

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the **SENATE** held on **Thursday, 22nd August 2019** at **11.00 a.m.** in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

1. Professor Raj Kumar ... (in the Chair)
Vice Chancellor
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Shri Anilesh Mahajan
4. Professor Akhtar Mahmood
5. Dr. Anita Kaushal
6. Dr. (Mrs.) Amita Rishi
7. Dr. Ajay Ranga
8. Dr. Amit Joshi
9. Dr. Ameer Sultana
10. Dr. Amar Singh
11. Ms. Anu Chatrath
12. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
13. Dr. Baljinder Singh
14. Dr. B.C. Josan
15. Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu
16. Shri Deepak Kaushik
17. Dr. Dalip Kumar
18. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhwa
19. Professor Emanuel Nahar
20. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma
21. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
22. Dr. Gurmit Singh
23. Dr. Harjodh Singh
24. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua
25. Dr. Harsh Batra
26. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
27. Mrs. Indu Malhotra, D.H.E., Punjab
28. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu
29. Dr. Inderjit Kaur
30. Smt. Kirron Kher
31. Professor J.K. Goswamy
32. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
33. Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta
34. Dr. Jarnail Singh
35. Dr. K.K. Sharma
36. Professor Keshav Malhotra
37. Professor Manoj K. Sharma
38. Professor Mukesh Arora
39. Shri Naresh Gaur
40. Professor Navdeep Goyal
41. Dr. N.R. Sharma
42. Dr. Neeru Malik
43. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu
44. Dr. Nisha Bhargawa
45. Professor Pam Rajput
46. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

47. Dr. Parveen Goyal
48. Shri Prabhjit Singh
49. Principal Paramjit Singh
50. Shri Parmod Kumar
51. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
52. Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mahajan
53. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
54. Dr. Raj Kumar Chabbewal
55. Professor Rajat Sandhir
56. Professor R.P. Bambah
57. Professor Rajesh Gill
58. Professor Ronki Ram
59. Shri Rajinder Bhandari
60. Professor S.K. Sharma
61. Shri Sandeep Singh
62. Shri Sanjay Tandon
63. Shri Subhash Sharma
64. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur
65. Dr. Surinder Kaur
66. Professor Shelley Walia
67. Shri Satya Pal Jain
68. Shri Som Parkash Kainth
69. Dr. S.S. Sangha
70. Professor Shankarji Jha
71. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
72. Shri Sandeep Kumar
73. Shri Tript Rajinder Singh Bajwa
Minister for Higher Education, Punjab
74. Shri Varinder Singh
75. Dr. Vipul Narang
76. Shri V.K. Sibal
77. Professor Karamjeet Singh ... (Secretary)
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Dr. Amod Gupta
2. Shri Amanpreet Singh
3. Capt. Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister
4. Professor B.S. Ghuman
5. Professor Chaman Lal
6. Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi
7. Justice Krishan Murari
8. Shri Manoj Kumar Parida
9. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
10. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
11. Shri Raj Kumar Bhatia
12. Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar, D.H.E., Chandigarh
13. Dr. Satish Kumar
14. Shri Sanjeev Bandlish
15. Shri Tarlochan Singh

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

The Vice Chancellor wished good morning to all the esteemed member of the Senate and welcomed them to the meeting.

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

- (i) Smt. Sushma Swaraj ji, former Honorable Union External Affairs Minister, and an alumnus of our University on 7.8.2019
- (ii) Shri Balbir Singh Gujral, father of Professor Sukhbir Kaur, Department of Zoology, on 13.8.2019.”

The Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Smt. Sushma Swaraj ji and Shri Balbir Singh Gujral, 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.

II. The Vice Chancellor said, “I am pleased to inform the honourable members of the Senate that:

1. I heartily welcome the following newly nominated Fellows by the Hon’ble Chancellor to this August House and believe that the University would be benefited from the collective wisdom and experience of all the members of this House:
 - (i) Shri Somparkash Kainth ji, Honorable Union Minister of State for Commerce & Industry.
 - (ii) Professor Rajinder Bhandari ji
 - (iii) Professor Raj Kumar Bhatia ji
 - (iv) Shri Anilesh Mahajan ji
 - (v) Madam Amita Rishi ji
2. I congratulate Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Deepak Kaushik and their team for being elected in the recent elections to PUTA & PUSA.
3. I am pleased to inform the House that after a long gap of 14 years, our University has bagged the Maulana Abul Kalam Azad (MAKA) Trophy for the session 2018-19.

The members applauded this achievement of the University by thumping of desks.
4. Professor Rajinder Jindal, Department of Zoology, has been awarded Research Peace Award-2019 by International Journal for Research Under Literal Access in association with World Research Council & United Medical Council.
5. Dr. Vishal Sharma, Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology, has been conferred with India Top Cited Author Award 2019 by IOP Publishing, UK.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

6. Dr. Kewal Krishan, Chairperson, Department of Anthropology has been appointed as the International Consulting Editor of the Medicine, Science and The Law – The Journal of the British Academy of Forensic Sciences for a period of three years from 2019 to 2021.

The Vice Chancellor also welcomed Shri Tripat Rajinder Singh Bajwa, Hon'ble Minister for Higher Education, Punjab, Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu, Hon'ble Minister for Food and Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs, and Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, who are attending the meeting of the Senate for the first time.

Lastly, he would like to propose, in the memory of Smt. Sushma Sawaraj Ji, one Professorship Chair, for which he is of the opinion that the Departments/Centres be asked to prepare a project proposal and submit the same to the concerned Ministry, if the Hon'ble members agree.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that Professor Anita Kaushal, who is also an hon'ble member of this House, has recently been awarded a Commendation Certificate and the award has been conferred by His Excellency, Governor of Punjab, on 15th of August 2019.

Shri Varinder Singh stated that he had a request to make. The University has won Maulana Abul Kalam Azad (MAKA) Trophy after a gap of 13-14 years. He would like to congratulate the entire University for the purpose. Secondly, at the moment, the University is having the service of eight Coaches, and out of them three have reached the age of superannuation. He pleaded that the remaining five Coaches should be adjusted in the University against the regular posts. If they keep the Coaches on temporary basis, they will not be able to pay full attention towards their duties because as and when a regular post is advertised and they get selected, they leave the service of the University. Therefore, he suggested that five Coaches out of eight should at least be adjusted in the University against the regular posts.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that, under his (Vice Chancellor) able leadership, the University had won MAKA Trophy after a gap of so many years, for which they all wanted to congratulate him.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that they might be going to receive the MAKA Trophy on 29th August, which is a National Sports Day. They also congratulate him (Vice Chancellor). She would like to endorse the statement of Shri Varinder Singh and would also like to inform the House that if they have obtained 99,000 points, more than 60% contribution is from the Coaches of the University as well as Principals and teachers of the affiliated Colleges.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that two of their colleagues namely, Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor J.K. Goswami, have won the PUTA election for the first time with a marvellous margin. The entire Senate should congratulate them.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that before taking up Item 1, he would like to discuss the Action Taken Report in respect of decisions of the Senate meeting dated 26.05.2019. In fact, in Item 25, they had resolved: Principal/Corresponding Author/Supervisor, but in the minutes it has been recorded wrongly, even though he had visited the concerned office(s) several times and told that there is no term "Corresponding Supervisor".

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Shri Varinder Singh stood up and enquired, “Is it a zero hour”?

To this, several members started speaking together and a din prevailed.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to sit down and let the House work.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the issue raised by him did not relate to politics. He would only like to say that when Item 25 was considered on 26th May 2019, it was discussed that it should be done like this and the same was agreed to by him (Vice Chancellor) and none had objected to that. Now, there is a mistake in the minutes.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would take care of the issue.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that let him clarify. When he notices the mistake as corresponding Supervisor was written there, whereas the corresponding Supervisor is not a term. In fact, the correcting term is Corresponding Author/Supervisor. Thereafter, he pointed out the mistake in writing to the office, but what to think of receiving a reply, even this correction has not been carried out. His humble request is that it should be got corrected. Secondly, there are several officers in the University, who did not care at all and they normally act in accordance with the image person concerned. Had somebody else been in his place, perhaps, it would have been corrected? However, this issue is not his, it is, in fact, related to all the teachers.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) felicitations of the Senate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Professor Rajinder Jindal, Department of Zoology, on having been awarded Research Peace Award-2019 by International Journal for Research Under Literal Access in association with World Research Council & United Medical Council;
 - (ii) Dr. Vishal Sharma, Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology, on having been conferred with India Top Cited Author Award 2019 by IOP Publishing, UK; and
 - (iii) Dr. Kewal Krishan, Chairperson, Department of Anthropology, on having been appointed as the International Consulting Editor of the Medicine, Science and The Law – The Journal of the British Academy of Forensic Sciences for a period of three years from 2019 to 2021.
- (2) the information contained in Vice Chancellor’s Statement at Serial Number 3, be noted; and
- (3) the Action Taken Report in respect of the decisions of the Senate meeting dated 3.11.2018, be noted, with the stipulation that correction in the minutes of Senate meeting dated 26.05.2019 (Item 25) be made as pointed out by Dr. Parveen Goyal.

The Vice Chancellor said that now, they should take up the agenda items for consideration.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019**III.** Considered the following Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) promotion cases
(Item C-1 on the agenda):

- A.** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010) in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/-+AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Dr. Gargi Ghoshal (w.e.f. 21.09.2017)	Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(i))		
2.	Dr. Dazy Zarabi (w.e.f. 01.01.2012)	Community Education and Disability Studies
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(iii))		
3.	Dr. Dipti Sareen (w.e.f. 14.11.2017)	Biochemistry
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(iv))		
*4.	Dr. Sasha (Assistant Professor in History) (w.e.f. 06.07.2016)	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(vii))		
5.	Dr. Pushpinder Kaur Mann nee Gill (Assistant Professor in Law) (w.e.f. 01.08.2018)	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(viii))		
6.	Dr. Babita Devi (w.e.f. 01.07.2018)	Laws
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(ix))		
7.	Dr. Manju Gera (Assistant Professor in History) (w.e.f. 07.09.2017)	University School of Open Learning
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xiii))		
8.	Dr. Navreet (w.e.f. 03.11.2017)	Public Administration
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xiv))		
9.	Dr. Monica Bedi (w.e.f. 01.07.2017)	University Business School
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xix))		
10.	Dr.(Mrs.) Meenu Aggarwal nee Gupta (w.e.f. 03.11.2017)	English and Cultural Studies
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxiii))		

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Sr. No.	Name	Department
11.	Dr. Kalpna Dahiya (Assistant Professor in Mathematics) (w.e.f. 20.04.2017)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxiv))		
12.	Dr. Suman Mor (w.e.f. 30.08.2018)	Environment Studies
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxvii))		
13.	Dr. Mukesh Kumar (Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Engineering) (w.e.f. 07.10.2018)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxxii))		
14.	Dr. Shankar Sehgal (Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engineering) (w.e.f. 07.11.2018)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xlii))		
15.	Dr. Rupinder Bir Kaur (w.e.f. 12.08.2018)	University Business School
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(ii))		
16.	Dr. Gurinder Singh (Assistant Professor in Physics) (w.e.f. 18.07.2018)	P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(viii))		
17.	Dr. Shuchi Gupta (Assistant Professor in Physics) (w.e.f. 17.07.2018)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(ix))		
18.	Shri Jaget Singh (Assistant Professor in Electronics & Communication Engineering) (w.e.f. 22.12.2018)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xi))		
19.	Dr. Amandeep (w.e.f. 04.07.2018)	Evening Studies-MDRC
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xv))		
20.	Dr. Priyatosh Sharma (w.e.f. 19.10.2016)	History
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xxiv))		

NOTE: 1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010 except Sr. No. 2.
- *4. The selection of Sr. No. 4 has been in compliance to third amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
5. The letter of promotion has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

B. That the following persons be promoted from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/-+ AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
*1.	Dr. Prabha Vig (w.e.f. 03.03.2015)	Life Long Learning and Extension
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(ii))		
2.	Dr. Sarabjit Kaur (Associate Professor in Political Science) (w.e.f. 07.08.2016)	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(v))		
3.	Dr. Sujit Lahiry (w.e.f. 14.08.2017)	P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(vi))		
4.	Dr. Vinod Kumar (w.e.f. 27.02.2017)	Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xv))		
5.	Dr. Gulshan Kumar (Associate Professor in Economics) (w.e.f. 01.01.2017)	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xvi))		
6.	Dr. Purva Kansal (w.e.f. 29.01.2019)	University Business School
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xviii))		
**7.	Dr. Alka Bali (w.e.f. 24.06.2016)	University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxii))		
8.	Dr. Rupak Chakravarty (w.e.f. 28.06.2018)	Library and Information Science
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxviii))		

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Sr. No.	Name	Department
9.	Dr. Prashant Kumar Gautam (w.e.f. 24.07.2018)	University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxx))		
10.	Dr. Jatinder Grover (w.e.f. 19.07.2018)	Education
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(ii))		
11.	Dr. Naveen Aggarwal (Associate Professor in Computer Science and Engineering) (w.e.f. 28.10.2018)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(iv))		
12.	Dr. Ajay Mittal (Associate Professor in Computer Science and Engineering) (w.e.f. 23.11.2018)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(v))		
13.	Dr. Satish Kumar (w.e.f. 12.07.2016)	Computer Science & Applications, P.U., S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(vi))		
14.	Dr. Sunita Srivastava (w.e.f. 06.11.2018)	Physics
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(x))		
15.	Dr. Navneet Agnihotri (w.e.f. 27.11.2018)	Biochemistry
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xiii))		
16.	Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura (w.e.f. 08.04.2019)	Biochemistry
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xiv))		
17.	Dr. Gurjaspreet Singh (w.e.f. 07.11.2018)	Chemistry
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xvi))		
18.	Dr. Sonal Singhal (w.e.f. 28.10.2018)	Chemistry
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xvii))		
19.	Dr. Navneet Kaur (w.e.f. 29.10.2018)	Chemistry
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xviii))		
20.	Dr. Ganga Ram Chaudhary (w.e.f. 28.10.2018)	Chemistry
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xix))		
21.	Dr. Vikas (w.e.f. 02.06.2019)	Chemistry
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xx))		

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 - *3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 4. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 - **5. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the third amendment of UGC Regulation 2010.
 6. The letters of promotion have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

- C.** That Dr. Neeraj Kumar Singh be promoted from Assistant Librarian (Senior Scale) (Stage-2) to Deputy Librarian (Stage-3) at A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010) w.e.f. 16.3.2018, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 4. The letters of promotion have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxix))

- D.** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Dr. Ajay Ranga (Assistant Professor of Law) (w.e.f. 24.07.2016)	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(x))		

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Sr. No.	Name	Department
2.	Dr. Karan Jawanda (Assistant Professor of Law) (w.e.f. 01.08.2018)	University Institute of Legal Studies
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xi))		
*3.	Dr. Aditi Sharma (Assistant Professor in Law) (w.e.f. 29.07.2014)	Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana
*4.	Dr. Shiv K. Dogra (Assistant Professor in Law) (w.e.f. 27.07.2015)	
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xii))		
5.	Dr. Ashish Saihjpai (w.e.f.17.07.2016)	University Business School, P.U.R.C. Ludhiana
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xx))		
6.	Shri Shashi Kapoor (w.e.f. 01.05.2018)	University Business School P.U. R.C. Ludhiana
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxii))		
7.	Dr. Aarti Khurana (w.e.f. 28.08.2016)	Mathematics
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxvi))		
8.	Mr. Deepak Kumar (Assistant Professor in Electrical and Electronic Engineering) (w.e.f. 31.01.2017)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxxv))		
*9.	Dr. Damanjeet Kaur (Assistant Professor in Electrical and Electronic Engineering) (w.e.f. 30.08.2015)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxxvi))		
10.	Dr. Preeti (Assistant Professor in Electronic and Communication Engineering) (w.e.f. 20.04.2018)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
11.	Dr. Charu (Assistant Professor in Electronic and Communication Engineering) (w.e.f. 07.10.2018)	
12.	Ms. Nidhi (Assistant Professor in Electronic and Communication Engineering) (w.e.f. 17.10.2018)	
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxxvii))		
*13.	Dr. Naresh Kumar (w.e.f. 22.02.2015)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxxviii))		

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Sr. No.	Name	Department
14.	Dr. Jaskaran Singh Waraich (w.e.f. 04.01.2018)	Defence and National Security Studies
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxxix))		
15.	Dr. Shashi Chaudhary (w.e.f. 20.09.2017)	Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies and Research
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xl))		
*16.	Dr. Anand Narain Singh (w.e.f. 23.12.2014)	Botany
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xli))		
17.	Mr. Amandeep Singh Wadhwa (Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engineering) (w.e.f. 04.09.2018)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xliii))		
18.	Shri Jaswinder Singh Mehta (Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engineering) (w.e.f. 04.09.2018)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xliv))		
19.	Dr. Prashant Jindal (Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engineering) (w.e.f. 22.09.2018)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xlv))		
*20.	Shri Rajinder Singh (w.e.f. 02.05.2016)	Computer Science & Applications, P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(vii))		

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 - *3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 4. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 5. The letters of promotion have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

- E.** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs. 7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Dr. Kulwinder Singh (w.e.f. 10.06.2018)	University Business School
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xvii))		
2.	Dr. Arun Singh Thakur (w.e.f. 28.05.2018)	} University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management
3.	Dr. Jaswinder Kumar (w.e.f. 03.06.2018)	
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxxi))		
4.	Dr. Nirmal Kaur (Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Engineering) (w.e.f. 24.08.2016)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxxiii))		
5.	Ms. Rohini Sharma (w.e.f. 15.09.2016)	Computer Science & Applications
(Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 Para 2(xxxiv))		
6.	Dr. Pooja Rani (w.e.f. 18.07.2018)	University Business School
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(iii))		
7.	Dr. Sabhyata Uppal Soni (Assistant Professor in Electrical & Electronics Engineering) (w.e.f. 31.12.2018)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xii))		
8.	Dr. Savita Chaudhary (w.e.f. 27.08.2018)	Chemistry
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xxi))		
9.	Dr. Gurpreet Kaur (w.e.f. 27.08.2018)	Chemistry
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xxii))		
10.	Dr.(Mrs.) Rachna Singh (w.e.f. 20.05.2018)	Microbial Biotechnology
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xxiii))		
11.	Dr. Ashish Kumar (w.e.f. 01.01.2019)	History
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xxv))		

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Sr. No.	Name	Department
12.	Dr. Anil Kumar (Assistant Professor in Public Administration) (w.e.f. 19.05.2018)	University School of Open Learning
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xxvi))		
13.	Dr. Bharti Garg (w.e.f. 20.05.2018)	Public Administration
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xxvii))		
14.	Dr. Bhawna Gupta (w.e.f. 20.05.2018)	Public Administration
(Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 Para 2(xxviii))		

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
 4. The letters of promotion have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Parveen Goyal said that Item 1 is for consideration, and he should be told as to what is the difference between items for consideration, ratification and information. Item 1 is approved and he would like to congratulate all 74 faculty members, who have been Professor from Associate Professor, Associate Professor from Assistant Professor and promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage 1) to Assistant Professor (Stage 2) and so on and so forth. However, the two pages provided to them, he is only be able to find as to how many marks/points, they have secured. It is only an information and it is not for consideration. As per dictionary, the meaning of consideration is 'to think about the same carefully'. Since the full information is not provided, how could they think about it carefully? However, earlier everything, i.e., annexure, API score, etc., relating to the item was provided to them. If information is only to be given, then the item should be included in the Items for information, and not in the Items for consideration. From these two pages, he (Vice Chancellor) should tell him as to who had obtained how many marks and on what basis. He has come to know that one of the candidates has secured only a single mark and another candidate has only obtained minimum marks. Secondly, according to him, ratification meant process of making agreement official. This is the only difference. If they wanted to provide them API score sheet and annexures relating to this, though he wanted to say that the utilization of paper should be reduced, and perhaps, he (Vice Chancellor) would say that the use of paper has been reduced. They should reduce the use of paper, but the softcopy, which is available with them, should be provided to them either through e-mail or by mailing the link. Day before, the office of the Vice Chancellor has also sent him a mail and when he saw, the entire agenda was already there in the agenda. He urged the Vice Chancellor to take action on this and reply given to him.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that these appointments have been made. In such items, they always say and that it has also been certified that the selections have been made in compliance to 2nd Amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010 and the bio-data of all the candidates have been attached. He did not know where the bio data of the candidate is attached. Is it in the minutes of Selection Committee or Syndicate or elsewhere? It is requested that bio data of the candidates be made available to the members of house also.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh, referring to the statement made by Dr. Parveen Kumar, said that, in fact, they should upload the complete bio-data of the persons appointed by the University on the University website. If it is done, there would not be any need to send the link even to anybody. Moreover, if anybody wanted to have any information about the persons selected or promoted by the University, the same could be had by him/her from the University website.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-1 (A, B, C, D and E) on the agenda**, be approved.

