went out of the way, if they see, he was in the habit of cutting with the green that such and such will do. What he did with the department, the way the proceeding of the department has been manipulated. He said that Dr. Neena Kaplash, she had no option but to give dissent in every case. She is from microbiology and she has been appointed in the department of Biotechnology. Every case is lying pending, she cannot say write or wrong. He is now telling as to what is the manipulation in the proceedings. There is no option with Dr. Neena Kaplash except to give dissent in every case and every case is pending in the court for the same reason. That she is from Microbiology and they know that she has been appointed in department of Bio-technology. Her case is lying pending, she cannot say that this is right or wrong. Every time her giving dissent every time is right. Now comes the matter of Dr. Deshdeepak Singh. Now he has been brought from Pharmacy and especially appointed Professor in department of Biotechnology. Alright. Now how can he give dissent on it.

Professor Ronki Ram said that then, in this way, all the cases have come to be personal.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that this is the personal of the Vice Chancellor to whom they have made to cut the words. Why they are not admitting that zero has been got written from the Vice Chancellor after making cuttings.



The Vice Chancellor said that discussion should not take place in such a way.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is not his personal case. He further said that if at all, the enquiry takes place, they will have to suspend the DUI. He cannot call a person on purely who is not an employee of the University inside his room and allow her to speak in front of the Chairman. It should be put on record. Now the Professor Ahluwalia has left and they must initiate disciplinary proceedings. His appointment should be seen as to on which order it has taken place. He asked the Registrar that he has made his appointment, was it valid, that order is valid. He said that his order is not in record but he has joined. Now it will be told that the paper is not there and by this way, he will be given more time to pass.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to whether there is no relevant paper here in the record.

The Registrar explained that only the file is here.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the records, there is only the latest paper of 20<sup>th</sup> July and now what is being transacted here, they relate to period beyond 20<sup>th</sup> of July. There is no paper related to that incident that took place in DUI office.

D. Amit Joshi said that the matter would go to the next meeting and they feel that let this Syndicate is held and there is a tradition here that to sealed those candidates all ineligible once.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor after forgetting the individual case, let them see the seriousness of the issue. We make it that there was any difference of opinion. If there are fewer persons in the Department and two of them say that he must continue and three say that they have no need. It is very right as has been said by Dr. Ronki Ram that they cannot ignore the opinion of those two Professors also. It happens when Dr. Ronki Ram chair the meeting, out of the sixteen, they send the resolve part of the opinion of the nine members without mentioning as to what has been stated by seven and what has been stated by nine. But here it is said that they cannot ignore. The question is if our Calendar says that the decision are to be taken by way of majority, then to say this that we cannot ignore the opinion of the two Professors, probably is not acceptable. He said that the second thing is that what is the hesitation in accepting that what is contained in the file, it happens to be the personal case of Vice-Chancellor as he made his personal case in the case of Ph.D. student of Sociology also. He further said that as he has told them that it was his habit to make it his personal prestige even if he has no direct concern about the happenings. He said that surprisingly the case is before the Syndicate, but he is referring to is everything post order dated 20<sup>th</sup> July and they understood that the matter is pending before the Syndicate, mostly they are going to close it down, the next Syndicate meeting has to take place with the same members of the Syndicate except that the Chairman of the Syndicate would be changing. What was the emergency which was to be used on 20<sup>th</sup> July under the Regulation 14 read with regulation 5 of Chapter V. On one side it is being said they are doing of the urgency, on the other hand, in his own hand, he is justifying that make its fifty percent, and make this treat as zero, to make this half and they are all writing it in the file. He further said that he is talking about eighteen. What has been written in 2018, When they have sent, the March 2018 note be read that his note be seen that there are no new facts which have been brought out by the Department., in my view she must continue, in case she is not to continue, then the second candidate has to be taken, even the one candidate is required Prof. Monika Sharma will still continue. He said that all these have been written by his own hand and the two Professors which have given dissent or which have not agreed, it is not said by them meaning thereby that their lawyer has not said this, the judge is say itself because prayer has taken place before him. Here the issue only is that a matter which was pending before Syndicate for consideration. Why and how did you use it unless and until he had reasons to be recorded that this was the emergency under which this

has been used. He said that he had told them that the regulation fourteen, including the Registrar, including the Vice Chancellor, no one was aware of it, including the Navdeep Goyal.. It was being told that if any emergency occurs, the powers of the Vice Chancellor had been withdrawn by the Syndicate, here the Vice Chancellor and the whole administration through media can pay against the Syndicate that the University would come to closure, the work of the University has been stopped, now nothing can be done, Ph.D. has been stopped and admission of students has been stopped, if someone happened to meet them, it was being told to them that go to the Syndicate. He further said that he himself is doing catharsis and retrospective, nobody should take on its own. Dr. Ronki Ram which is sitting along side him and he is proud of him. When they did not attend the meeting of Syndicate in June or July, 2018 or did not attend the meeting of the Senate, so since he in fact has emotional attachment with the University, he was with all of us. The spreadings like that the University has been washed away, all work has been suspended, the agenda has been lying pending. He remarked that the agenda of June and July has still been lying pending even today, the University nevertheless is going on. In what way the University had stopped working that day that all these are the enemies of the University and they are the outsiders. He said that he is simply saying this that if they have to keep care of the University, it could only be done by all these three books should be considered as Bible. In case, on every day, they have to make violation of these, then one would find written in the files as is being talked. Whatever has been told by Dr. Amit that whatever has happened in the DUI office, nothing could be serious than that and now it is not in the file, where are these things written in the file. He said that he was told that even after the issuance of these orders, the Chairperson of the Department had written that they have no need of it and it was told there that these are the orders of the Vice Chancellor, which will have to be obeyed. The Vice Chancellor does not follow the orders of the Syndicate, that Vice Chancellor has become a God and his orders shall have to be obeyed by all. The Vice Chancellor who does not have belief in this book, in these norms, he teaches to others that they shall have to follow his orders and after that by calling the Chairperson, he is pressurized and he is unable to know what they are doing.

It was asked as to who was the DUI at that time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the current DUI was very much in June, July.

On members saying that to the present DUI, no one can threaten, Shri Ashok Goyal said that by this way, whatever Dr. Amit was saying is not true.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that someone must have said that this be done. The members named the SVC in the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the matter should be enquired into and after 20<sup>th</sup> July whatever the correspondence has been exchanged within the office of DUI and the office of the Chairman of the Department, that should also be brought for appropriate decision in Syndicate and this should also be enquired into as to what has actually happened. That in the office of the DUI where the appointment of the candidate is in question, there the candidate has been made to face to face with the Chairman and whatever has been told that the Chairman has been asked to wait outside and asked to go back after taking the letter, while the candidate in question was inside the room and the Chairman has been made to stand at the door. He said that in the last his simple suggestion is that, although others are asking for certain things to acquire, the simple method is that the Chairman be called and he be asked on behalf of Syndicate, if it is said that they have no need, then straightway relieving should be made.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the day the first appointment on adhoc basis of that candidate took place, it should be seen that she was not eligible, it is written. While ineligible

she was appointed, who were the person present there then. He further said that it is immaterial whether the strength of the members is sixteen or it is eight, he himself was present then and also present by now. What motion had took place then, that motion may again take place by now. He is mean to say that he is not with a person, he is with the University and he would never afraid to say something.. He further said that now the case which have come, should not become a case of pro and against. If someone has misbehaved, he/she should be punished and whosoever has appointed him earlier, whether he is Vice Chancellor or so. If the Vice Chancellor have gone, why not to open up the case. Otherwise they would not be able to move further and will stick to where they are.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him call the Chairperson and discuss the matter with him.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that tomorrow the Chairperson should be called and his behaviour, time table and eligibility, all these three things, should be checked.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is not a matter of authorization to the Vice Chancellor. It is the decision of the Syndicate that the Vice Chancellor should call the Chairperson and whatever Chairperson recommends, the Vice Chancellor should follow.

The Vice Chancellor got it clarified as to if it would be one to one meet with the Chairman.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be taken care of that if expelled, then both would be expelled.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let this be discussed very much here that if expelled, both will be expelled, why ?

Shri Navdeep Goyal said that for Assistant Professor, it is nowhere. The UGC guidelines are very much clear that specialization did not need for Asstt. Professor.