IV. Considered **(Item C-2 on the agenda)** that the following person/s working in the Group-I of the Laboratory and Technical Staff (Pay-15600-39100+ GP Rs.5400/-), be confirmed on their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of joining in Group-I	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Mr. Prem Singh Scientific Officer (G-I) Department of Physics	29.04.2015 (A.N.)	30.4.2016
2.	Mr. Shakti Chand Dhanda Scientific Officer (G-I) Department of Physics	29.04.2015 (A.N.)	01.5.2016
3.	Mr. Balbir Singh Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Central Instrumentation Laboratory	01.01.2016	01.01.2017
4.	Mrs. Anu Arora Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) A.C. Joshi Library	28.01.2016	28.01.2017
5.	Mr. Swapan Middy Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Department of Computer Science & Applications	28.01. 2016	29.01.2017
6.	Mr. Ramesh Kumar Scientific Officer (G-I) Department of Microbiology	02.02.2016	02.02.2017
7.	Mrs. Manminder Kaur Technical Assistant (G-I) Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering	16.02.2017	16.02.2018
8.	Mr. Rup Lal Bhardwaj Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Department of Physics	23.05.2017 (A.N.)	24.05.2018
9.	Mr. Dinesh Kumar Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Department of Physics	23.05.2017	25.05.2018

Sr. No.	Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of joining in Group-I	Proposed date of confirmation
10.	Mr. Varinder Kumar Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology	19.09.2017	19.09.2018

(Syndicate dated 30.7.2019 Para 7)

Ms. Anu Chatrath remarked that since this item is also similar to Item 1, it should have come only for information.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item 2 on the agenda**, be approved.

V.

The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-3**, on the agenda were read out, viz. and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-3. That –

1. Dr. Sanjay Chaturvedi, Professor, Department of Political Science, be granted voluntary/pre-mature retirement w.e.f. 26.11.2018, under Regulation 17.5 & 17.8 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and the following retirement benefits as admissible, be also sanctioned to him:
 - (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, and
 - (ii) In terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 08.10.2013, the payment of leave encashment will be made only for the number of days Earned leave as due to him but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned leave of 300 days by the government of India.
2. Resignation of Dr. Santanu Basu, Associate Professor in Food Technology at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, be accepted w.e.f. 5.10.2019 as he has given three month notice from 5.7.2019 to 4.10.2019, under Regulation 6 at page 118, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 30.7.2019 Para 9)

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

VI. Item C-4 on the agenda was withdrawn, viz. –

4. To consider the direction of the Syndicate dated 30.07.2019 **(Item C-4 on the agenda)** to the Vice-Chancellor to hold the process of the Selection of Assistant Professors (26 posts) in Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to why Item 4 has been withdrawn.

The Vice Chancellor said that no discussion would be held on the withdrawn item. Whatever information they had, they are going accordingly.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that there must some reason for its withdrawal.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that, last time, when an Item was withdrawn and when he had stood up to say something, it was told that no discussion on the Item, which has been withdrawn, could be held.

The Vice Chancellor said that when the Item would come again, they could discuss the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are not saying that they wanted to discuss the Item, but he (Vice Chancellor) has withdrawn the Item. He wanted to know as to why it has been withdrawn.

The Vice Chancellor said that if he (Shri Ashok Goyal) liked to know the reason, he should give in writing to him (Vice Chancellor), he would provide the same to him. However, now there is no place for any discussion.

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

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they have objection to the conduct of the meeting. Here everybody started speaking at his/her own will. For what, he (Vice Chancellor) is in the Chair? Only the member, who is permitted by the Vice Chancellor, should speak.

VII. Considered that the contractual term of appointment of Ms. Navdeep Sharma, Programme Coordinator, NSS, **(Item C-5 on the agenda)**, be extended for one year w.e.f. 01.07.2019 to 30.06.2020 on the same terms and conditions as mentioned in the appointment letter dated 16.06.2016.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2019 Para 17)

A couple of members said that the Item is approved.

Shri V.K. Sibal stated that the contractual term of appointment of Ms. Navdeep Sharma, Programme Coordinator, NSS, was for a particular period and her term could be extended for one year. After that one year expired, her contractual appointment is finished. Now, they have to give her a new appointment, but they could not extend it further. He reiterated that her term was extendable only for one year, which is over, and once it is over, she is not entitled for second extension. They could give her a new contract. To extend the old contract, is not within anybody's power. This is what, he is trying to say. He suggested that the case should be got legally examined as he has serious doubt.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it is for *post facto* approval as the Syndicate has already approved it. Now, the minutes of the Syndicate are for approval by the Senate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the point made by Shri V.K. Sibal is valid. Therefore, the case of Ms. Navdeep Sharma for extension should be got legally examined.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that they could not use the word 'extension', and instead they should use the word 'contract'.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would see to it. When Ms. Anu Chatrath said as to what Item he (Shri Sibal) has said, the Vice Chancellor said that if they wanted to record something, they should do so. Shri V.K. Sibal has got his viewpoints recorded. Now, he is going to seek legal opinion on the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No, the House says that this item is approved".

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) should just give his opinion and should not waste time in, "No, No".

Shri Ashok Goyal again said that the House says that this Item is approved.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would see to it.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that when the House is saying that the Item is approved, why he is getting it legally examined.

Ms. Anu Chatrath remarked that the House is run by the majority, and if the House says that the Item is approved, no legal opinion is required to be obtained. Let his (Shri Sibal) opinion be recorded only.

The Vice Chancellor said that what the Hon'ble member is telling, just listen.

Ms. Anu Chatrath intervened to say that only one member is telling. Let they should obtain the opinion of other members also.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is requesting the other members also to record their opinion.

At this stage, several members, including Shri Prabhjit Singh, Shri Naresh Gaur, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, Dr. Dalip Kumar, Shri Jagdeep Kumar, said that the item is approved.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they talk like this, nothing would go on record.

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

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to be calm and sit down and the House would not function like this. He said that if any opinion is coming.

The Vice Chancellor was not allowed to complete his statement as several members started speaking loudly.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that, as said by Shri V.K. Sibal, extension could only be for a particular period, and extension for only one year could be granted. For extension of further one year, they are obtaining legal opinion, what is harm in it. If it is found to be illegal, why extension is to be given?

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it should be examined, whether the House could extend the contractual appointment of Ms. Navdeep Sharma.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that since the Syndicate has unanimously recommended, it should be accepted.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that if the suggestion for legal opinion is coming, the legal opinion is more important than the majority even.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that since this Item has been brought by him (Vice Chancellor), he must have got it legally examined before bringing the Item to the Syndicate. Now, the House says that his (Vice Chancellor) recommendation should be accepted. In fact, it is his (Vice Chancellor) recommendation and not of theirs.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that since the Item has been brought by him (Vice Chancellor), it is approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he simply wanted to make a suggestion that as a proposal or as suggested by one of the Hon'ble members, Shri V.K. Sibal, that it be legally examined and the Chair gave the ruling that they would get it legally examined. He said that let everybody be given an opportunity to speak on the Item.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is what, he is doing.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he (Vice Chancellor) is not doing this as he has already given the ruling. He said that if after giving opportunity to speak to all those, who wanted to speak, consensus is arrived to get it legal examined, then he would get it legally examined. Simply on the suggestion of one member, it should not be got legally examined. At the moment, he did not want to speak on this Item because the members are saying that the Item is approved. However, if the members, who are saying that it is not approved and they are suggesting for getting it legally examined or say that everything has not been done correctly or by following due procedure, then he would speak; otherwise, the Item is approved from his side.

Dr. (Mrs.) Amita Rishi requested that since they all are academicians, they should maintain decorum in the house, so that they could be able to listen as to what their opinion is. If there was no decorum, nobody could get the essence of points being made by them.

The majority of the members appreciated the opinion expressed by Dr. Amita Rishi and remarked that she had said "Very Well".

Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan said that the NSS Department of University is only in books. Nothing is being done by the NSS department for colleges. Why are they giving the extension to the Programme Coordinator, NSS? Four months' ago, his college had written a letter to allow them to organise a camp, but not even a reply has been received. When grant is not coming to the colleges, what is the need to have NSS Department? Unless and until a reply is given to them as to for what purpose the NSS Department has been kept, item would not be approved.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Ms. Kirron Kher said that, in fact, she would like to speak on Item 7. So far as Item 5 is concerned, she did not believe that contractual term of appointment should be extended just like this. She believed that another should be given an opportunity unless and until this is an outstanding person. She has observed that most of the things are done here in nepotism and people allege that she (Ms. Kher) did not attend the meetings, and that was why, she did not come because it is becoming more and more political, which is very embarrassing. This is not the University, from which they all have passed. They expect the Syndicate and Senate to be far more respectful to the Chair and far more decent to each other. As such, her view point is that she did not believe that extension should be given as there are several capable persons. As said by one of the Hon'ble members, even if the extension is to be given, the same should be given after obtaining the legal opinion.

On a point of order, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that, first of all, he would like to reply to the query made by Member of Parliament, Ms. Kirron Kher, regarding appointment. As per Supreme Court guidelines, no contractual could be replaced by another contractual. Secondly, if any, as other member(s) has/have suggested, is there problem in the functioning of the Department or the Office? Is there any complaint against her on record? Or it is just a here say? Hence, they should evaluate in that light also. He further said that he would like to welcome all those members, who have been nominated/ appointed by the Hon'ble Chancellor. At the same time, he has very strong reservation and it is for the first time in the history of Panjab University, as per his knowledge, that the members of the House have been sent out unceremoniously, undemocratically and unconstitutionally.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not here to discuss the decision of the Hon'ble Chancellor. He said that this would not be made a part of the record.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa continued on speaking and said that sometimes one has to raise his voice. When things happened undemocratically, unconstitutionally and unjustified way, one should speak out and he wanted to speak on that. Whether they record or not?

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that if wanted to speak and did not want to obey the House.

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

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to sit down and when the members did not paid any heed to his request, he said that nothing would be recorded.

When Shri Jagdeep Kumar and Principal I.S. Sandhu raised the matter relating to issuance of circular regarding declaring holiday for 23rd of August 2019 on the occasion of Sri Krishana Janamashthmi, the Vice Chancellor said that it is not a Zero Hour.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that instead of twisting the matter, the Hon'ble members should focus on the agenda. If they are discussing Item 5, they should talk on that only, and the other things would come later with the passage of time. In the terms and conditions, they have mentioned that the term of appointment is for three years, let those terms and conditions be examined. If the term of appointment is for three years and the same is extendable only for one year, the same should be got examined. If everything is found to be in order, the term of appointment of the

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

incumbent should be extended, for which the Vice Chancellor could be authorized. Secondly, so far the issue of affiliated Colleges is concerned, Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan was rightly telling that if grants are not coming to the Colleges, what is the need of this post because they (Colleges) are also bearing the expenses of this post (Programme Coordinator, NSS). Earlier, the additional charge of this post used to be given to one of the Professors of the University. The University might be paying some honorarium to the person concerned. Only the post of Programme Coordinator, NSS, is not there as several other such posts are there, the charge of which is being given to the Professors of the University. In fact, this appointment had been made before the joining of the present Vice Chancellor. On the one side, they are talking about financial crunch again and again and the filling up of about 26 posts of Assistant Professor is in lurch/limbo, and on the other side, they are talking about on this posts. They are not coming forward for filling up of other posts even though the Departments are empty. PUTA is also requesting again and again the vacant posts should be filled up at the earliest. Since they are not receiving grants in the Colleges, they are paying from their own sources. The College representatives might agree on this issue. The Vice-Chancellor could also confirm this. Even a single penny has not received by the Colleges till date. He (Vice-Chancellor) has to think on this. If she has legal right to get extension, extension should be given to her.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that, as per agenda papers (page 349 to 352), during the tenure of Programme Coordinator, NSS, the University had won many achievements, which could not be ignored. Many awards have also been won by the University such as Indira Gandhi Award and President Award, MAKTA Trophy, etc. On the issue of grants, he had difference of opinion with Principal R.S. Jhanji.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that on the basis of achievements won by the University only, they have decided to recommend that extension be granted to Programme Coordinator, NSS.

Shri Sanjay Tandon stated that he also wanted to debate on this issue. This issue was not so big. One could not make one minutes' decision in one hour. They were not objecting but agree with decision of Shri V.K. Sibal with regard to the extension in the term of Dean of Student Welfare. He suggested that a legal opinion should be obtained to examine this issue. He stressed that this item was twisted by the other members that they are opposing not to grant the extension. This was not a prestige issue on which the other members are debating. He said that this issue can be resolved within half minute but they had been arguing for the half hour. They further told that other members of the house did not want to close this issue. If someone stands up to speak on this issue, they mingled the agenda items with each other. He further said that everyone's time in this house is very important and has cut down the schedule. In this way the agenda items could not be completed. Some members wanted to let down the Chair only because of one or two agenda items by speaking loudly. They said that if such things happen, how the University will work. Moreover, this was very simple point which the Vice-Chancellor has given its ruling on this point; the matter should not be discussed any more. He further said if the entire Senate will give their opinion through voting to examine the case legally only then you will examine. He told the Vice-Chancellor, that he is the CEO of the University and has the full power. They further quoted the example that if someone stops your salary, cheques, stops or interfere in your work, is it right? In this way, University cannot work smoothly. He requested the Vice-Chancellor that the Syndicate and Senate cannot work such a manner and he objected that above said statement should be recorded. The Chair in its wisdom should give the ruling and matter with regard to the extension in the term of appointment of Programme Coordinator, NSS.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Shri V.K. Sibal said that no further extension should be granted to the Programme Coordinator, NSS. If the Programme Coordinator, NSS, has been appointed for three years, only one year extension should be given. He further kept his viewpoint that if the University wanted to give extension to the Programme Coordinator, NSS, then he has no objection.

Professor R.P Bambah said that Programme Coordinator, NSS should be appointed on contract basis.

Ms. Anu Chatrath told that she was agreed with the views of Shri V.K. Sibal and Professor R.P. Bambah on the issue of extension. They shared that 4-5 members in the house are law graduate and they very well knew the violation of law against the Supreme Court and the High Court. She further admitted that no authority is supposed to violate the law laid down by the Apex Court whether holding the post of Chief Executive or Programme Coordinator, NSS. Ms. Anu Chatrath further quoted that law laid down by the Apex Court says that if a person appointed after following the proper procedure against the sanctioned post, cannot be replaced by another candidate. Moreover, the University authorities are facing a lot of litigation in the High Court and Supreme Court on which the stay orders have already been granted that if a person appointed after following the proper procedure and secondly as per the representation submitted by the Programme Coordinator, NSS that during her tenure the University has been awarded a President Award and the Indira Gandhi award. Considering her representation and contribution, the 15 members from the Syndicate being an Executive Body has unanimously decided for grant of one year's extension in her service. She further stressed on the point raised by Professor R.P. Bambah that instead of extension, the new contractual appointment be made. In this regard, Prof. R.P. Bambah told that by doing this practice, the University will violate the law by replacing a person with another contractual appointment against the regular sanctioned post. She further told that the Programme Coordinator, NSS has contributed three years' unblemished services and has done something the University should not be retrench her in this way. She endorsed Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa that legal opinion should be obtained on this issue. On this point, she told since the University is already facing financial constrained and crunch problems and on other hand by hiring some senior Advocates by paying them huge amount of Rs.10,000/- and Rs.20,000/-, respectively, there will also be financial loss. She further told that she herself in an Advocate, Shri V.K. Sibal and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa is also an advocate, why university want to pay the fees to the other advocate/s why we want to oblige some outside advocates. She again said that Programme Coordinator, NSS has given unblemished services to the University and has three years' experience and long standing relations between the students of colleges and University that in her opinion, the decision of the Syndicate should be approved in Toto.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh said that he is not a member of the Syndicate but being a Senator he had gone through the Agenda papers. Some of the members do not go through the agenda papers, that is why, they talk without agenda, which is very painful for him. The Chair has circulated the agenda and he believed that this agenda item is in order. While reading the agenda from the screen, he cannot judge whether the Programme Coordinator, NSS is a male or a female. The Programme Coordinator, NSS was appointed in year 2016. As per agenda, because of her sincere efforts, the grant from Punjab Govt. which had been pending since 2009 has been released to Panjab University in 2018 About 140 colleges having NSS units have been benefitted by this grant. Perhaps, in my view some of the colleges could not get this benefit. They are thankful to the Hon'ble Prime Minister for the introduction of Swacch Bharat Abhiyan

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

and because of her convenership, the Panjab University got 7th rank. He further stressed that the whole credit goes to the Programme Coordinator, NSS, it is very shameful for the University before this they have never listen anything about Swacch Bharat. All the achievements had already been mentioned in the agenda. He said that achievements such as Indira Gandhi Award, President Award, release of pending grant for 140 colleges and 7th rank in Swacch Bharat Abhiyan, have been won by the University only because of Programme Coordinator, NSS. Further, he questioned the Chair, since you have come up with agenda item and they believe in you. He failed to understand whether the Chair want to seek legal opinion or not? Is it binding on them? He told that if the University wants to seek the legal opinion and it is up to them whether they will accept it or not. He would like to bring to their notice that more than 50 legal opinions had been rejected. He also endorsed the viewpoint of Ms. Anu Charath that no contractual appointment can be replaced with the regular one. He said that he have no objection if you pass the agenda item or give any ruling with regard to the contractual appointment. The appointments of lecturers in the departments of Panjab University are like a Pandora Box. As per Panjab University Calendar, there is a provision of contractual appointment for one year but their term is extended even up to 7 years. If the University extends her tenure, all the cases will have the reference of this item and the University can be closed. He said that it is his duty to tell you that this is not fair; you are the Chair and authority to decide about it. If you stop it, you will have to face a lot of problems. As per rule, there is a provision of one year extension; you have the power to extend it for another year. The Vice-Chancellor can extend it 2, 4, 5 and for 7 years too. He has given his consent on this item and the item may be passed. He thanked the Chair.

Dr. Subhash Sharma stated that he does not want to say anymore on this item, when the discussion has been started, he would like to draw kind attention of the house about the discussion held two years back. As per agenda item he would like to draw the attention of members about the discussion of the Syndicate held on 1.5.2016 Paragraph 2(i) and the decision taken thereon at that time. Today, Sh. Raghbir Dayal is not among us, but at that time he objected that as far as the candidate has already got her Ph.D. Degree from CMJ University in the year 2013. He questioned as to whether his information was true or not. After that Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be ensured that the information is complete. It means at that time the degree was complete but the information was not given. She Ashok Goyal said that why the candidate has not claimed on the basis of what was in her possession. He further requested that he would not take much time but will read the relevant portion of the agenda. Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Mrs. Navdeep Sharma might not be mentioning her Ph.D. degree because of the controversy of CMJ University. He said that what Shri Bansal was saying that she has not mentioned her Ph.D. but she has asked for the benefit for the degree of CMJ University from her college subsequently filling up of this form which will have bearing, because she will be granted increments, if she is entitled. If she is not entitled, she will not be granted increments. Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there was no difficulty in checking the facts and the discussion was going on.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened and said 'No'. If she produces the revised certificate, salary shall have to be given, and if not, this salary will stand. On this point Shri Raghbir Dayal had said that his previous statement about her Ph.D. was not complete. The discussion was going on. Now, he was coming on the point which was resolved that however, the appointment letter be issued to her after getting the documents cross-checked and obtaining legal opinion from at least two Legal Retainers.

Continuing, Dr. Subhash Sharma stated that first of all he would like to inform that no legal opinion has been appended with this letter and he did not know whether it

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

was obtained or not. Secondly, all the facts should be checked. When the discussion was going on, he would like to endorse the statement of Shri B.C. Josan that the degree obtained from the CMJ University is valid. Further, he stated that Sh. Ashok Goyal said that he will give them all the documents, including the judgement of the Supreme Court, including orders of the Government of Meghalaya and also including the judgement of the High Court to which they were referring, he stated that they get it examined. Now probably this is the only reason that the degree has been invalidated, this statement of Shri Ashok Goyal had already been recorded. On this discussion, his first point was that the above facts should be got verified, if verified, Is the degree is valid? If so where were these documents?. Secondly, had legal opinion been obtained? If obtained, no document had been attached with this item. In spite of that, is there no value of resolving this item in the Syndicate in its meeting held on 1.5.2016 on which the discussion had already been made during the Syndicate? He further said that where is report whether the Ph.D. degree of CMJ University is valid or not. In this regard, a team was sent to Meghalaya, where is the report of that team with regard to the authenticity of the degree whether valid or not. He requested that the report of that team should be attached with the agenda papers. After it, legal opinion be obtained in this regard whether the degree issued by the CMJ University is valid or not. Law is supreme, no Syndicate, Senate or even the Chair is not above the law. After getting these documents, the case will be processed thereafter.

Ms. Kirron Kher requested the Vice Chancellor to grant her permission to speak first as she has to leave. She knew that people might have objection to this, but she would request all the Hon'ble members to grant her permission to share her viewpoints on Agenda Item 7.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has the right to interrupt Dr. Subhash Sharma as he has taken his name. To maintain decency, he did not do that. Now, when he wanted to speak, when Dr. Subhash Sharma has finished his statement, he (Vice Chancellor) is allowing somebody else.

A din prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Ms. Kirron Kher said that they have proposed extension in the term of appointment Professor Emanuel Nahar, Dean of Student Welfare, for the fourth time. Is none else in this University? They are proposing extension to Professor Emanuel Nahar, Dean of Student Welfare, to which she strongly opposed. He (Vice Chancellor) had opposed it in Syndicate and she is seconding the same here.

A din prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that he opposed the way the agenda is being discussed. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to announce as to what has been resolve about this item.

The Vice-Chancellor told the house as Ms. Kirron Kher has to leave the house after making her statement, if any other members want to do so, he/she would also be permitted to speak on priority.

At this stage, a din prevailed as some members started speaking together.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

The Vice-Chancellor requested to calm down. He also requested the members to sit down; otherwise, in this way, the rest of agenda item could not be discussed.

Professor Ronki Ram requested the Vice-Chancellor to allow him to speak on this issue. He told that in his opinion, they were facing the difficulty on this issue. He also endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Sanjay Tandon that they were talking on this issue, but most of the time, there had been some misunderstanding and then the legal opinion had to be obtained. It is true that Shri V.K. Sibal has suggested that legal opinion should be obtained but before seeking the legal opinion, it would be better, if the issue is discussed in detail. Secondly, when Ms. Kirron Kher wanted to leave the house and she wished that before leaving, she should be allowed to express her viewpoints. As she is a senior person as also a Member of Parliament, she could be allowed to express her opinion. Now, since she had expressed her opinion and had gone. Since it is not a part of the agenda, the issue would be discussed as and when it could come. Now they should speak on Item 5 and he thought no one should have any objection to it. He further said we all are one and understand each other, they should not enter into any debate unnecessarily. Sometime, people say as to why that particular item had not come earlier, but he (Vice-Chancellor) should resolve it in an amicable manner. Since, she is a Member of Parliament, he (Vice Chancellor) had to listen to her. But when that particular item will be discussed, her viewpoint will be taken into

The Vice-Chancellor remarked that Professor Ronki Ram's viewpoints were absolutely right.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to draw the attention of Dr. Subhash Sharma through the Vice Chancellor that, as per agenda Dr. Subhash Sharma, as he has been able to read what he was referring to, are not the minutes of the Senate of 2016. In fact, these are the minutes of Syndicate. Why because whatever he said on that day in the meeting, he stood by that even today. Why he is being reminding again and again that Shri Ashok Goyal said this and that.

At this stage, a din prevailed as several members, including Shri Varinder Singh, Shri Naresh Gaur and Professor Ronki Ram started speaking loudly together.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to sit down, so that they could proceed further. He requested Shri Ashok Goyal not to get angry and instead start with his statement.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever resolved part is, the same has already been read by Dr. Subhash Sharma, and he did not want to repeat that. He requested the Vice Chancellor to have some patience to listen to him and let him complete.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Don't lesson him and teach him and go with his statement straightaway whatever he wanted to put on record before the house". Don't advise him to listen to him (Shri Ashok Goyal) carefully. He should not insult him (Vice Chancellor).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that only he (Vice Chancellor) is insulting them.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is again wasting the time. Let them underline it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever decision was taken to make appointments on three years contract, which was as per the terms and conditions, was extendable for

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

another year. And the members had read the terms and conditions of the contract, which itself say that it is extendable for another year as they did in the cases of so many shopkeepers in the University in which they extend the lease of five years for another five years. It is not that this contract could be as per the wishes and requirement of the University. The contract for another year could be extended only if both the parties agreed. He gave an application and the Syndicate, keeping in view whatever information was brought by the Vice Chancellor to the Syndicate, recommended the extension. So to say that contract was over, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) says the term of appointment of Ms. Navdeep Sharma, Programme Coordinator, NSS, is extended and should be extended. So far as the original appointment is concerned, it was to be got examined legally from at least two Legal Retainers. That was the decision of the Syndicate, and he was sure that Dr. Subhash Sharma, who was there in the Syndicate in 2017, must have ensured that what was directed by the Syndicate to be done in 2016, has been done and only after verifying everything, the then Vice Chancellor, on behalf of the Syndicate, issued the appointment letter. Now once after three years an issue for extension come, which was brought by the Vice Chancellor, and all the members of the Syndicate unanimously recommend to the Senate that this should be extended. He simply wants to ask where is the question of getting it legally examined now when the clause of the contract itself say. The Syndicate had considered the Item and had the Item been before them, there would not have been any confusion. They have written in the Item that the contract is extendable for one more year. When somebody said, "Same terms and conditions", Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to where it has been written. Since they have not written here, that was why, confusion is there. In the Item, which was brought to the Syndicate by him (Vice Chancellor), it was written that as per the terms of the contract of three years extendable for another year. So they have done that only. Now to say, whether it was examined or not in 2016. If the appointment letter has been issued without following the dictates of the Syndicate, of course, that could also be reopened and he is not against that. The opinion, which he gave at that time about the degree is invalid, he stood by that even today. So please don't remind him. He has not changed his stand so far as technicalities are involved. Hence, he requested that this Item should be passed and there is no need for obtaining any legal opinion.

Dr. Subhash Sharma stated that, in fact, he was not reminding anything to Shri Ashok Goyal, and instead he was bringing the facts to the notice of the House. His question still remained that the legal opinion, which was to be obtained from the two Legal Retainers at that time, why the same had not been brought to the notice of the House.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to bring to their notice that the legal opinion had been obtained.

To this, Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the said legal opinion should be shown.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was the case of the year 2016.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the legal opinion should have been appended with the Item, especially when the minutes of the Syndicate of the year 2016 have been appended. The things/issues, which had been mentioned in the resolved part about the validation of the degree, obtaining of legal opinion, why the same have not been appended with the Item? He suggested that the Item should again be placed before the Senate after attaching those things, and until then the Item should be withdrawn.

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

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should be told as to whether the degrees of CMJ University are valid. They should also be told as what the decision of the University in this regard or the Item should be withdrawn and the Item should be brought again along with validation of the degree and legal opinion. They would not approve the Item on the basis of illegal things.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that there is an urgent issue, which needed immediate attention of the House. Today, a letter has been issued by the Assistant Registrar (General).

The Vice Chancellor said that, at the moment, he would not allow any discussion on this issue. He would not allow deviation from the agenda. He (Shri Jagdeep Kumar) should raise this issue during zero hour.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that whatever discussion has taken place on this Item, they have come to the conclusion that the discussion was important and meaningful apart from heightening of tensions and emotions. The facts, which have been told by Dr. Subhash Sharma and Shri Ashok Goyal, had taken place on the Item. All those things have been recorded properly and decided. He (Vice Chancellor) had brought the Item in a proper way, but due to certain technicalities in the writings, those issues in the recent Syndicate could have been broken into pieces. The information could have been brought together in the light of that context, but that was not there. The issue was that the contract was for a period of three years, and the contract was to be extended for one year more. In fact, this was the spirit. Secondly, why it happened because he (Vice Chancellor) made him (Professor Ronki Ram) Chairman of a Committee to look into the matter, which came through UGC and the UGC says that the NSS should be made a permanent part of the syllabus at the graduation level. So the Item came that should they make NSS a part of the syllabus in the Colleges also? They did it. Since they did not have a proper NSS Department in the University and they only have a Centre and Professor Pam Rajput was also there, an Item in this regard was brought in the year 2015. At that time, the Dean, Faculty of Arts, was Professor B.S. Ghuman, who at the moment is the Vice Chancellor of Punjabi University, Patiala and Professor Pam Rajput had said that they could not make it a part of the syllabus because this is not a part of the bachelor degree programme, and instead it is an extra-curriculum part of the syllabus. He told her no, the UGC has given them direction. So keeping that in mind, they needed the person to continue on this post. Keeping this in mind, he (Vice Chancellor) brought the Item to the Syndicate that one year extension in the contract should be given. At this stage, they involved Shri Rana ji from Chandigarh Administration and he (Vice Chancellor) appointed a 20-member Committee. Keeping that in mind, they thought that let the contract be extended for one year more, and thereafter, he (Vice Chancellor) could think for making a permanent appointment. So this is the only condition. He thought that had the Item been properly drafted, such questions would not have arisen. Shri V.K. Sibal is one of the legal luminaries and he simply said that the contract could not be extended, but here is an Item where the three years' contract is extended for one year more. If the legal opinion was to be obtained, it had already been taken. Had those papers relating legal opinion should have been appended with the Item, there could not have been any problem? Such a debate has taken place only because of the confusion, which could not have been there and the same could have been avoided. Therefore, keeping in view the time and value of the Syndicate/Senate, such types of confusion should be avoided. He thought that at this moment, in order to clinch it and not to waste the time of another Senate, the Item should be passed and the same would also same the time. Dr. Subhash Sharma would also take note of it; otherwise, the Item would again come

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

and they would again spend time and they would not reach anywhere. If he (Vice Chancellor) wanted this post (Programmer Coordinator, NSS), as per UGC, should be made permanent and he is welcomed to do this. Make it a regular appointment, and by that time, let this person to continue.

Dr. (Mrs.) Amita Rishi said that though she is new to this House, the discussion held so far it says if there is any question of legality and validity of the degree, that must be taken care of and; hence, legal opinion on the issue is must, and the same would be in the interest of all of them as they did not want to face any litigation at a later stage.

When Shri Jarnail Singh tried to say something, the Vice Chancellor said that now, it is the turn of Professor R.P. Bambah and he requested Professor Bambah to make his statement.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that, in accordance with the Regulation 18(d) at page 31 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, he proposed that the discussion on the Item be closed.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he seconded the proposal made by Professor R.P. Bambah for closure of the debate.

Shri Sanjay Tandon and few other members said that they all seconded it.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that since they have not been provided full information about the case, they should re-examine the whole case. In the meanwhile, the Item should be withdrawn.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that even though the debate on the Item has been closed, discussion is still being allowed. Could they do that?

The Vice Chancellor said that he is of the opinion that they would take the legal opinion in this case.

To this, several members said, "No, No Sir".

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to listen. In fact, they are not allowing him to complete. He said that he is of the opinion that these are the things which are lying about this post.

The Chair ruled that legal opinion on the issue whether the contractual term of appointment of Ms. Navdeep Sharma, Programme Coordinator, NSS, could be extended in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract. However, in the meanwhile, Ms. Navdeep Sharma would continue as such.

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

The Vice-Chancellor said that now the next item No. 6 on the agenda should be taken up for consideration.

To this, certain members said, "No, no".

At this stage, a din again prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Dr. Subhash Sharma heard to say that those, who wanted to record their dissent, could do so.

Ms. Anu Chatrath also heard to say that voting should be held on the issue.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to sit down and let the meeting continue. He requested the members to discuss Item 6.

VIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-6**, on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-6. That Dr. Paramjit Singh, Fellow, Principal, Government College, Hoshiarpur, be assigned to the Faculties (opted by him), as mentioned below:

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

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2019 Para 25)

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that Item 6 is approved.

At this stage, a din again prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that he was listening to the arguments on this point. He had to implicit faith and respect for Professor R.P. Bambah when he proposed that the debate on the item be closed. Perhaps, he did not know what he really meant. What is the decision? Leaving it there, in word or two he would like to say that only two points had come to his notice.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that he had already closed the discussion on Item 5.

To this, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that what has been closed by the Vice-Chancellor.

At this stage, a din again prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Subhash Sharma requested the Vice Chancellor to take up Item 7 for consideration.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he hoped that he (Vice Chancellor) in his own wisdom could really look into his own decisions also or if he (Vice Chancellor) has come with the close mind than it will not.

The Vice Chancellor said, "No, No".

Continuing, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that if he has not come with a closed mind, he would be open.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

At this stage, a din again prevailed as several members started speaking together.

The Vice Chancellor requested the Hon'ble member to sit down. What he (Shri Bansal) is doing is not acceptable as the decision on the Item has already been taken.

At this stage, a din again prevailed as several members started speaking together, and Dr. Subhash Sharma was heard saying that Item 6 is passed.

When Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal did not stop and continued speaking, the Vice Chancellor was heard saying that he is a responsible person and knew better than anybody else.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he knew what he (Vice Chancellor) is and he was joined by several other members. Since several members started speaking together, a pandemonium prevailed.

Dr. Subhash Sharma was heard saying that Item 6 is approved and requested that Item 7 should now be taken up for consideration. As several members were speaking, pandemonium continued to prevail.

When the members did not stop indulging into shouting at each other, the Vice Chancellor said that the meeting is adjourned.

When the meeting resumed after the adjournment, Dr. Amit Joshi said that he would like to welcome Shri Tripat Rajinder Singh Bajwa, Hon'ble Minister for Higher Education and Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu, Hon'ble Minister for Food & Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, who are attending the meeting for the first time, and Hon'ble Shri Som Parkash Kainth ji, Union Minister of State for Commerce and Industry who has been recently elected as a member of Parliament, as also Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education, Punjab.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor said that now, they should take up the Item 6 for consideration.

To this, a couple of members said that Item 5 is still under consideration.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar requested the Vice Chancellor to first tell them the resolved part of Item 5.

The Vice Chancellor said that the decision on Item 5 is that they are taking a legal opinion on it, but in the meantime, he would allow her to continue as such.

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

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stood up and enquired as to what the Regulations/Rules are and what was going on there.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that was what, he is going to tell them. He would allow her (Ms. Navdeep Sharma) to continue.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to draw the attention of the House, including the Vice Chancellor, to Regulation 20(a) and (b),

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

wherein it is written that "When the debate, if any, is concluded, the Chairman shall put the proposal to vote. All questions shall be decided by majority of votes of the members present and voting".

At this stage, a couple of members, including Ms. Anu Chatrath and Shri Varinder Singh, started speaking together and Shri Varinder Singh was heard saying that they have not to elect a person and instead have to select.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to sit down.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that she would like to add one point that she is acting as NSS Programme Officer for the last three years. Now, her term is over. She is not concerned with the legalities, but she would like to make them aware of her experience with Ms. Navdeep Sharma.

The Vice Chancellor said that, now, they are considering Item 6.

Dr. Neeru Malik requested the Vice Chancellor to allow her to continue with her speech. Ms. Navdeep Sharma is really working in a very good manner and she is putting in efforts.

At this stage, pandemonium again prevailed as several members started speaking.

The Vice Chancellor requested the Hon'ble members to let him do the work and run the University. When the members did not acceded to his repeated requests, the Vice Chancellor said that nothing would come on record.

Dr. Subhash Sharma pointed out that 19 Fellows had the right to make a requisition and it is written in the Regulation that the Syndicate shall fix the date for the special meeting of the Senate, but the date has not been fixed so far, though three meetings of the Syndicate had taken place.

At this stage, pandemonium again prevailed as several members started speaking.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, as on today, the Chancellor has nominated 40 members, whereas he has no power to nominate more than 36 members.

To this, Dr. Subhash Sharma said, "only you have all the powers and Chancellor and Vice Chancellor does not have any power and only you people have the powers".

Shri Varinder Singh stood up and said that the Executive Head is the Vice Chancellor.