Shri Amit Joshi said that leave all the things, the year in which his appointment has taken place, bring it and he will remove their suspicion about it. He said that by this time, he should be removed immediately.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that specialization is very much there.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Vice Chancellor has obliged him because of his intimacy with the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it shall have to be seen if the other is also ineligible. Now after seeing that to differentiate between that it is not to be made under consideration that she was on number one and her joining was of 17<sup>th</sup> and of the other was of 19<sup>th</sup>. One is to be seen that specialization is different or not and another is to be seen that ineligibility is there or not. So that can be differentiate. And what is the view of the Chairman about the other candidate, is also to be seen.

Shri Prabhjit Singh assigned some papers to the Vice Chancellor stating that a Committee be constituted to verify some facts in the college.

The Vice Chancellor wanted to seek some clarification as to act on the decision suggested, Shri Ashok Goyal said the correspondence between the department and the DUI,

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

the Vice Chancellor intervened to ask who will see it, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is the Syndicate. He said that as far as mystification is concerned, that should be enquired into.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to who will enquire it. He further said that they do not want any specific Committee, then how it will be done.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he wanted to say something. He said that whatever has taken place as yet, there are allegations on the Vice Chancellor, between the department head and the Professor concerned. He said that he would personally suggest that the head of the department says that there is no work load and he has dissent on it. He said that what he suggest is that they should set up a Committee of three senior Professors of the department who look at it in entirety and give them the report within a week on all the aspects. One is what is their work load, two is she qualified, three causes of misbehavior. These all the three aspects should be looked by three senior Professors and give you a report within a week.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he would name the three senior Professors. He said that whole of the University in the same way as in the Chess all assemble around the Queen when a quarrel happens to occur. He said that all are already together around her even by going out of the way, he said that for what they would located three professors, he did not want to say here and could tell them off and outside the camera. He said that the Vice Chancellor should call the Chairperson of the Department who has to take workload from the teachers. He cannot say about the Professors on record.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the Professors means not the Professors from this Department but the Professors from the other departments.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is the one aspect, the other aspect about which it has been told that it has occurred. This will have to be enquired. He said that for this three Professors committee should be constituted only with a view to take up the facts. The facts would come before them.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the three points should be marked. One, Is there enough work load, two, is she qualified to hold the post and the third one the misbehaviour part. All the three aspects should be asked to be looked into by the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that all the other aspects are okay but the aspect of work load should be looked into by the Vice Chancellor itself instead of by the Committee.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that in his view the aspect of work load is an important part. This is the main issue and the conflict is very much on that point, because a lot of cutting has taken place on that matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no problem if the whole of the file is seen by the Vice Chancellor itself.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that let him see the file. He further said that after effecting cutting, it has been made zero, for what the committee is to be formed.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Malhi said that all these issue, would be seen by the Vice Chancellor.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that only the disciplinary part of matter should be taken into account by the Committee. The members are resolving this point.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor has said that one to one decision has been made.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that this should not be made specific that the Committee would see this or that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the report is to be given to the Vice Chancellor and his opinion cannot be ignored.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the Vice Chancellor be authorized to call the Chairperson of the Department of Biotechnology to check from him the workload and specialization/eligibility of both the incumbents and also to know whether Dr. Monika Sharma has misbehaved with him (Chairperson) or not, and take appropriate action thereafter, accordingly, in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate.
- (ii) the Vice Chancellor is further authorised to constitute a Committee of three senior Professors from the University to look into disciplinary aspect i.e. regarding misbehaviour of Dr. Monika Sharma with the Chairperson.

**Issue of suspension of Teachers of Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce & Management, Ludhiana.**

**38.** Considered minutes dated 23.05.2018 of the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, on the issue raised by the Fellows regarding suspension of Teachers at Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce & Management, Ludhiana.

- NOTE:**
1. Minutes of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Committee held on 16.05.2018 and 19.05.2018, respectively are also enclosed **(Appendix-XXVIII)**.
  2. Copy of extract of discussion of Senate meeting dated 06.05.2018 is enclosed **(Appendix-XXVIII)**.