At this stage, a din again prevailed as couple of members started speaking together.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they should go into the background of this and the issue of DSWs needed to be discussed threadbare. Last year, when Professor Arun Kumar Grover, former Vice Chancellor, had brought an item for giving the DSW an extension for three months in the year 2018, they themselves, including he (Shri Varinder) himself had said that he should be allowed to complete one year. It was done keeping in view the interest of the students.

At this stage, a din again prevailed as couple of members started speaking together.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Shri Varinder Singh reiterated that last year, when Professor Arun Kumar Grover, former Vice Chancellor, had brought an item for giving the DSW an extension for three months in the year 2018, they themselves, including he (Shri Varinder) himself had said that he should be allowed to complete one year. In view of the interest of the students, it is necessary that there must be coordination/cooperation between the Vice Chancellor and the Dean of Student Welfare, whereas they wanted to have fights between the students and the Vice Chancellor and create problems for him.

At this stage, a din again prevailed as couple of members started speaking together.

Shri Varinder Singh said that these very people had sought enquiry against the person, who was Dean of Student Welfare before the existing Dean of Student Welfare, should be got conducted by the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI).

At this stage, a din again prevailed as couple of members started speaking together.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Satya Pal Jain to speak.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that today he was sitting behind quietly and listening to the debate since morning. This issue was very serious.

IX.

Considered **(Item C-7 on the agenda)** that Professor Emanuel Nahar, Dean Student Welfare, Professor Neena Caplash, Dean Student Welfare (Women) and Professor Ranjan Kumar, Associate Dean, Student Welfare, be given extension in their term of appointment for one more year i.e., up to 31.5.2020 or till recommendation of the Syndicate is considered by the Senate. The Vice-Chancellor has expressed his strong reservation on the above said resolution, as he has not recommended the names for the post of Dean Student Welfare, Dean Student Welfare (Women) and Associate Dean Student Welfare.

NOTE: Orders to the above effect have been issued vide No. 3955-4105/Estt. I dated 31.5.2019 (Appendix).

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2019 Para 16)

Shri Varinder Singh stated that the issue of Dean of Student Welfare needed to be thoroughly discussed. If they go into the background of the case of Dean of Student Welfare, the former Vice Chancellor, Professor Arun Kumar Grover, in the year 2018, had recommended three months extension to Professor Emanuel Nahar as Dean of Student Welfare. However, they in the Senate have said that he (Professor Emanuel Nahar) should be allowed to complete one year, and as such, his term as Dean of Student Welfare should be extended for one year. At that time, he (Shri Varinder Singh) had also said that he (Professor Nahar) should be allowed to complete one year as Dean of Student Welfare. Keeping in view the interest of the students, it is absolutely necessary that there should be coordination between the Vice Chancellor and the Dean of Student Welfare. He alleged that the members, who are raising hue and cry, just wanted to create problem, so that there is tussle between the Vice Chancellor and the students. These very persons were demanding that enquiry should be got conducted against the person by the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), who was Dean of Student Welfare, before Professor Emanuel Nahar.

At this stage, a din prevailed as several members stood up and started speaking together.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to sit down and requested Shri Satya Pal Jain to speak.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that he was sitting quietly and listening to the entire debate carefully. The serious thoughts, which should have come on this issue, have come. He would like to put before them two-three points. They both, i.e., Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and he (Shri Satya Pal Jain), are political opponents, but they are opponents outside this House. However, in the House they are equal and have to right to put their viewpoints irrespective of which political party they belonged to. He did not want to go into from which angle he (Shri Bansal) was putting his viewpoints. He (Vice Chancellor) has rightly allowed Mrs. Kirron Kher to make her statement before her turn as she has to go somewhere. Had Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal been allowed to put his viewpoints, it would have also been better and there would not have been any harm as he had the right to put his viewpoints before the House? However, he (Shri Bansal) also knew that two former Members of Parliaments, two Ministers (Shri Som Parkash Kainth, Honorable Union Minister of State for Commerce & Industry and S. Tripat Rajinder Singh Bajwa, Minister for Higher Education, Punjab) and certain MLAs and members of the Syndicate are present here and they had the experience of Parliament and Legislative Assemblies. Sometimes, they wanted to put their viewpoints, but the Chair did not allow them to do so. It is also expected from them that they should respect the ruling of the Chair. It would have been better if they were allowed to put their viewpoints before the House, but the Chair did not permit them. He requested them to gracefully accept the ruling of the Chair. People were willing that Ms. Navdeep Sharma, Programme Coordinator, NSS, should continue and she is continuing. Even if they did not authorize the Vice Chancellor for obtaining the legal opinion, he (Shri Satya Pal Jain), Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, knew that the Vice Chancellor could otherwise also obtain the legal opinion and even in the case of regular employees.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Satya Pal Jain to restrict himself only to the Item under consideration.

Continuing, Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that if they maintain decorum in the House, their respect in the outside/society would be increased. He had witness the debate in the Parliament on the issue of Article 370 and in certain cases in Vidhan Sabha also, but the level there was much high than this House now. They should put their viewpoints before the House, but should not personalize the debate. If they did not express their viewpoints in the Senate, where would they do so? If they expressed their viewpoints by maintaining the decorum, it would be better.

When it was enquired as to what decision has been taken on Item 5, Professor Ronki Ram said that he would be speaking on Item 5. Certain other members said that Item 5 is under consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that Item 7 is under consideration.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he is speaking on Item 5. He would be speaking on that context on which Shri Satya Pal Jain was speaking. At the moment, it is neither an issue of an Item nor of maintaining decorum in the Senate. In fact, the issue of constitution of Senate as also of the governance of this University and also how the University had been governed and would have to be governed. This is not an issue of disapproving or approving an item. If there is any doubt about Section 38 of P.U. Act, 1947, and if he (Vice Chancellor) thought that he is absolutely right and the House felt that it is right, then instead of taking legal opinion on Item 5, legal opinion could be

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

obtained on Section 38 of the Act. There should not be any adamancy. Neither he (Vice Chancellor) is accepting their opinion nor are they accepting his (Vice Chancellor) opinion.

At this stage, certain members started speaking together and nothing could be heard clearly.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh stated that the strength, which is being witnessed in this House today, perhaps has never ever earlier been seen and the same is delightful for them. The image, which they have presented to the new members, is not good. They could have their difference of opinion, but they halt at a level. The Chancellor is not present in the House and if he wished, he could come as he is the Chairperson of the Senate. To raise question on his (Chancellor) decision, is perhaps not correct. Every team has a Captain. Leave aside the player, recently Shri Ravi Shastri has been appointed as Coach of the Indian Cricket Team against the opinion of the Captain (Mr. Virat Kohli). He did not know much about law, but he always goes into the spirit. So far as he knew, Dean of Student Welfare could be appointed by the Senate on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate. As far as he knew, the Vice Chancellor has been written/mentioned first. The words are "Vice Chancellor and Syndicate" and not "Syndicate and Vice Chancellor". The procedure is that the Vice Chancellor makes the recommendation and the same could be approved/disapproved by the Syndicate. The former Vice Chancellor had directly appointed Professor J.K. Goswami as Dean of Student Welfare and the Syndicate had disapproved the same and recommended appointment of somebody else as Dean of Student Welfare. He did not want to go into what had happened earlier as everybody knew about everything. When they welcomed somebody and at the same say that the five, who have gone, is wrong, then that welcome did not have any meaning. If they wanted to welcome, they should do it with open heart. Everybody knew that they come to the meeting with a set mind frame. Shri Ashok Goyal ji was saying that the Senate should be done away with and the Vice Chancellor wished to do so. If such an atmosphere prevailed, then they all would be responsible for doing away with the Senate. They all are responsible for the impression, which went outside. Whether "five, five" was not being heard from his right side? It should be told that when some decision is taken on the basis of numbers, persons like him say that democracy did not mean that they could do anything on the basis of numbers. Here when it suited to them, they always say that they could do it on the basis of numbers. So far as Dean of Student Welfare is concerned, Professor Emanuel Nahar is his personal friend and he is not problem on his working, and he did not want to say anything about his personally. Personally, he is of the opinion that this decision should have been taken at the level of the Syndicate. He has gone through the minutes of the Syndicate meeting and he has read that he (Vice Chancellor) had requested the members with folded hands that an Officer should be given to him. He did not feel from any angle and perhaps it is also not right for Professor Emanuel Nahar and he (Professor Nahar) did not know that he is just a puppet in this entire politics. They did not want to give an Officer of his choice to the Vice Chancellor, that too, when it is written that Dean of Student Welfare is to be appointed by the Senate on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate. In this way, perhaps, that would also not be correct on their part. There are several friends, for whom he has full respect, and he knew that they would again entangle on this issue, but they have to arrive at a consensus because the Panjab University is already facing a lot of problems. Today, they have the presence of Union Minister, Minister for Higher Education, Punjab, and D.P.I. (Colleges), Punjab. Have they discussed any serious issue in front of them, i.e., implementation of 7th Pay Commission, status of Central University to Panjab University or any other important issue? Have they not lost this opportunity? He had raised this issue thrice that

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Chandigarh University is continuously harming them, and they should approach the Punjab Government, but they did not want to discuss this issue; rather, they wanted to discuss only an appointment of an individual. He would personally appeal to Professor Emanuel Nahar. Just a few minutes before, he was joking to Professor Nahar that he has become a star as several members have come to attend the meeting today. Fortunately, Chancellor has not come! Had people in such a number ever come to discuss the serious issues? Have ever so many Ministers, M.Ps. and MLAs come? It is good that these Ministers, M.Ps. and MLAs have come. This issue could also be dealt with as was done in the case of Item 5. In Item 5 also, on the issue Shri Ashok Goyal was saying and they have respect for him (Shri Ashok Goyal). His issue was relating to increment, and that was why, he did not want to speak on the issue. They always used to say, and when he was covering Haryana Vidhan Sabha, that the previous Speaker was better than the incumbent because in every Vidhan Sabha people say that such a Speaker has never come. Now, he (Vice Chancellor) is on the Chair and if he wished he could choose the path of confrontation and he would have no problem with that. However, whatever they are saying they are saying with full honesty and from the core of their heart that this confrontation would take the University to a much lower level if they include an Officer in the team of the Vice Chancellor without his willingness/ consent. If they are Cricket lover, they might remember the controversy between Dhoni and Sehwag. If someone did not want an Officer, that too, a person, who has remained as such for three year, he did not know legal aspect as he is not aware of Law. Legally also, if his (Vice Chancellor) recommendation was not there, the matter should again be placed before the Syndicate and consensus could be arrived in the Syndicate or they should convince him (Vice Chancellor) pleading that Professor Nahar is left with only few months. They have today already stretched this issue so much and should not stretch this bitterness anymore because it is only good saying, but ultimately the loss would be of all of them, including Panjab University. They would not be able to do much as they are already in service, but they should take care of the coming generations. What Shri Ashok Goyal ji has said, he is completely in agreement with him that this Senate and the Syndicate would be abolished if this atmosphere continued to prevail. In the end, he would like to make a request to all of them that either this item should again be considered in the Syndicate or they could also discuss it with Professor Nahar. They should also show at least some faith. He (Vice Chancellor) is on the Chair and if he wished and he has also to run the University on day-to-day basis and he has gone through the minutes where several persons have said that they would do this and that, but those are not practical things. One should have right to appoint a couple of persons in his team. In the case under consideration, there is no recommendation of the Vice Chancellor and the item, which has come to the Senate, is also technical wrong as there is no recommendation of the Vice Chancellor. Hence, he requested the Vice Chancellor either withdraw this item or get the same reconsidered by the Syndicate.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that, in fact, when the item came to the Syndicate regarding appointment of Dean of Student Welfare and so on and so forth. However, after discussion, the Syndicate did resolve that they recommend the extension in their previous appointment, to which the Vice Chancellor did not agree and put a strong reservation against that recommendation. So far as Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007 (page 107) is concerned, the recommendation is to be made by the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate together and it is not one or the other. Therefore, without the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor, this Item could not be taken up for consideration. As such, he would like to request that either the item should be referred back to the Syndicate or all of them should be doing what the Vice Chancellor is saying.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that, actually, last time, when the extension for one year was granted.

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal stood up and requested the Vice Chancellor to tell them as to what decision has been taken in Item 5.

Continuing, Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that last time before his (Vice Chancellor, Professor Raj Kumar) coming, when extension for one year was granted, how that decision/consensus was arrived, everybody knew because at that time it was being felt that the Dean of Student Welfare and other appointments would be made by the new Vice Chancellor, and at that time also consensus was arrived. At that time, it was said by his colleagues, including Dr. Subhash Chand Sharma and Shri Varinder Singh.

The Vice Chancellor requested Principal R.S. Jhanji to stop and asked Professor Emanuel Nahar to abstain if he deems fit as Item 7, which related to him, is being discussed.

To this, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that discussion is taking place on Item 5.

Certain members in one voice said that discussion is taking place on Item 7.

Continuing, Professor R.S. Jhanji stated that at that time Professor Ronki Ram and Mrs. Anu Chatrath had desired that one year extension should be given and thereafter, the issue would be taken care of because at that time also the matter was being referred back. The consensus was arrived only to give extension for one year and all of them, who were present in this House, are party to this decision. At that time, extension was not been granted. Now, the issue of extension has again come up. They might have also seen in the Syndicate that Regulations 1 and 2.2 at page 107 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007 say "The Senate may, on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate, appoint a Dean of Student Welfare for such period and on such terms and conditions as may be determined by them". It is 'on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate' and it is not oblique. When the Vice Chancellor had requested again and again in the Syndicate, either the consideration of the matter should have been deferred or consensus should have been arrived. Now, the matter has come to the Senate without the consent of the Vice Chancellor. In fact, the Item should not have come without the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor to the Senate until the consensus was arrived. As said by one of his colleagues that 19 Fellows had given a letter, but the Syndicate did not made consensus for fixing the meeting and the meeting could not be held until now. One of the members has said that the Vice Chancellor and the members are on two different terms. It is absolutely clear that until such a situation prevailed officially in the case of Dean of Student Welfare and until coordination is there with the Vice Chancellor, such problems are bound to come. Disturbance is continuing for the last so many years as the coordination could not be reached. The House must take into account that the House is for the facilitation of the Vice Chancellor and not for creating problems for the Vice Chancellor. They should not make ifs and buts on the decisions of the Vice Chancellor every time. Had it been so, what was the need of the position of the Vice Chancellor? In fact, the Vice Chancellor is representing the Chancellor. There is brute majority in the Syndicate. Either there should have been balance, but their system is such that it is functioning on number game. If there are 15 persons in the Syndicate, it did not mean, that they could do anything. If they did not have majority in the Senate, it did not meant, that they did not have any right to give their opinion. It is

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

absolutely wrong and this meant, there is a dire need for Governance Reforms. Now, they are vehemently saying that Governance Reforms must be there and all such things should be abolished and they have to come to this at some point of time; otherwise, the system would continue to function like this on the basis of brute majority. Without any political line and controversy, they had taken a decision on Dean of Student Welfare at that time and extension was given to him for the third time, and extension was given on this condition alone. Otherwise, they had said that extension should be given only for three months and when the new Vice Chancellor would come, new appointment would be made and all of them had accepted this at that time and, thus, they all are party to that decision. Now, they are saying again and again that it should be done like this and that. In fact, all of them are involved in that decision, and they had said that it should be extended for one year. Ms. Anu Chatrath and Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal had specially said this.

Ms. Anu Chatrath intervened to say that at that time, the agenda was only for one year extension.

Continuing, Principal R.S. Jhanji said, "Madam, you should have the patience to listen. In fact, this matter should not have come to the Senate and question of discuss did not arise at all. It should be recorded that the matter should be sent back to the Syndicate. If the Vice Chancellor makes his recommendation, the decision should be taken in the Syndicate and brought here or the Vice Chancellor should be authorized or it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor that he could appoint Dean of Student Welfare himself.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that, at the very outset, he would admit the legal position that it is for the Senate finally to take a decision on the matter. They should not mix up the things. Today, the issue before them is, a recommendation of the Syndicate for arriving at a decision. They have to go back to the proceedings of the Syndicate, which is available at page 355. He admitted as read over by others, the Senate may on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate, appoint a Dean of Students Welfare for such a period and on the terms and conditions as may be determined by them. Let they proceed further, when they begin with the discussion Professor Navdeep Goyal said that three persons are already working as Deans, Man & Women and Associate Dean, Students Welfare and he was of the opinion that they could continue with them. The Vice Chancellor asked as to what are the rules so that the decision could be taken in the light of those rules. He further said that he would not read further on this as he had already gone through this matter. One thing is very clear on this. When this item was fixed before the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor did not come up with his recommendation. He thought that the item as such should have been taken up only after the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor, but the fact is that the Vice Chancellor did not make a recommendation, did not preclude the Syndicate to make a recommendation. The item was fixed there not by any member of the Syndicate, rather the item was fixed by the Vice Chancellor of the University, and he is sure that even if it was fixed by the Registrar or by anybody else, the Vice Chancellor had given his consent to it that this item was listed. It was not thought appropriate or whatever or it was just crossed over that the Vice Chancellor thought it fit not to recommend the name and after that had the Vice Chancellor recommended a name, then the matter would have taken a different cause there. Then matter would have proceeded on those lines and this is the name before the Syndicate by the Vice Chancellor and whether the Syndicate agree with it or not and that certainly was not done. So in that situation, the Syndicate felt let them recommend those names for continuation again for a year. Now, here what he has said earlier or said by anybody else that give him an extension for another year, is irrelevant. Now, what they have to

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

see is, that the matter was fixed and he is just repeating it for the sake of adding confuses to it that the Vice Chancellor took an item to the Syndicate and there, to begin with, the Vice Chancellor only says what are the rules? He wondered, how the item was brought there, if the rules had not already been brought to the notice of the Vice Chancellor! Why was the item fixed there? Since the item was fixed and the members of the Syndicate deliberated upon it and made the recommendation, he thought the motive should not be imputed to it. They should now discuss all merits of the recommendation of the Syndicate and if the Senate feel that it wish to somehow turn down this recommendation of the Syndicate, well it could do so as the Senate is the ultimate authority. But let them not bring in other things here. Let them confine their arguments or their interventions in this matter only to that point that what would happen in the absence of a name recommended by the Vice Chancellor. He is sure that somebody would say that ultimately during the course of the discussion the Vice Chancellor said he did not accept this name but that was not the stage to say so, and that stage was initial, only when the item was brought before the Syndicate. He would like to add only one sentence that he thought that they should accept the recommendation of the Syndicate.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that 2-3 viewpoints have emerged out of the discussion and he would also like to make two-three submissions before them. If they see the Item, the Item is to consider that Professor Emanuel Nahar, Dean of Student Welfare, Professor Neena Caplash, Dean of Student Welfare (Women) and Professor Ranjan Kumar, Associate Dean, Student Welfare, be given extension in their term of appointment for one more year i.e., up to 31.5.2020 or till the recommendation of the Syndicate is considered by the Senate. So when they are considering the recommendation of the Syndicate, technically and legally speaking, the appointment/extension of these persons comes to an end because the words are "To consider" not accepted or rejected by the Syndicate. Since they are considering it, this item (their appointment/extension) comes to an end. It is not under consideration whether he (Vice Chancellor) should have done it or should not have done it. Secondly, it is a fact that there was no recommendation of the Vice Chancellor about the appointment/extension in the term of appointment of Dean of Student Welfare. He (Vice Chancellor) did not make any recommendation, and the Syndicate has done. In his view, first is the recommendation by the Vice Chancellor and then comes the recommendation by the Syndicate, and then comes the acceptance by the Senate. These are the three steps, which have to be taken, legally speaking, before the appointment of Dean of Student Welfare. In this case, when the first step itself was not taken as the Vice Chancellor did not make the recommendation, in his view and he might be wrong as somebody could differ with him, the Syndicate could have said, "Sir alright, you go through the regulations/rules". Next time, they would meet, he (Vice Chancellor) should come out with the recommendation(s). They should have themselves requested the Vice Chancellor to give recommendation so that they could consider the same. They could have differed with the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor, and he is not saying that the Syndicate had no right. They could have said that he is recommending 'A', they are of the view that they should appoint 'B' or they should appoint 'C', that could have been there. Now, they are in a very strange situation. There is a recommendation by the Syndicate without any recommendation by the Vice Chancellor, which they are considering today. His respectful submission is this, that certain powers have been given to the Syndicate and the Senate and there is no doubt about that, but wherever there is right, duty/duties also attached. Without duty/duties, one could not exercise any right arbitrarily. If they go through the Act, here the Vice Chancellor is the representative of the Chancellor. By sitting in the Chair both in the Syndicate and Senate, he (Vice Chancellor) represented the Chancellor. Dean of Student Welfare is a very important assignment. Just about half an hour or an hour

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

before, when the students were shouting slogans outside, he (Vice Chancellor) out of them firstly called the Dean of Student Welfare and asked him to meet the students and come back with the recommendation. Academically, Dean of University Instruction is the next senior position after the Vice Chancellor, and Dean of Student Welfare comes to the management from the students' side. Similarly, the Registrar is top-most position in the administrative/non-teaching side. His personal view is – whosoever could be the Vice Chancellor, but the appointment of Dean of Student Welfare should at all not be made without the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor and in his appointment, the Vice Chancellor should have full say. They could well imagine the position if there is one view of the Vice Chancellor and another of the Dean of Student Welfare! What would happen to the University? He (Vice Chancellor) had asked the Dean of Student Welfare to talk to the students and if talked to them from a different angle, what would happen. Until there is no effective coordination amongst the Dean of Student Welfare, Dean of University Instruction, Registrar and the Vice Chancellor, no Institution/University could neither function smoothly nor move ahead/forward. The University is a family and he (Vice Chancellor) is the head of their family as also of their Government, which regulated the Syndicate and Senate. He (Vice Chancellor) is the Speaker as also the Chief Minister. Therefore, he would like to request to all the members with folded hands, though Professor Emanuel Nahar has gone out and had been sitting here, he would have also requested him with folded hands that he should himself say to the Vice Chancellor that if he has not recommended him (Professor Nahar), then he (Professor Nahar) would request him (Vice Chancellor) that he would be saved from this controversy, and whosoever seemed appropriate to him, he/she should be appointed as Dean of Student Welfare. This would have been his big commitment to the University. Today his proposal is that since the Vice Chancellor has not made any recommendation, the entire procedure which has been followed is against the Act, Regulations and Rules. He says another thing that they should forget the Act, Regulations, Rules, etc. for a minute, if the Secretary to the Vice Chancellor, Dean of Student Welfare and his other staff are not of his confidence, there would be difficulty in performing the work. His proposal is that the recommendation of the Syndicate, with all respect, that whosoever has been recommended by it, is a very good person and none is against the person (Professor Emanuel Nahar), irrespective of the fact whether he has a political affiliation and their political affiliation another, it did not make any difference, but he (Vice Chancellor) should himself request him (Professor Nahar) that he should request the Vice Chancellor that he is withdrawing his name from the position of Dean of Student Welfare; otherwise, the Senate should authorize the Vice Chancellor today to make his recommendation and whosoever seemed to be appropriate to him for the position of Dean of Student Welfare, should be recommended by him. If he (Vice Chancellor) deemed fit, he could recommend the names of two-three persons, out of whom one could be chosen in the Syndicate. Lastly, as said by Dr. Gurmeet Singh, the impression, which is coming outside, that they are the Princes here and they would do whatever they wished and the Vice Chancellor has no power because the power has been given to the Syndicate in certain cases and to the Senate in certain other cases. So whatever their resolution has come, they would do that. Who would be the Dean Research/Dean Science is discussed for about two hours, but how much research has been done/undertaken is not discussed even for a minute. It is all because their objectivity is being finished. This is my man, he should be appointed and this is not my man, he should be removed. His request to them is that they should rise above these things and authorize the Vice Chancellor and the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor should come to the Senate through the Syndicate. The Vice Chancellor should immediately appoint the Dean of Student Welfare as the election of Panjab University Campus Students' Council is approaching and they did not have even a time of 15 days'. The students are sloganeering outside the Senate meeting, though the students have the right to put their viewpoints before them, but.... They were aware

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

that since the elections are coming, the demonstration by the students is bound to come; rather, all the organizations would demonstrate. His polite request to them is that they should immediately authorize the Vice Chancellor to appoint a person, whom he deemed fit, as Dean of Student Welfare and there is no need to place the matter before the Senate. He/She should immediately join as such. This arrangement should be till the recommendation of the Syndicate is considered by the Senate. The moment they are considering it, this recommendation goes and it is for the Senate to take the decision.

Professor Mukesh Arora and one other member said that they endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Satya Pal Jain.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that when they went to the meeting of the Syndicate and they could seek a copy of the agenda of the Syndicate meeting, the item, which had come, was extension for one year. Thereafter, he did not know, under what pressure, the Vice Chancellor withdrew that item at the floor of the House and did not make any recommendation. Naturally, when they are going to the meeting of the Syndicate after going through the agenda, they were of the opinion that since the Vice Chancellor has come with this item, which is extension of appointment for one year, and they discussed the item accordingly. They were of the view that it is good that the Vice Chancellor has brought this extension, and since Professor Emanuel Nahar is doing a very good job, extension should be given to him, and the Syndicate took the decision on those lines. Now, since the decision of the Syndicate has come, he felt that in the Senate they if deemed fit, in accordance with the provisions of the regulations, should grant one year's extension as the Senate is the ultimate authority, he proposed that one year's extension should be given to these persons.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta stated that, as said by his colleagues, Principal R.S. Jhanji and Shri Varinder Singh, he is also witness to this that when earlier extension was given to these persons for one year, Professor Arun Kumar Grover, the then Vice Chancellor, had brought an item to give three months' extension to these persons. At that time, both the groups, i.e., BJP and Congress were together and when the groups were together, they made a request and the other group acceded to that request and a unanimous decision taken that these persons be given extension one year's extension instead of three months. Three months' extension was being given on the plea that since the new Vice Chancellor is coming, he should be permitted to choose his team so that the work of the University could be performed smoothly. They had granted one year's extension instead of three months. Already, they have granted nine months' extension more and even before that, he had got extension. If they continued to give extension after extension on the plea that he/she is going a wonderful job and he/she was appointed, his/her predecessor was also doing a wonderful job. Did have any doubt that the new person(s), who would be coming, would not be doing good work. They are also the Professors of this University. If they have to appoint another Professor as new Dean of Student Welfare, they are depriving him/her of that right. Therefore, he is of the opinion that, since these persons have completed their term, new Deans of Student Welfare should be appointed at the earliest and extension should not be given under any circumstances. Secondly, it has been written that the Vice Chancellor has expressed his strong reservation and he has not recommended the name for the post. If the Vice Chancellor has not recommend anything, what they are considering. Therefore, according to him, the Dean of Student Welfare should immediately be changed and the matter should be got reconsidered by the Syndicate and new Dean of Student Welfare got appointed.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that all the provision contained in the regulations and rules have been read out and in those it is mentioned "Vice Chancellor and Syndicate". When some whispering was heard, she said that first the Vice Chancellor should decide as to who should speak and who not, the Vice Chancellor said that she should continue. She said that first of all, they should note down the name, only then she would continue.

The Vice Chancellor said that she should continue with her speech.

Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that she believed that the agenda is always brought before the Syndicate and Senate is brought with the approval and consent of the Vice Chancellor. So he (Vice Chancellor) brought the agenda before the Syndicate in its meeting to appoint the Dean of Student Welfare. In that meeting, a question was specifically raised by Dr. K.K. Sharma as to what else he (Vice Chancellor) recommends, to which the Vice Chancellor replied that he does not recommend anything. Meaning thereby, the Vice Chancellor, who was supposed to recommend, as his learned friend and senior colleague, Shri Satya Pal Jain has pointed out that recommendation by the Vice Chancellor is the first stage and the second stage is recommendation by the Syndicate and third is consideration by the Senate. If the first stage person himself before the Syndicate that he does not recommend anybody, meaning thereby the exercise of power by the Syndicate extending their appointment till 2020, is valid recommendation and appointment. Now, the question is before the Senate. Shri Satya Pal Jain has raised another issue that the election of Panjab University Campus Students' Council is coming in next few days, the Vice Chancellor has full-fledged control over the present Dean of Student Welfare. He (Vice Chancellor) has rightly sent him (Professor Nahar) to talk to the students. Now, if they talk on these things, i.e., on the forthcoming Students' Council election, then they are giving some other impression to the society. Under the circumstances, the Vice Chancellor has sent the present Dean of Student Welfare to talk to the students and in future also, he (Vice Chancellor) could send him. Moreover, he (Professor Nahar) has enough experience in dealing students affairs/problems. At the fag end, especially when the election to the Students' Council is coming in next few days, to change the Dean of Student Welfare, she believed it would neither be in the interest of the University nor in the interest of the students' bodies because he has a continuous relation and he is fully aware of their grievances. As such, she fully endorsed the recommend of the Syndicate that all these three persons should be given extension.

Hon'ble Union Minister of State for Commerce and Industry, Shri Som Parkash Kainth stated that he is speaking in this House for the first time. He had been a member of Vidhan Sabha and has also witnessed the proceedings of the Parliament. He is watching since morning and has observed that the standard of discussion here in every way is falling. The standard of discussion is not very good. It is their duty to see as to how the ranking of the University in the world is improved. He has observed that they spent a lot of time in discussing appointments. There are more than 2 dozen universities in the State of Punjab. Earlier, only Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar and Punjabi University, Patiala, were the teaching Universities, on which the Government had to incur a lot of expenses. Private Universities functions themselves and they are doing well. There such a discussion never takes place. Since the Senate comprised of so many intellectuals, it is their duty to contribute as much as they could. Their stress should be as to how to improve the standard of this University and its functioning. The Vice Chancellor is the Chief Executive Officer of the University. They should think as to how he could be strengthened and the fruitful discussion takes place. They should try to contribute positively. Ministers, Members of Parliament, Members of Legislative Assembly and certain other dignitaries are present in this

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

House. He urged them to rise above the party lines and should not talk on party lines and instead their focus should be to improve the standard of the University. If such a person is appointed as Dean of Student Welfare against whom the Vice Chancellor has strong reservations, it would hamper the functioning of the University. Citing an example, he said that if a person is appointed a Minister to whom the Chief Minister of the State did not like, it would not be good. He urged the members not to indulge in lengthy discussion and instead their priority should be to strengthen the Vice Chancellor as he is not a person but an institution. They should always work for the improvement of image and honour of the University. If they appoint a person against whom the Vice Chancellor has a strong reservation, he did not think it would be good/nice. Hence, he would like to request to all the Senate members that let they not enter into any controversy and instead contribute for the welfare of the University. There are several private Universities which are doing well. If they continued to fight like this, structural changes would become inevitable. These are the things, which brought structural changes. If Article 370 could be abrogated/scrapped, why the structural changes could not be made? If they went like this, there would be no alternative, but to bring in structural changes. They must strengthen the University, so that its name and fame is improved. If they should contribute and fight for improve the name and fame of the University, it would be nice on their part, but if the fight for the individual, it would not be good.

Hon'ble Minister for Higher Education, Punjab, Shri Tripat Rajinder Singh Bajwa stated that he is attending the meeting of the Senate for the first time. He has a vast experience as he has seen the functioning of the Assembly because he has won election for four times. He has also got an opportunity to work with Hon'ble Shri Som Parkash Kainth ji. The Institution, to which they have come today, is his (Vice Chancellor) creation. He (Vice Chancellor) did not make any recommendation, he is not ready to accept the recommendation of the Syndicate and he is also not ready to order voting in the Senate, then what is solution to this problem. How long the discussion would continue? Shri Som Parkash Kainth ji has said that they have to change the structure of the University. In a way, he has threatened of the brute majority, which they have in the Parliament. He (Shri Som Parkash Kainth) is proud of the brute majority in the Parliament and on the other hand, they object to the brute majority, which prevailed in the Senate. They are ignoring the majority of the Senate and threatening of the majority, which they had in the Parliament, to do this and that. It is true that they could do anything, but they should not break the regulations and rules of the University. If everything is to be done by them, then where is the need for calling the meeting of the Senate? Similarly, then there is also not any benefit of the recommendation of the Syndicate. Then they should stop holding the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, and should do whatever they wished. He (Vice Chancellor) did not make any recommendation, which meant that he has no choice. It meant he only disliked and did not like anyone. It would have been better on his part to make his recommendation. However, he agreed that there should be complete coordination between these two positions to run the University and there is no denial about this. However, the Vice Chancellor should have guts to tell that he liked this person. His silence is also unfortunate for the University. They are facing this situation only because the Vice Chancellor did not like to make his recommendation, but he (Vice Chancellor) would like to abolish the Syndicate and Senate with one stroke, which would be unfortunate. Shri Som Parkash Kainth ji has given an idea about that. It is welcome, but such things did not last long. According to him, the system, which is prevailing, should be allowed to continue. The importance of Syndicate and Senate should not be eliminated. However, if the persons, who have been recommended for these positions, felt it appropriate not to enter into this controversy, they have the right to withdraw their names. He also thinks that there should not be any clash between

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

the two of them for the functioning of the University, but at the same time, they must ensure that they should not destroy the entire system, i.e., Syndicate and the Senate. If the decision has been taken, the same should be implemented.

Shri Sanjay Tandon stated that he was a little bit upset from the discussion, which took place so far. Before he put his viewpoints about the mention made by Shri Tripat Rajinder Singh Bajwa, he would like to remind Shri Bajwa though Shri Som Parkash Ji has left the House; otherwise, perhaps he would have also agreed with him that there was a Minister in the Punjab Government namely Shri Navjot Singh Sidhu, but the relationship of Shri Sidhu was not so good with the Chief Minister. And the Chief Minister removed him from his Council of Ministers. He (Chief Minister) had also not brought any proposal for removing him from Council of Ministers. He citing an example, he said that if one, who is a Chief Minister of a State or Managing Director of a Company or the Vice Chancellor of an Institution, is asked to get certain work done but through a person of their own choice, i.e., forcibly, it would not be proper. However, the person concerned says that he could not work with that particular person and it is written "The Vice Chancellor has expressed his strong reservation". The Syndicate should have also respected the views of the Vice Chancellor. The proposal could have made there and consensus reached. There is a popular saying in English, "Either it is my way or high way", i.e., either his opinion should be accepted; otherwise, he would not allow them to work. This is not a way. One of the members has made a mention of brute majority, but the brute majority did not mean that one should disrespect/degrade the Chair, raise fingers or level allegation(s) on the Chair or any of the members stood up and insult the Chair. According to him, in a way, it is an insult of the University. At the time, singing the University Anthem, they should say with pride "Teri Shaan or Shocket sada rahe". In what way, they are showing the "Shaan or Shocket" despite their being the members of this House for the last about 15 years. Is it their duty to teach them the right way? He has joined this House just about two years ago and at that time, the former Vice Chancellor, Professor Arun Kumar Grover, had filed an affidavit and a lot of hue and cry was made in this House. Certain persons had favoured him saying that certain sharks are there in this House for the last so many years and they put a lot of pressure on the Vice Chancellor and the University authorities by making pressure groups. He had astonished to learn this whether such things are also happening in this University. Pressure is put on him (Vice Chancellor) either to declare this or they would not permit him to work. How these persons raised their arms and also enter into the well of the House and stood before the Chair. According to him, it is a shame for all of them. They wanted to get the work done from the particular person and also to keep him/her along. He is a good Officer and he has got three years term. In fact, he (Professor Emanuel Nahar) should have himself told that since a lot of controversy is being created against him, he wanted to withdraw his name. After all, they have to work in unison. When this had come earlier in the Senate, he himself had said that his (Professor Nahar) term should be extended till the term of Professor Arun Kumar Grover as Vice Chancellor. Thereafter, when the new Vice Chancellor would come, he should have the right to choose his own team. He (Vice Chancellor) might be remembering that when he had made the appointment of the Registrar, at that time he was in the Syndicate and he had said that it is his (Vice Chancellor) right to appoint any, whereas his heart was in favour of 'A', 'B', 'C', etc. because how could he be subjective in his opinion. If he (Shri Tandon) is running the University, he has to be objective, and for years, this University is suffering, but nobody is bothered about it that the University is suffering. Just now a mention was made about the Structural Reforms, Structural Reforms is not a threatening. In fact, Structural Reforms are the need of the hour. And all of them, who are doing like this, they are rather proving that this is the real need of the hour. This is the need of the hour that they should bring in structural changes. How private Universities are

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

functioning in a better way? In private Universities, the Vice Chancellor took the decision in accordance with the requirement and suitability. In this way, they are moving ahead and are getting new projects. However, here they are fighting for appointment of an individual. Should they decide as to who would be the Secretary to the Vice Chancellor and Registrar, Dean of Student Welfare, Dean College Development Council, etc.? Is it their prerogative? And thereafter, they expect that if there is any mistake, they would hold the Vice Chancellor responsible. How could the system work in this manner? If they take decision at home, they are responsible for the same. If there are rights, duties are also there. Shri Satya Pal Jain has also talked about it. Suddenly, they pick up the Calendar and show the Act on every issue. Under which Act, they work at home. What rules they show, when they talk at home? What rules they show when they asked their child to come home after 10.00 p.m. Is there any Act? However, if here the Chair asked him/her to sit down, he/she says he/she they would not sit down and he/she would rule and speak. Who is the teacher, whose students are not ready to listen to him/her? He is of the considered opinion that he (Vice Chancellor) should be given full power in this matter. Since he has not made his recommendation, the Senate should reject this appointment. On this position, whosoever is found to be suitable, should be appointed by the Vice Chancellor and get the work done and this is his request to him (Vice Chancellor).