Dr Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that item No. C-38 is to consider minutes that is regarding third meeting of the Committee which was constituted by the Vice Chancellor on the issue raised by the Fellows regarding suspension of teachers at Aurobindo College of Commerce and Management, Ludhiana. He said that the findings of the Committee for which the item had come in 7<sup>th</sup> July meeting of Syndicate for consideration, the observations of that Committee are at page No. 356. He said that as to whether the policy about which the teachers had complained will not be followed. The college does not give annual increment, there is no appraisal policy, colleges is not giving Ph.D increments, the academic calendar is not being followed by the college in letter and spirit . He further said on all this, under the rule 11.1, the notice of disaffiliation needs to be given to which other members also agreed.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter which has been raised here, is subjudice.

The Registrar explained that let him update in the matter. He said that whatever the Registrar had in vogue, that rule 9.2 according to which the suspension was not in order, the college was asked to enquire first and then move on. They had gone to the Court and challenged that even the action of the Senate. Now it is under jurisdiction of the Court. They have challenged. The complete matter has been given to Shri Anupam Gupta that what has happened, it is already there. The Committee findings have also been given, to the Counsel.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they understand what has been explained here but the question is that the persons which have been dismissed, cannot they take any action against the college. Can we not give the notice of disaffiliation to them.

It was explained by (Dean College Development Council) that they have granted permanent affiliation to that college. On 26<sup>th</sup> of May when the Senate meeting was held, it was deliberately said that permanent affiliation has been kept in abeyance. This has also been challenged by the college and which is the part of the petition.

The members were in favour of taking legal opinion in the matter.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that our submission is only this one, that as the case is already in the Court, and we have been halting there, and if even after that they have dismissed and if we could do something in it, a legal opinion should be taken about it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Syndicate had resolved to disaffiliate the college, could a notice be given about this, the legal opinion should be taken.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired about as to what about the teachers which have been dismissed.

Dr. S.S.Sangha said that the Controller of Examination is aware that last year the Deepawali was on 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> October which later happened to be on 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> October. The last date for submission of examination form was 20<sup>th</sup> October followed by Saturday and Sunday. The candidates deposited the forms on 23<sup>rd</sup> October. The fine has been imposed. The fine amount is excessive which was difficult for the candidates. The candidate missed the chance to deposit the form because there happens to be Saturday and Sunday during the last dates. Earlier too, the fines had been remitted. This is the case of the candidate from Fazilka and he said that the candidate be charged with genuine fine.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be looked into.

Dr. R.K.Mahajan said that there had come an issue of change of name from the Department of Punjabi. He requested that the same may be included in the agenda of next meeting of Syndicate and he handed over that document to the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that a representation has been submitted in the office of Vice Chancellor and requested Shri Muneeshwar Joshi, Secretary to Vice Chancellor to note it. He further said that he would also give a copy of it to him.

**RESOLVED:** That legal opinion on the following be sought from the Legal Retainer of the University in respect of Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce & Management, Ludhiana:

- (i) on the issue of dismissal of three teachers and ;
- (ii) disaffiliation notice to the College under Regulation 11.1 appearing at page 160 of P.U. Cal. Vol.1, Chapter VIII(A).

## **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Some general discussion which took place after consideration of Item C-22, and C-29 has been brought here.

1. Dr. Amit Joshi pointed out that in the recommendations of the Standing Committee, one of the problem given in the recommendations of the Committee is that a student who gets compartment in 5<sup>th</sup> Semester has to wait for appearing in that paper for another one year as he has to wait for odd semester examinations. He requested

that such students be allowed to appear in the compartment paper with the 6<sup>th</sup> semester examination.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha enquired whether the item has been approved.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that all the recommendations of the Standing Committee have been approved.

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

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that a special chance be given to those students who got compartment in 5<sup>th</sup> semester.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is the reason due to which they feel difficulties.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha clarified that this is not a special chance, rather this is a chance which they would have got to clear the examination of 5<sup>th</sup> Semester. He is pleading that instead of holding the compartment examination in the next year, they should be given this chance in the month of March/April to save their one year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it means the examination would become an ongoing process and it would continue.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha explained that if the candidate is a chance to appear after one for the compartment paper, then how he would seek admission in the postgraduate class.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know whether he (Principal Sangha) is pleading for special Chance.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha clarified that he is not pleading for special chance, but pleading for pre-poning the genuine chance of such students. Suppose one is having a compartment in 5<sup>th</sup> Semester and he would appear in June next year in the 6<sup>th</sup> Semester, but he would not be allowed to appear for the compartment paper in June and he has to wait for one year to appear in the compartment examination of 5<sup>th</sup> Semester in the month of November. He further clarified that it is not a special chance but the chance which he has to get in November. If the chance would be given after one year, it would spoil his career.