Dr. Parveen Goyal stated that the existing structure of the Governing Body is very good as every type of contribution is there. None has the majority here. Hence, they should maintain the 'Shaan or Shocket' of it as depicted in the Panjab University Anthem. No dictatorship takes place here as everything is done in a democratic manner. There are three Calendars, i.e., Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007, Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2009 and Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2016. Their own persons, who are sitting outside, i.e., Panjab University teaching and non-teaching employees as well as students, have the expectation that everything is being and would be done in accordance with the regulations and rules. He drew the attention of the House towards Regulation 1 at page 110 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007, wherein it is written "The Vice Chancellor shall have authority to appoint whole-time or part-time wardens for the various Hostels of the University". According to him, it should never be discussed in the Governing Body that he (Vice Chancellor) should appoint this or that person as Warden. What has been discussed is page 107 where mention has been made about the appointment of Dean of Student Welfare and Regulation says ".....on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate...." As such, it is to be done by both (Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate) together. He has gone through the entire proceedings relating to the appointment of Dean of Student Welfare and it comes out that he (Vice Chancellor) is hundred per cent in agreement and is happy with the present Dean of Student Welfare, and neither there is any recommendation. Here six points have been mentioned and in these six points, he (Professor Nahar) found to be suitable as per Hon'ble Chairman. Either they shall have to make certain recommendation. And his second humble submission is that had the spent so much time on discussing the implementation of the recommendations of 7th Pay Commission, it would have been better.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he has got a lot of knowledge from today's discussion, which he did not get for the last so many years. He is fortunate that he has learnt a lot, after listening to the learned members. He agreed to the suggestion given by Shri Satya Pal Jain that the Syndicate should have asked the Vice Chancellor to make his recommendation or the matter should have been placed before the Syndicate again with his recommendation. Shri Satya Pal Jain is absolutely right, but he did not know that the Syndicate had requested the Vice Chancellor so many times to

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

recommend the name for Dean of Student Welfare, and despite their repeated requests the Vice Chancellor said he has no recommendation. Should they accept that if the recommendation(s) of the Vice Chancellor is/are not there, the work of the University comes to a standstill? Could anybody say in the House that if the Hon'ble Chancellor has appointed the Vice Chancellor, it has been done for the smooth functioning of the University and not to halt the work of the University? Ms. Anu Chatrath has read that the Vice Chancellor was specifically asked, but the Vice Chancellor said that he has no recommendation. He would read an extract of the proceedings appearing at 357, para 4 for them, "The Vice Chancellor said that they could get their recommendation recorded, but he has no recommendation in this regard. He (Vice Chancellor) has said a number of times that he would not give any recommendation. Meaning thereby, he completely said he would not give any name. As told by Professor Navdeep Goyal, earlier, the item was brought for extension to the incumbents, but later on a revised item was placed on the table during the meeting. That meant, first was his recommendation and in the second (revised), he has not made any recommendation. If they go through the proceedings of the Syndicate and had the same been also read by Shri Sanjay Tandon, Shri Satya Pal Jain and Hon'ble Union Minister, Shri Som Parkash Kainth, who has gone, they would have known everything as exact words have been used there that he (Vice Chancellor) is requested with folded hands that such an impression should not be allowed to go out that the Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor are at loggerhead. If he (Vice Chancellor) did not give his opinion/recommendation, the Syndicate has to do its job and he is also saying that they could record their recommendation, but he would not do so. Then, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) had said that it would not send a good message, but he (Vice Chancellor) did not know why the Vice Chancellor remained adamant on his statement that he would not make any recommendation. When Shri Satya Pal Jain read this item, it also got his attention and he thought that they did not have resolved there in this manner that the DSW be given extension in their term of appointment for one more year, i.e., up to 31.5.2020 or till this recommendation of the Syndicate is considered by the Senate. He completely disagreed with this as this was not the resolved part. The resolved part was as it recorded he did not know how the item was changed while coming from Syndicate to the Senate. There is no such resolution that 'till it is considered by the Senate'. He fully agreed with Shri Satya Pal Jain that if it is so, then they are considering it today. It was that so and so be given extension in their term of appointment for one more year, i.e., up to 31.5.2020. It is really shocking that even after the recommendation is made by the Syndicate. They would be surprised to know that the Vice Chancellor on that day, even after the recommendation made by the Syndicate unanimously, said that till it is considered by the Senate, he is going to appoint somebody else in the place of these people. He was not ready to work with these people even between the intervening period, i.e., the meeting of the Syndicate and Senate. It was specifically resolved that the extension be given in their term of appointment for one more year, i.e., up to 31.5.2020 and till this recommendation of the Syndicate is considered by the Senate, all the said incumbents would continue as such. It was not said that the extension is up to 31.5.2020 or till the recommendation is considered by the Senate; rather, it was specific date, i.e., 31.5.2020 and to the suggestion, which had been made by the Vice Chancellor, that too, because he (Shri Ashok Goyal) apprehended that the Vice Chancellor has made up his mind not to follow the decision of the Syndicate. On one side, the Vice Chancellor said that they should get their recommendation recorded which would go to the Senate and on the other side, they apprehended he (Vice Chancellor) did not want to follow the recommendation of the Syndicate till it is considered by the Senate, i.e., that was why they said 31.5.2020 and till that time they would continue. He would also like to tell that they are not sitting in their homes and instead are sitting in the Panjab University Senate meeting and every Senate (House) has its own Regulations and Rules. There might not be any Regulations and Rules for running the homes, but not House/official

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

forum – whether it is a Company or Parliament or Assembly, Regulations and Rules are there, which have to be followed. And there are certain Regulations and Rules, which have been mentioned in these Calendars, according to which, they (Shri Sanjay Tandon and he (Shri Ashok Goyal)) are sitting in this House. If they say that the Institution did not run in accordance with the Regulations and Rules, then they have to change their thinking a little bit. Suppose if the Vice Chancellor did not make any recommendation and they say that the Vice Chancellor is the Head of the University and it is wish of the Vice Chancellor as to how the work is to be got done. To whom minister is to be made, depended on the Chief Minister. Had a Regulation/Rule been there for the Chief Minister that while removing a specific Minister, other person is to be appointed Minister, he could have done that, where here the provisions existed. He was saying this with due respect to the Chancellor as he is equally his (Shri Ashok Goyal) Chancellor also and he did not consider him to a person belonging to a particular party; rather, he considered him Vice-President of India, Vice-President of his (Shri Ashok Goyal) nation and he considered him the Chancellor of the University. Probably, he could not explain well, and that was why, it was taken in the wrong spirit. He wanted to request the Vice Chancellor to approach the Chancellor to get the things legally corrected, which through an oversight seemed to have been done illegally because their Act, he is not saying regulations, says that there could not be more than 85 Ordinary Fellows, but as on date.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to restrict himself only to Item 7.

At this stage, some arguments took place between the Vice Chancellor and Shri Ashok Goyal. The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal not to make any comment on the decisions of the Hon'ble Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not commenting.

The Vice Chancellor said, "No, No review, no comment, no any saying".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that already, he would have the satisfaction of his (Vice Chancellor) notice and if still he (Vice Chancellor) felt that there is no question of any review, he agreed with him.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to restrict himself only to Item 7.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that for Item 7, his proposal, because he (Vice Chancellor) has already given the ruling in the earlier case, though he has not told the resolved part in the case of Item 5, they were compelled under pressure to give him the opinion of the House in writing that the recommendation of the Syndicate in regard to Item 7 should be approved by this House and all the three incumbents should be allowed to continue. To summarize, what he and all his friends have said and on behalf of them, he is giving in writing, which reads as "Resolved to approve the recommendation of agenda in its meeting held on 28th May 2019 vide para 16 that Professor Emanuel Nahar, Dean Student Welfare, Professor Neena Caplash, Dean Student Welfare (Women) and Professor Ranjan Kumar, Associate Dean, Student Welfare, be given extension in their term of appointment for one more year i.e., up to 31.5.2020 and the Vice Chancellor has refused to put the matter to vote. It is being submitted by the following Fellows and here are 48 Fellows, who signed it. Thereafter, he handed over the papers in this regard to the Vice Chancellor on the floor of the House.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

On a point of order, Shri Rajinder Bhandari suggested that a note should be recorded on the papers, which have been submitted by Shri Ashok Goyal, that “received during the process of discussion”.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said, “Obviously, it has to be”.

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

Shri Sandeep Singh stated that first of all, when this Item came to the Syndicate, he would like to tell them that the Vice Chancellor had gone outside only for five minutes saying that he would consider it and informed them, and he knew this because he is also a member of the Syndicate, but he (Vice Chancellor) came back nearly after about two hours, and that too, on the request of the Registrar and the Secretary to the Vice Chancellor, who used to go to the Vice Chancellor and came back to the House again and again. They had made a request to him time and again that he would disclose the name of the person(s), whom he wanted to appoint as Deans of Student Welfare and they would appoint him/them, but he did not disclose the name(s). Now, it is not right to give lecture on each other unnecessarily. It seemed that he (Vice Chancellor) did not like to appoint anybody. He was not present in the House when the Hon’ble Minister said that as Article 370 has been abrogated, the Senate would also be abolished in the similar manner. He wanted to tell that there is a lot of difference between Jammu & Kashmir and Punjab. They should remove the doubt from the minds that they could do whatever they wished. Sorry, he would like to point out.

Shri Satya Pal Jain intervened to say that he (Hon’ble Minister) has never said that if Article 370 could be scrapped, Senate could also be abolished.

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

Dr. Subhash Sharma clarified that he has just talked about the Structural Reforms. Structural Reforms and abolition of Senate are entire two different matters. He requested the members not to misquote him (Hon’ble Minister, Shri Som Parkash Kainth ji).

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he would like to apologize with folded hands, but he should be listened.

At this stage, a din again prevailed as certain members started speaking together.

Shri Sandeep Singh clarified that since he has little knowledge, he could have understood wrongly. What he (Hon’ble Minister) said, perhaps, its meeting could be something else, but still to say this thing is a big issue. There could be difference of opinion amongst them. He would like to ask the Vice Chancellor whether he has any ill-will against Professor Emanuel Nahar. Has he (Professor Nahar) ever disobeyed him (Vice Chancellor) or his equation did not match with him (Vice Chancellor)? It did not seem to him that Professor Nahar could have ever disobeyed the Vice Chancellor or Professor Nahar could have made a request to the Vice Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor could have raised any objection. Actually, they have created a doubt at their own level. As such, they should discuss that they would like to appoint this particular person and they should tell whether this person is suitable to them or not and the same should be told to him (Vice Chancellor). Why they are afraid of disclosing

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

this? Or it should be fact that a First Information Report (FIR) has been lodged against Professor Nahar or he has committed a fraud or created any problem for the University. Then they should discuss about such issue. Or he (Vice Chancellor) should tell them that he did not like this person (Professor Nahar), but the Vice Chancellor also did not wish to do this. The House with majority is making a request to him (Vice Chancellor) that this issue should be clinched. His (Vice Chancellor) delaying the meeting for two hours, they reached their homes at 11.00 p.m. In the end, he said that he is making a request with folded hands that these persons should be allowed to continue and Item 7 should be approved.

Dr. Subhash Sharma stated that one should not divert, twist or misquote the issue. The issue of Governance Reforms/Structural Reforms, which has been touched by Hon'ble Minister, Shri Som Parkash Kainth ji, is already on the Panjab University agenda and on that they have unanimously appointed a Committee. Someone is saying that the Government wished to abolish the Senate, but it is not true. Before this Government, they have reached the consensus and have discussed this issue in the Senate several times that the Governance Reforms are required. If they dug out the minutes, they would find that majority of the members have said, "Yes, Governance Reforms are required". Since the Governance Reforms are required by the University, they have appointed a Committee for the purpose. When Professor Arun Kumar Grover was the Vice Chancellor, they had said that he (Professor Grover) has submitted an affidavit in the Punjab & Haryana High Court, though they did not have any objection to the Governance Reforms, he (Professor Grover) should have discussed the issue in the Senate. Hence, the Governance Reforms/Structural Reforms should not be taken otherwise. To say that they have the brute majority and the Senate would be abolished, is not correct. The Hon'ble Minister has only used the words "Structural Reforms". He is saying here with full responsibility that when they talk about Governance Reforms/Structural Reform, as these are required everywhere. He would like to remind the Hon'ble Minister for Higher Education, Punjab, that even the Punjab Government just after coming to power had first changed the Board of Governors by amending the Act of Punjab Technical University. Recently, also several such amendments have been made by the Punjab Government. They had made a Right to Service Act, and the Government has changed the same. As such, Governance Reforms/Structural Reforms is an issue for discussion and they have to discuss the same at one point of time because the society asked them as to all this is being done. The people from outside asked them as to what they do in the Senate. He remarked that sometimes such people are elected to those Faculties, to which they have nothing to do as they have not studied the subjects falling under those Faculties. Still they got elected to those Faculties. Should the reforms are not needed? Hence, they should not limit themselves to that since one has talked about Structural Reforms, he liked to abolish the Senate. Reforms are always there and all the governments did it. Reforms are absolutely necessary for the living society and they have to undertake the reforms, which should be done after debate and discussion. Coming to the agenda, he stated that the members have talked about the big things and it has been said that the University would be run by the Act and the Regulations & Rules, Yes, the University would be run in accordance with the Act and Regulations & Rules. He has been able to understand in about two and a half years that when they talked about the Act and Regulations & Rules, several persons tell him that they would like to tell him (Dr. Subhash) that the University has one principle, "show me the face, I will show you the Regulations/Rules". For a single event/incident/issue, different types of Regulations/Rules are implemented here. The ones, who were reading the provision of the Act, that the Vice Chancellor should order the voting, were those very people, who while sitting in the meeting of the Syndicate, despite being writing by the 19 Fellows, which was their constitutional right as it has been written that "The Syndicate shall fix the date". Though 3 meetings have

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

taken place after that, sometime they have said that the legal opinion should be obtained and so on and so forth, but date for the special meeting of the Senate has so far not been given. Now, those very persons are asking them to follow the Act. He would like to draw their attention, especially when they say that they should follow the regulations and rules and should also be ceremonial, he should be told that he (Vice Chancellor) had appointed a person as Dean Research, now it is being said that since the person has completed three years, why not he should be allowed to continue till his retirement and there is no harm, but the Syndicate without an agenda item, even though it is written in the Act, that without an agenda item they could not take any decision, the Syndicate with brute majority the Dean Research, who was one of the senior Professors, was removed un-ceremonially and appointed another person as Dean Research by violating the Act. He should be told in which Act, it was written. Which provision of Panjab University Act says that the Syndicate could remove the Dean Research without the issue being on the agenda? On the one hand, they have violated the Act, and on the other hand, they are talking about ceremonial, ceremonial, etc. They had removed one of the senior Professors from the post of Dean Research within a period of one and a half months. Are they talking about ceremonial, ceremonial, etc.? They have also read the discussion, but he would not like to go into those things. They have read that the Vice Chancellor did not bring/make any recommendation, but they did not see the spirit that the Vice Chancellor is making a request with folded hands that another person should be appointed after arriving at a consensus without his recommendation and he is ready for that. They did not see that because they wanted to appoint only these persons. He (Vice Chancellor) should bring his recommendation and if he brought his recommendation, they would reject the same and humiliate him, the way they had done in the case of Dean Research. If the Vice Chancellor did not bring his recommendation, it was done only because the Dean Research was humiliated by rejecting his (Vice Chancellor) recommendation with brute majority and the Vice Chancellor was also humiliated. Did they want that he (Vice Chancellor) brings another name of a senior Professor and they also humiliate him and then humiliate him (Vice Chancellor) also again? Did they want to humiliate the Vice Chancellor again and again as also of the senior people of the University? This is the reason, they wanted the Vice Chancellor to bring his recommendation? Why did they not listen to the Vice Chancellor when he was requesting with folding hands that they should bring in someone else and make a consensus? Even today, it is not too late, they could arrive at a consensus even now. Several competent persons are present here, they could make a consensus and appoint anyone of them. But they did not wish so as they only wanted to humiliate the Vice Chancellor not once, but twice, thrice and so on as had been done in the case of former Vice Chancellor, in the same way they should twist the arm of the present Vice Chancellor. They talked about the Regulations and Rules, but he should be told as to under which Regulation and Rules, the Affiliation Committee has been formed.

When certain members objected, the Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Subhash Sharma to conclude.

Continuing Dr. Subhash Sharma stated that, which he is going to say, would be bitter, but he has to say it. The Vice Chancellor is saying they should appoint anyone except this person, why did they want to allow present Dean of Student Welfare to continue. Why have they become obstinate to appoint only this person by humiliating others? There are so many reasons for this, though there are several cases for this, he would like to tell them the background of one of the case. What is happening in the office of the Dean of Student Welfare of this University, is that an application was received in the office of the Dean of Student Welfare on 15.5.2014 and the application was from the brother of President of National Students Union of India (NSUI) of that

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

time. In his application, he had stated that here capital diabetes have become and health issues have also arisen at the campus; hence, he should be allotted a shop at the campus. What Dean of Student Welfare did is that he immediately formed a Committee and at that time Professor Navdeep Goyal was the Dean of Student Welfare and the Committee which was formed comprised of Professor Emanuel Nahar. He would like to tell them as to why they are adamant to appoint Professor Nahar as Dean of Student Welfare. Committee recommended that since it is good, a good shop at a nominal rent should be allotted to him. Resultantly, a shop was allotted to him in a building, which is a pride of this University. A shop was allotted by the office of the Dean of Student Welfare without any open auction, informing the other persons and by misusing the office of Dean of Student Welfare. This is only a tip of the iceberg and he could tell them several such cases which are going on in this office for the last 7-8 years. As such, people are using this office for their own benefits. They might have listened about 2-G Spectrum. What was that? The case was that spectrum was allotted to those, who were their favourite ones. There the spectrum was in their hands and here the allotment of shop was in their hands. This is only the reason, they wanted the present Dean of Student Welfare to continue.

At this stage, a pandemonium prevailed as several members started speaking together and also levelled allegations against each other.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stated that they are not participated in the discussion since morning because the entire agenda have been routed through the Syndicate. It is being tried to say as if the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate are at loggerhead. From January onwards at least 6-7 meetings of the Syndicate (having about 25-30 items each) have been held and about 250 total items had been already been approved. He (Vice Chancellor) should make a statement on how many items the consensus was not arrived at. If 250 items brought by the Vice Chancellor had been approved by the Syndicate, even though he had less feedback than the members, what did they expect from them? The Vice Chancellor should make a statement that the Syndicate did not accept his this particular recommendation. Only on two issues, they had difference of opinion. Just before him, somebody was saying that they (Syndicate) had removed someone from the post of Dean Research by arm twisting him (Vice Chancellor). On how many issues, they have humiliated the Vice Chancellor. When he (Vice Chancellor) appoint someone, who was at number 4 or 5 in the seniority, did he not humiliate someone? They had requested him (Vice Chancellor) that he should not start this practice so that the Vice Chancellors, who would follow him, would not face any problem and appoint Dean Research on seniority basis. Were they right on this or not? Secondly, he had brought this item relating to Dean of Student Welfare and he himself had requested him to make the recommendation and despite his requesting thrice, he (Vice Chancellor) did not make any recommendation. If he (Vice Chancellor) wanted to discontinue with the services of someone, he must have record that he (person concerned) has failed on these cases. If nothing like that has happened, on what basis the Syndicate could discontinue him. It is being said again and again that they wanted to bring in their own person, he should be told as to whom they wanted to bring in. It meant, all the provisions which existed in the Act, should be abolished because he has come and he needed his force. Has he ever been stopped for any work by an Officer or the Syndicate? He has got those items approved from them (Syndicate), which Departments did not have even a single teacher because he had told that he wanted to do this as he wanted to start this Course. Even though there was no laboratory, he had got the seats of M.Sc. increased to double despite their requesting him to see that it is not viable. By sitting in the House of this University, they are talking about private Universities, where there are no service conditions. Could they compare the Act of private Universities with the Act of Panjab University? They must see as to what they

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

are doing. He is surprised that someone has made a mention about the Affiliation Committee. He is present in the House where several teachers and Principals and other Fellows are present, and if they would like to discussion about any of the affiliated Colleges, 10 minutes time should be given to the Dean College Development Council and put a heap of files before him, if they see that impartiality has been done to any of the College, he would leave the House.

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

The Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua to conclude.

Continuing, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that he (Vice Chancellor) has got several items approved from them (Syndicate). However, if they have requested him on two Items, that too, because he did not want to make his recommendation, their recommendations should be accepted. To this, it is being said that they would not follow the Act, Syndicate is humiliating him and so on and so forth.

Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan intervened to say that they themselves had said that no Affiliation Committee would be formed. Then how the Affiliation Committee was formed?

Continuing, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he appealed that all the files relating to grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation should be brought and discussed at any place. So far as this Item 7 is concerned, this should be approved.

At this stage, Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that a Committee of the Senate should be constituted and everything would be clear.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma stated that he had to speak on Item 5, but he was given opportunity. A lot of discussions had taken place here saying that there should not be politics here, which is very good, where there is democracy, politics is and would always be played, and all of them would agree with him. However, the politics to this level should not be played. He had brought an Item in the original agenda relating to extension of appointments, but agenda relating to this Item on the tables was given to them something else. It is beyond their understanding. Could the Vice Chancellor explain as what transpired in those two days that he has to change the agenda? The appointment of Dean of Student Welfare was to be recommended by the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate. The Vice Chancellor is one amongst equal out of the 16 members of the Syndicate, though he is chairing the meeting on behalf of the Chancellor. If the Vice Chancellor had not make any recommendation, it was their duty to recommend the name(s) and they have done it as per the norms and these appointments should be extended.

Principal N.R. Sharma stated that since morning the Hon'ble members are talking about Regulations and Rules. According to him, the biggest problem is only because of the Regulations and Rules, reason being that they started changing the Regulations and Rules from the months of October/November and the process continued up to the month of December. Dr. Subhash Sharma has just remarked "Show me the face and I will show you the rule(s)". It is a fact; rather, confirmed fact. Secondly, it should also be told that where it is written that after every two minutes the Senators come to the Well. Perhaps, it might also be a part of their Regulations and Rules. Thirdly, he is saying it very heavy heart that at least the Officers should be given some grace/respect. It is not an issue whether they should grant extension to Professor Emanuel Nahar or not, but such a long unwanted discussion should not take place. He

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

further said that what is the need of extension. Have they not a suitable person or they wanted to oblige someone? From where the need for extension came? If there was some suitable person with them, then he must have been told gracefully. In case they had even to oblige someone, in that case too, it should have been told that they have to oblige someone. He further said that so far as his view is concerned, the matter of extension is not appropriate in terms of the fact that they have Professors, and they are good workers, opportunity be given to them. Secondly, there has been a clear cut strong reservation expressed by the Vice Chancellor. When the Vice Chancellor has expressed his strong reservation and the Syndicate has been mandating that the extension be given to Professor Emanuel Nahar and despite of that fact the item has been brought in the Senate. He said that after bringing the item in the Senate, he is of the opinion that Prof. Emanuel Nahar should have left the position gracefully. Let the situation be handled by the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that it looked to him very nice today and as has been said by Principal N.R. Sharma that where there is assembly of people, politics prevails. That scene of politics has been made to be seen today. He said that in real terms, the political game was being played in this house on this day. Secondly, here are so many colleagues of him and he is not of their category and most of the people think that they are not with them. He further said that the Dean Research was reverted back after one and half month because he (Vice Chancellor) had worked against rules and regulations and strong reservation of the Syndicate was put upon him. He said that whatever he has done, has done wrong. It might be whosoever it may be either the member of the Senate or the Syndicate who will say that whatever has been done wrong, should be made right. Many a speakers who have spoken earlier to him and placed the view that show me the face and they will show the rule.

The Vice Chancellor asked him to conclude.

On this, Shri Naresh Gaur said that they have come here for discussion and if the Vice Chancellor wants him to go out he would quit. He said that he has spoken only two lines and he (Vice Chancellor) has asked him to conclude.

The Vice Chancellor said that let Shri Naresh Gaur keeps on speaking and they are here for the cause of the University.

Shri Naresh Gaur continued saying that he did not want to name any one. He has been fighting over an issue for the last six years that when he happened to visit a college and he said that there was a complaint against the college and when he visited there, he pointed out the discrepancy but later he was replaced by the another person from this very House and the affiliation was granted to that college. He had sent several emails to the office of the Vice Chancellor. The Registrar was also been informed through seven copies of emails that the college whose affiliation has been approved, does not fulfill the requirement.

The Vice Chancellor said that other speakers have also to speak he requested Shri Naresh Gaur to summarize his statement.

Shri Gaur continued saying that whatever have spoken on Dean Student Welfare, he being a member of the Syndicate and he had got many a things recorded there also. As has been stated, that Vice Chancellor with folded hands made requests, they themselves also had requested the Vice Chancellor that whatever was the selection of the person was on the part of the Vice Chancellor, let that be known to the Syndicate, and it has been on the record that the Vice Chancellor had no problem with Professor Emanuel Nahar, it is recorded in the minutes of the Syndicate but he does

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

not like him. He said that it was the same thing when one would say that he does not like his face, he should not come to the office the next day. He said that the University would not run in this way. The Senate, Syndicate of University has been formed with some system, with some law, with some rules and regulations. Every section has been given a representation in the Syndicate and Senate. This has been done, in order to facilitate that whatever has been talked of the structural changes, governance reforms, and it was very true that it should happen but the thinking is questionable. He said that forty eight members of the Senate had already given him in writing that this item should be passed.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that all the members have been advising the Vice Chancellor, then why not the three names are not being given by him. He further said that the names could be given by this time, nothing has lapsed by now. Either of the names would be selected. All have been requesting the Vice Chancellor and he should show his grace and bring the names in the Syndicate. He said that all say that Vice Chancellor should do this or that. Last time in 2018, when the Senate meeting was held in March when Professor Nahar was sitting on the seat where he (Mukesh Arora) is sitting now, it was said by Professor Emanuel Nahar in that meeting that the election are due and he should be given one year extension instead of three months extension because there surmounts so many problems later on. The whole of the Senate then had said that let it be given. We all revert to our words and at that time all had said that let the extension of one year be given. Now Professor Emanuel Nahar must have shown grace and should have left the post. Now there is no recommendation of the Vice Chancellor. As one of the members had asked as to if there is any FIR lodged against Professor Nahar for which he be removed. He would later question the House was any FIR lodged against Dean Research, for which he was removed. He said that to whom he (Vice Chancellor) consider better, he could be appointed as Dean of Student Welfare.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that she has recently recalled her memory that in the history of Panjab University, there has never been an incident of holding of a Senate meeting on working day except in emergency. She further added that by fixing the meeting of the Senate on working day, they have done a great loss to the University. She had come to know that a meeting of the Senate is fixed for today.

Shri Varinder Singh, while pointing towards Mrs. Anu Chatrath, said that they never make an issue when they are put on the Committees on working days. Now keeping a Senate meeting on working day is an issue. This is also a work of the University. He said that when they go on inspection duty on working day, why could not they hold meeting of Senate on working day?

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that in case the Vice Chancellor wants debate and deliberation on each issue, the meeting should be held on non-working day. She said that in case anyone disagrees to her on this view, he/she can do so. She stated that Mr. Varinder Singh keeps so much of influence that he made to hold the meeting on working day. On this Shri Varinder Singh replied that he has no power. Rather Mrs. Anu Chatrath hold power and knows how to distort the power.

Dr. Subash Sharma said that on working day, the good strength attendance of House is there.

Shri Varinder Singh continued saying that they have so many great personalities from them the University could draw great benefits. He said that one things needs to be noted that for the last six seven years, when Professor Arun Kumar Grover was the Vice Chancellor and till the date, it should be seen as to how many issues relating to

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

the welfare of the University and of the students have been raised. He further said that as and when any new Vice Chancellor joins, there are few people who intend that the Vice Chancellor should work according to them. They have only one point agenda that to get their works done by twisting the arm or by kneeling before the Vice Chancellor. He said that they carry only one motive, yet there are three four people, whom he did not want to name, their main purpose is to make settings with the Vice Chancellor. The historical background of this phenomenon he would like to tell is that the Dean of University Instruction, Professor Dinesh Gupta had been performing wonderfully. He was removed from the DUI by Syndicate in 2017 on the pretext that there happened an incident of stone pelting and he failed to control the situation. He said that there took a great discussion on this issue in the Syndicate and he was favouring Professor Dinesh Gupta. He said that at that moment, it was his very version that the Dean of Student Welfare was intensely involved in the event, as to why he be not removed. He said that he was alone in the fight and nobody supported him in the Syndicate. He said that the number game of the same nature is being played today and this number game rules even of today. The players know it very well as to how to increase or decrease the numbers, as they have been over here for the last 40 years. He said that these are the very people who had sometimes earlier had demanded that a CBI inquiry be conducted against the then Dean Student Welfare. These are the those members, who did say that the CBI inquiry be held of the DSW. He said that the document which has been given to the Vice Chancellor bearing the signatures of 48 members demanding that this or that be done. He said he would also sign the same if it is demanded that the CBI inquiry be conducted against the former Dean Student Welfare. He said that the former Dean of Student Welfare, if consider himself free of any allegation, then he should have no objection for conducting any inquiry against him. He further said that the University is meant for the welfare of the students. But what is being dealt here is that they play politics and there has never come an issue concerning the welfare of the students. He said that unless and until there lacks coordination between the Vice Chancellor and the Dean of Student Welfare, until then, nothing could be done for the welfare of the students. He cited the instance of stone pelting in which the students have been suffering even of today and nothing has been done towards that. It was because of their politics that the Dean of University Instruction was removed and no action was taken against the Dean of Student Welfare. He said that if the things are seen from the point of view of the welfare of the students, then there must necessarily be a coordination between the Vice Chancellor and the Dean of Student Welfare. He said that he would now tell that if the Dean of Student Welfare have to be changed, how he could be changed.

He continued stating that the second issue is that when any resolution has to be brought to the Senate, it should be brought with the consent of the Vice Chancellor and of the Syndicate. There was no consensus between them in the Syndicate. The Syndicate has been working as one party. In case of no consensus, the ultimately work is to be done by the Senate. He said that he has no concern as to who will be selected for DSW, but the process should be done in a fair manner. There should be no number game. The practice of arm twisting by distorting the rules and regulations should be stopped. He said that his request to the Vice Chancellor is only that the forty eight members who have given in writing to the Vice Chancellor that this or that should be done, let they bring the resolution that the former Dean of Student Welfare be examined of the charges levelled against him by the CBI and he will also sign the same document of being forwarded by the forty eight members.

The Vice Chancellor asked Shri Varinder Singh as to what was his opinion on item No. 7.

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

On this, Shri Varinder Singh said that his opinion is that if the name of the persons has not been proposed in the Syndicate, the name could now be proposed and the proposed person could be appointed as Dean Student Welfare.

Shri Rajinder Bhandari said that he is very grateful to the whole of the House for their having expressed welcome in the Senate. He said that he had been there in the Senate for four terms. He know the older people and he have seen them working here over the period of time and listened their speeches. He said that there are some people who mould the Calendars and if the calendar is not there, then the other documents as per their convenience. He would further the statement of Shri Satya Pal Jain on this item. He said that the quotation which has emphatically been quoted here that the Senate may on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate. He said that one of his learned colleague has stated that the Vice Chancellor had not given any name and the Syndicate has done in its own wisdom. He asked as to where it has been written that if the Vice Chancellor does not recommend a name, the Syndicate would decide in its wisdom. He said that this item cannot come to the Senate as it is. This item does not have legs to stand. It was not tenable, infructuous. He said that the matter be reverted back to the Syndicate and Vice Chancellor's recommendation would go to the Syndicate and the Syndicate should give its recommendation along with the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor, it is only after that the route of the Senate be followed. He said that in the meantime, till the arrangement is not made, the Vice Chancellor may appoint a person as Dean Student Welfare as he deems suitable. He said that till that time, the item be dropped, withdrawn as it is not acceptable in its present form because it is bad at law.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that, first of all, he wants to be proud of the procedure of the Syndicate. So many issues have come to fore for discussion. This issue has just now been raised by Shri Rajinder Bhandari that this item is infructuous. But where is the power with the Vice Chancellor that he can take decision at his (Vice Chancellor) own level if the item is infructuous. It has nowhere been written in Calendar. He further said that it has also been stated that the decisions are taken on the basis of the faces. It looks to him that the people who were opposing the selection, they are just opposing it on the basis of face and there are no other reasons. It has nowhere been pointed out by the Vice Chancellor that the DSW was not competent or he had any problem with the present Dean Student Welfare. He further added that he was not in the habit of stretching the issues long. He said that there had raised an issue that there remained 10 to 15 days in the students elections, the present DSW must continue because the process of election has already begun and the present DSW understands the situation and he can conduct the election in better way and it was for the benefit of the University one year's extension be granted to him.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that all here are wiser and experienced to him and persons like Dr. Rajinder Bhandari, who served long in the Senate. He said that he has been feeling lonely here today because he is neither from the A party or B party. Nobody would support him. He will reflect only the facts, that too, on the basis of the papers which have come to him. The papers, which have come, under which Act they are covered. He was surprised to see that many have been advocating that the powers be given to the Vice Chancellor but as per Act no one can give powers to the Vice Chancellor. He said that if there was any other powerful thing beyond the Act, that could only be the Supreme Court orders and nothing was beyond that which gives powers to Vice Chancellor that he may dominate others and appoint the DSW at his own. It has well been said that for the welfare of the University, the coordination between the Vice Chancellor and the Dean Student Welfare is compulsory. He further said that Hon'ble Minister from State of Punjab, Shri Tripat Bajwa is from his Education Department and as a courtesy, he had gone down to see him off, the

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

students on the gate has been saying that by replacing Professor Nahar, Professor Davinder Singh would be appointed as DSW. He does not know how his name came. It was discussed nowhere in the Senate or in the Syndicate. The students knew that Professor Davinder Singh was being appointed as DSW. If there was any such type of name, it should have been told in the Syndicate so that they could have considered it. If the Syndicate have not considered it, then they may tell in the Senate, it could be considered here. He said that there had been instances when they had requested the former Vice Chancellor, Professor A.K. Grover that he should not go into the structural reform, it was his request before the Vice Chancellor it be made known to them as to what should they consider. For the last three years all have been observing and all are speaking but are unable to decide what is to be done. No one knows about it as no name was being given by the Vice Chancellor. It was not sure as to whether the name given by the Vice Chancellor would be accepted or not. It was just like the property dealership that they make mutual understanding with the Syndicate or the Senate. There was no issue of rules and regulations. He said that if seen from the point of view of rules and regulations, then it was a very significant post. The Senate elections are due next year and the people put queries to them because they are the elected members that what have they done, they had gone after taking leave. Tell them as to what should be their reply. They will have to face the public tomorrow morning. It was very regretful that there had come an item and leave the one person, let the Vice Chancellor appoints two persons instead of one and get it passed in the next Senate. He continued saying that they have the need of an officer and all the members were talking about Professor Nahar. He further said that there are total three persons and two of them are the ladies. About them, no one has talked about and most of the stress was being given to Professor Nahar. He said that if the Vice Chancellor has any problem with Professor Nahar, then let the Vice Chancellor retire him. He may be ordered to go to his home. They have to go by rules and regulations. Nobody from left or right would support him and neither he has any party. He has been talking about by seeing the papers and not the face. He said that on the basis of the paper which are in his hand and according to these papers, as per the provision which was there in the Act was that the Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor has recommended it. In the proceedings of the Syndicate, it has been stated to the Vice Chancellor time and again and it could be that the Vice Chancellor might not have made up his mind or it may be that from whom the Vice Chancellor had to ask, and they have not informed the Vice Chancellor in time. It was not known what was the reason because of which the Vice Chancellor could not tell the name. He continued saying that Professor Emanuel Nahar should be allowed to continued and Professor Nahar will retire till May 2020 and the item of his extension be passed.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that about the validity of the item his first question to the Vice Chancellor was that he (Vice Chancellor) had expressed his strong reservations whether it was particularly for one person or against all the three.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was for all the three.

Shri Randhawa continued saying that if the strong reservation be given against three persons, it should be given on record and the headline of the item should have been made up of that. He said that it was the duty of the Vice Chancellor that the explanation of that, should also be given so that all the people may discuss it with open mindedness. He further said that without coordination no machinery can work. He agreed to this point. The reciprocal faith of the Team and the Vice Chancellor on each other was so essential. The Vice Chancellor first of all should have kept ready the alternatives names with him as per the provision of the Calendars for replacement of all the three. Those names are not with the Vice Chancellor. These names should have been brought in the light of the strong reservation of the Vice Chancellor. He continued

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

saying that secondly, for the last so many years, the team which has been working over here, the main objective of that team is that their main link remains with the welfare of the students and in those activities, one democratic activity is the student elections. If there was any issue relating to students election, or if it has not been conducted in a prescribed manner that should also be told here. If there had been any unfair means, that should also be brought fore. If the Dean Student Welfare performed all his activities in rightful manner, then his view is that the same thing should be extended and if the new team will be appointed by this time, and the election are due in another ten to fifteen day, it might not be such that because of inexperienced hand, there might come another crises. He said that he wanted to share his experience in this regard. It is the matter of 1997 and the things happened in the same manner and he had contested that election and the same scenario had emerged and they realized later on that a situation had become cause for an agitation and it resulted into bitterness. He said that there has already occurred an agitation and students have suffered a lot on that cause on which they are required to work. The Senate had passed in one voice that the cases against the students should be withdrawn and dropped. He said that while keeping all these things in view, it is his contention that this very team should be allowed to continue, it would be a better way.