Professor Keshav Malhotra, Dr. R.K. Mahajan and some other members suggested that it could be taken care of by the Committee.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha requested the members to pass the recommendation regarding special chance to the students of 5<sup>th</sup> Semester.

It was requested (by the Controller of Examinations) that the recommendation part of the Standing Committee (Sr. No. 1-7) at page 607 of the agenda papers should be approved as they are receiving requests as most of degrees are held up. The Standing Committee has recommended that their examination be conducted in the month of October so that their degrees given to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that the students are having compartment in 5<sup>th</sup> Semester and how it affects the release of degrees.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Dr. Amit Joshi while clarifying the position said that if his 5<sup>th</sup> semester is not clear he cannot be given the degree, but the 5<sup>th</sup> semester compartment examination is held after one year.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that the students are given two chances for clearing their compartment of 5<sup>th</sup> Semester. These two chances are given, one in the months of June and the other in November next year. He requested that out of those two chances, the students could be given one chance in the month of October so that one year of their career is saved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it means, that it would be the special chance.

Several members in one voice said that it is not the special chance, but it is one of the two chances available to them.

**This was agreed to.**

2. When Dr. Amit Joshi wanted to say something about late admissions, Dr. Subhash Sharma intervened to say that all this could be looked into by the Committee to be constituted.

At this stage Dr. Amit Joshi pointed out that many results are not declared by 31<sup>st</sup> of August. He further said that there are some students who could not apply for admission due to one or the other reasons, such students should be allowed admission with late fee till 30<sup>th</sup> September, if the seat is available in the college. So, he requested the members to give authorization to the Vice Chancellor to allow to admit the student till 30<sup>th</sup> September with late fee along with other such cases, if any.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the authorization is given.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that one of the girl student whose father was martyred in Kargil while on duty and the candidate could not apply for admission till 31<sup>st</sup> August. When she came after performing the ritual, the last date was already over.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then they should give the whole authority to the Vice Chancellor and there is no need to follow rules and regulations. In any exceptional or difficult circumstances, the Vice Chancellor may be authorized to make admission on any date.

Professor Keshav Malhotra informed that the last date for admission in the University School of Open Learning is 5<sup>th</sup> October.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he is talking about the case of the daughter of an ex-serviceman.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it could be done in rare cases.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is also an exceptional case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that rare case has more intensity than exceptional case.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested that the last date should be extended to 30<sup>th</sup> September.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why this date could not be extended upto 31<sup>st</sup> December.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2018

Dr. Amit Joshi said if the date is extended till 31<sup>st</sup> December, how it could be feasible as the examination would start from 1<sup>st</sup> December.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should dilute the things and maintain academic excellence.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the students face a lot of problems.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that they should take admission in USOL where the last date without late fee is 5<sup>th</sup> October.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if that student is not given admission till 30<sup>th</sup> September, then her one year would be spoiled.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the last date of 31<sup>st</sup> August with late fee is fixed after lot of deliberations. If it is extended to 30<sup>th</sup> September, then how the student would get time to study and how the candidate would fulfill the condition of 75% lectures.

Dr. Amit Joshi enquired from the members whether the date would be extended to 30<sup>th</sup> September or not, so that they would be able to tell the students.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that there were some exceptional cases, it could be done, if a seat is vacant.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Principal of the College gives this in writing whether the seat is vacant.

3. At this stage, Shri Prabhjit Singh raised the issue of the teachers of Chawariawali College and pointed out that some teachers of this College met him yesterday and they have not been paid salary from the last four months. The Teachers are also being forced to mark the attendance of the non-attending students. He requested the Vice-Chancellor that as per his wish, he can send an Inspection Team and see whether the record is right.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, first of all, they should have to take up the issues on the agenda.

Registrar

Confirmed

(Raj Kumar )  
VICE-CHANCELLOR