Dr. S.S. Sangha said that there were two resolves to the issue. All the Syndicate members here have been saying that if the Vice Chancellor would have given the names but he has not come with the names. If they are stating this with full honesty, then one solution to the issue is that the item be taken back to the Syndicate and names should be provided there. The second thing is that if it is to be resolved immediately, then as there have been sitting so many people from other than this University, if the desire is to put the crises to an end, the names could be furnished very much here. If they want to linger on the issue, then the issue would not be resolved anyway. All the politics shall have to be disbanded with. He said that any suitable candidate could be appointed as Dean of Student Welfare.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that they had already an elaborated debate and lot of things have been said by many of them, so he would be very brief. He said that his view was that this regulation was very clear that a joint responsibility of the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate to make a recommendation. Now as one of those functionaries have not given his recommendation, he is at the loss to understand why they have been discussing the issue in this way and spending so much time on this issue. This needed to have been sorted out Syndicate itself and a joint recommendation should have been before them here so that there would not have been difference between the two. He said that he thinks that it is a matter of checks and balances. It was only because of that peculiar provision in the Calendars, that these checks and balances have been incorporated in the provisions of the Calendars. So in that sense, because and there is a reason for that, the Vice Chancellor needs full cooperation and full coordination with these vital functionaries, so there needs to be full coordination and not the optimum confidence in this respect is not unfair to lodge him with the team which did not get him along. Therefore, considering that he is responsible for implementation of what has been happening in the University and the decision taken by the Senate and the Syndicate. So it is all important that these people should be in full cooperation with the Vice Chancellor. So he said that it is his suggestion that the matter be taken back to the Syndicate, then discuss it together and when the recommendation from both sides come, then come to the Senate.

Dr. Jagdeep Kumar said that on this issue he wanted to say only this that when this issue came in the Syndicate, it was the issue of extension and thereafter the nature of agenda was changed and the Syndicate with folded hands as has been stated by Shri Sandeep Sikhri that Vice Chancellor was requested to suggest names and was

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

given time, it took two to three hours but it should not be taken as critical that the Vice Chancellor remained arrogant and no name was recommended by him. Then the Syndicate proposed the name that now they have to choose at their own. As has been stated by Shri Prabhjit Singh, it was quite right that the Vice Chancellor has the very right to select his team but the Act has not been giving such a power. As per provisions of the Act, the power rests with the Syndicate. It was only after that by any means the powers of the Syndicate be withdrawn, then do whatever the Vice Chancellor wants to do at his own. In Syndicate too, this was discussed that whatever is to be decided, that shall be decided by the Senate and that would be final. He said that as the member of the Senate, he has the request to make this extension be passed and one year's extension be given to Professor Nahar.

On the point of order, Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the power rests with the Senate and not with the Syndicate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there have been ten pages of proceedings on this case, from page number 355 to 364. He tried it very hard, Shri Sanjay Tandon, Shri Satya Pal Jain and Professor Gurmeet, all have said that there should be coordination and cooperation. If the lines in 356 are read in all, which has been spoken by him (Vice Chancellor), at one place it has been said that he is par excellence and at one place, it has been said that they were fully cooperating with them. There was no sign anywhere on the part of the Vice Chancellor that they were not cooperating with him. The page number 356 was very clear and 357 was also very clear. So in that background, the issue has come to fore from beginning, that coordination should be there with the Vice Chancellor. It is not clear anywhere that there was no coordination. He (Vice Chancellor) says that they had a very good coordination. He was talking of all of the three and not only of Professor Nahar. The extension to all the three is to be given up to May 2020. Basically the item has been discussed in the name of Professor Nahar. The retirement of Professor Nahar falls on 31st of May, 2020. He said that his submission was that if there was no reaction of the Vice Chancellor here, on any count, the cooperation and coordination has fully been endorsed by the Vice Chancellor. He said that the item should be passed and all the three should be considered for extension.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that the discussion has been taking place on this item since morning, the ruling given by the Vice Chancellor on item No. 5, the history would be created for future of the governing bodies that if one's opinion is not imposed upon them, it would be reasonable. He said that it was his opinion otherwise there would be legal implications also talking about the item, he said that when it came to the Syndicate, it was brought by him (Vice Chancellor). The item which was brought, did relate to extension of DSW. He asked what was the option with the Syndicate. Either it should have been rejected or it should have been accepted by the Syndicate. That was the item which was unanimously recommended to the Senate that this was the proposal. He said that the Vice Chancellor neither gave his dissent but only said that he keeps his reservation and what was the reservation, that would be known to himself. He has not shared it with the members and told them that he would take it to the Senate and share his reservation there. He said that the Vice Chancellor should now share his view by now in the Senate. Some members might have told to him that the Syndicate would reject it. The name was not given with the presumption that the Syndicate would reject it and it would bring unfamiliar to him. He said that so far as Professor Emanuel Nahar is concerned, it was unfair to the man. If anybody has any objection against him, then the issue may be noted by the Vice Chancellor. He further said that please do not create an opinion that Senate and Syndicate are against you. He thought that it was only issue based. He said that Dr. Subhash Sharma has spoken that, so far as it was the concern of Professor Nahar, it is unfair to the man. If anybody

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

has any objection against him, then the issue be probed by the Vice Chancellor. Rather than appreciating his services that he has rendered to the University, he should not be inflicted with allegations that he was such and such and he has given the shop this or that way or rooms has been given to some students etc. He said that extension should be given.

While the Vice Chancellor asked Professor Rajesh Gill to speak, Professor Keshav Malhotra stood up and he asked the Vice Chancellor to let him speak for just two minutes. Mrs. Anu Chatrath also said that Professor Malhotra be allowed to speak. The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Malhotra to take his seat and said that if two minutes are given to everybody, then how much it would be by multiplying to seventy.

Professor Malhotra continued saying that he had been here for twenty years but the Vice Chancellor has only twenty months of working and the Vice Chancellor has tried to change the history and without going for voting, the decision has been given.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she had been here in the Senate since 2012 and there were many ups and downs and many highs and lows but the scene which has emerged today, was never seen and this is an institution which are monumental. For us, its meaning was something different. It is likely that some people could see it from some another angle. She said that everything she had got in her life it was only due to this institution. She has reverence for this institution and it pains to see how they have been working. It happens rarely that the meeting of the Senate happens in August, it usually is held in the month of September. She said that she was glad to see such a strength, in the start, it was very difficult to find a vacant seat, all had been filled and people were not in a hurry also. Otherwise, the people have got up and they always have any important tasks, they leave in the meantime. Today they have been sitting here and she was thinking that what was so much important issue? She said that she does not feel that this was so important. There are so many other important issues of the University which have never been taken up. They spend time on those and while exercising administration, they might dislike many a things but even then they have to follow that. It was not a matter of marking good or bad. She further said that once she was thoughtful of that Senate and Syndicate should be ended. There are so many irregularities. Now she thinks that it has saved them. If there would not have been Senate or Syndicate, then it was not known that as to what would have happened. Now as was being talked of that you show me the face and I will show you the rule, here it has been being allowed to speak by seeing the face and to someone it is not allowed to speak on the basis of face. This has become the case that some are stopped from speaking even after one sentence and some keep on speaking continuously and that is too the irrelevant. She said that she was also bothered about the respect that was to be given to the members of the Syndicate and Senate. If the respect of CEO is sought, then the members should also be respected. She said that it was not a fun for them to sit here for hours, they have also come here while leaving behind so many important tasks. She said that she may not be a minister but she had also a lot to do. She had been listening since morning. She said to the Vice Chancellor that leave to the rest, when it is talked of the Dean Research and when it is proclaimed that he was dropped unceremoniously and injustice done. She said that as PUTA President, as a fellow and as an ordinary teacher of the University, every teacher sees towards them, the Vice Chancellor has the discretion to appoint Dean of Student Welfare, Dean Research and what not, but let she remind him that this discretion has to be used strictly. There should be some rules and regulations. It should not be such that positions are determined on the basis of face. To check this practice, some good tasks has also been done. One of such good deed was that the Dean Research would be appointed on the basis of seniority and they were very happy with that. It is being said her that there happens the election of Deans, then it is said that let they be appointed on the basis of

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

seniority. If they are selected on seniority basis, then too violating the norms, pick and chose policy is adopted. It embarrasses them because they are also their colleagues.

The Vice Chancellor said she should come to Item 7.

Professor Rajesh Gill continued that there were so many speaking and that too irrelevant, and she will speak and shall complete, let what may come. She said that she does not want to name anyone but he has come with the colour of the shirt as of the Vice Chancellor's and spoken irrelevant. She further said that the issues, which she has been talking of, were very much important for them. These are relevant for their institution. They have drenched the institution with their own blood and they will not let it die. She said that Dean Research would be appointed on the basis of seniority and this will continue.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that in the Act there has been no mention of the seniority for the Dean Research, the competence shall prevail.

Professor Rajesh Gill continued saying that, that was what she was saying that they had evolved it.

On being interrupted by Dr. Subash Sharma, Professor Rajesh Gill said to the Vice Chancellor that if Dr. Subhash Sharma continued his interference, that would be considered as humiliation to her as a member of the Syndicate and the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Gill should go ahead.

Professor Gill said that if there was a lack of norms, the rules could be framed and they have made norms. She said that she has been saying time and again that Dean Research would be appointed on seniority basis. All the teachers in the University are very happy with the criteria. They will not allow the distract. Secondly, their viewpoint was also that the Wardens of the Hostels should also be appointed on seniority criteria. The PUTA President gave in written to him but he bothered never because there was to be made the pick and choose. By raising from the twelve thirteen number, the Wardens have been appointed. The teaching community feels grudge and disappointment. The administration cannot be run on such tactics. She said that they have to respect merit, calibre and seniority. She questioned that at least some rules should prevail. She said that so far as the issues of Syndicate and dictates of the Syndicate are concerned, it does not mean that if Syndicate takes some decision, they must collide with each other. She had been observing the Syndicate for the last so many years. The members who were sitting here, when they sit in the Syndicate, their behaviour is different. They have to respect to each other. If the Vice Chancellor has been sitting on such a nice and respectable Chair, she expects that he should treat all with the same yardstick. The pick and choose policy appears from this very point that should not be there. She further said that the issue of Dean Research should not be reopened here and she has a lot of other issues in hand.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he had been sitting very quietly in the corner and listening to the debate. He was wondering as to whether he should speak or not. He deliberated on it because he saw that in the debate which has taken place here in this house today, he really saw the collapse of all democratic structures. He said that they were talking of the restructuring of the governance reforms and other constitutional reforms that they must carry on. He said that he was the member of the Governance Reform Committee which had to study reforms. He wants to tell the Vice Chancellor that one thing which he has really come to the conclusion after reading the constitution of this University, the different regulations, different Acts that the forefathers of this University had actually done a great favour to all of us because he

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

cannot think of a more democratic document for which this University is one of the oldest University in the country. He further said that when today, he looked at the whole idea of dialogue to have to be brought to a low level, he himself feels humiliated sitting here in this house. He asked himself as an academician what he was doing there in this house. You are talking in terms of politics, rules, etc. You are talking of numbers but with no emphasis on rationality, to the idea of what really a debate is. He has been trained in attending seminars and debates. He knows how we listen to one another. He knows that he does not go to seminars with pre-conceived notions. He goes there with flexibility and today when he talks in terms of dialogue, I think this is central to democracy. Dialogue, the inevitability of dissent, are central to democracy. Therefore, give a chance to the people to speak. He said that he came from a department which actually teaches students to speak, to have dialogue in the class. He does not want to give a lecture here. He also does not think that any kind of collective team work, means humiliation of one and the ego of another. Let me tell him (Vice Chancellor) that he has been in the Syndicate for three or four times. He has been the member of the Senate for twelve years.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Shelly Walia should focus on the agenda item.

Professor Shelley Walia continued saying that let he be allowed to speak because he had been sitting quietly and had not interrupted, anyone. He said that what he was actually trying to say is that he (Vice Chancellor) must not have a closed mind. He respects him. He (Prof. Raj Kumar) is the Vice Chancellor of this University and he (Vice Chancellor) has not come here with pre-conceived ideas and that he was going to listen to a dialogue. There is no dialogue if he (Vice Chancellor) has made up his mind. But if this dialogue actually changes your mind, then he would think that every Seminar and every legal institution, what really come to a conclusion and the conclusion is a collective decision, a kind of amicable decision without pointing a finger at you and without you (Vice Chancellor) pointing a finger at others. Do not try to victimize others and therefore if there is a dialogue, if there is some kind of academic understanding between us, then let them come to a decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that he must conclude what he was telling.

Professor Shelley Walia continued stating that he is a student of literature as well as of politics. But actually he was trying to emphasise that come to a decision and do not have a closed mind.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Walia should tell him, what to do.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he would tell him what to do. What the Vice Chancellor must realize that high decibels will not bring a democratic decision. If there is a disagreement, then let them find a democratic means of solving it. By democratic he means, using the Voting procedure.

Professor Ajay Ranga said that he has one minute story to say.

The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Ranga to speak on the agenda.

Professor Ajay Ranga said that this relates very much to the agenda. He continued while narrating the story that there was a king and after clashing with his ministers, make someone a Wazir. Within one month, Wazir reduced the king even below the rank of Wazir. After some time, the king bought a canon and told the Wazir that he will shot him away from where he (the king) was sitting. Then the Wazir advised

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

the king neither to point the canon towards him nor he will destroy his kingdom. He said to the King that let the king reigns the power and also let him (Wazir) enjoy the power, and they will try this canon on the public. He said that the shooting pipe of that gun is towards this House. The bullet of that gun could fall on the Vice Chancellor, probably may fall on him (Dr. Ranga), tomorrow it may fall on Dr. Gurmeet and at anybody else. He said that what was the dispute of wazirship, it was only for gaining of power. He said that this is the issue of power-shifting. It is neither the matter against Professor Nahar nor anyone else. He further said the gun has been loaded on the shoulders of Professor Nahar and since morning for about three four hours, he is being de-dressed. He said that it is a kind of legal issue and his view on this is that the situation, which has been created, is a legal problem and on this Shri V.K. Sibal and Dr. Rajidner Bhandari has deliberated very ably. The matter has been tried to be winded up by terming it as a legal issue. He said that it appears to him that the issue deserves to be settled on legal terms.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he has the privilege of working with all the Vice Chancellors. This calendar has stood the test of time for more than one hundred years and would safely say that this is the most democratic calendar. Those people who are thinking about the structure change or drastic changes, they think it is a fight between the democracy and autocracy. Although particular people think about autocracy, they will be against democracy and it is the sacred duty of the Vice Chancellor to protect the dignity of this calendar. He said that whatever decision the Vice Chancellor should take, read the calendar, hold the spirit of that and that would be very good for the University as well as for you (Vice Chancellor). He said that this Syndicate has always stood by the Vice Chancellor, whenever there has been any particular point, they have stood by him. He said that the Vice Chancellor should take the decision which is in the best interest of the University without going for this or that rule. He said that everybody talked of Dean Research. He said that he told to the Vice Chancellor that appointment should be blind. Only a blind appointment, will have no repercussion whatsoever it could be scary. He further stated that he stood by the decision of the Syndicate because he was a part of that and the Vice Chancellor should also go by that.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that he thought that the matter is simple but obviously not. He would first try to point out that when a Professor accepts as Dean Student Welfare, he is making a sacrifice because his mind is occupied with students' problems, students' welfare, dealing with the fanatics of students with opposite things. So he has no time and even mental ability to continue this. So when a person gives this sort of service, he does it because he has some obligation to the institution. So whatever decision they may take, they should first record that we appreciate the service given by Professor Nahar for six years. That he has done it as a sort of sacrifice. Independently whatever decision they may take. Now the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate, they have to go together. Vice Chancellor and his officers have to work together. So they have to coordinate each other. He said that his suggestion is to endorse one which Dr. Bhandari and Shri V.K. Sibal has suggested, that they send this matter back to the Syndicate and request that the Vice Chancellor and Syndicate may please come with unanimous opinion. He also suggested that a note may also be appended showing that they have made a lot of investment and come with a consensus. He further said that he would also request the Senate to authorize that if came with common decision, the matter be implemented at that particular point and coming to the Senate later. Professor R.P. Bambah further stated that he would like to request the Senate to authorize the Vice Chancellor that if he comes with a decision, it should be informative. They wanted to give them so much responsibility again and again, but since the election of the students is coming and this team has a lot of experience, this should be allowed to continue till the election is over. He did not know whether the

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate would agree as to what should be done, but he is quite optimistic that if they (both the Vice Chancellor and Syndicate members) sit together, they would definitely be able to resolve the issue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is a well-wisher of the University and would like to inform the house about the history regarding appointment of Dean of Student Welfare which is always done on the recommendation of Vice-Chancellor. He stated that Professor A.S. Ahluwalia became the DSW but Syndicate in its wisdom recommended Professor Navdeep Goyal as Dean of Student Welfare. Later, Professor Navdeep Goyal built harmonious co-ordination with the then Vice-Chancellor Professor Arun Kumar Grover. Although, the then Vice-Chancellor had opposed the name of Professor Navdeep Goyal. History speaks itself. Later, when Professor Navdeep Goyal was relinquished his charge from the Post of Dean of Student Welfare, the Vice-Chancellor recommended the name of Professor J.K. Goswami as Dean of Student Welfare, but the Syndicate in its wisdom recommended the name of Professor Emanuel Nahar as Dean of Student Welfare.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra to conclude.

Professor Malhotra requested for some more time in order to make the house aware about the history. He further stated that this is the beauty of democratic set up. He appreciated that the views expressed by Professor Shelly Walia. He requested the house to discuss and express their views in open mind and also requested the Chair should not be closed mind. He further said that he is sharing experience with them that Professor Emanuel Nahar has done a very good job. Needless to say, every Dean of Student Welfare has to work in coordination with the Vice-Chancellor. As far as the working of Professor Nahar is concerned, he is one of the best Dean of Student Welfare. Had he (Professor Malhotra) been a D.S.W., he would have reacted to students problems. Professor Emanuel Nahar is polite and had no major problem with the students, owing to which, nothing has been reported or brought to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor. He has sorted out majority of the problems at his own level. Keeping this view, he requested that the decision of the Syndicate on three names, i.e., Professor Emanuel Nahar, Professor Neena Kaplash and Professor Ranjan Kumar, who have done a tremendous job and are still doing, should be allowed to be continued. During their tenure, the hostel accommodation facility has been very transparent. Now, online allocation of hostel facility has also been introduced. This makes the system transparent and no approach is being entertained. Earlier, the problem was that it had become very difficult to get the hostel accommodation without approach. Therefore, he requested the House that they should continue with good persons, i.e., Professor Emanuel Nahar and other two. In the end, he also said that on the recommendation of the Syndicate, which is under consideration, 48 members had given their consent in writing, that is should be passed.

Shri Anilesh Mahajan introduced himself to the House and informed that he is attending the meeting of the Senate for the first time. He wanted to share his viewpoints on certain issues. Though he is the youngest one in the House, he would like to tell them that the position of Dean of Student Welfare is an interface between the Vice-Chancellor and students. In his opinion, if there is a deficit of trust between them, the present Dean of Student Welfare should voluntarily withdraw himself/herself. Secondly, the extension in service should not be treated as an entitlement; rather, it should be treated as an extra ordinary provision. At this stage, no further extension should be given in the term of appointment of Dean of Student Welfare. Being an alumnus of this University, it was very sad to hear that University had been debarred from the status of Potential for Excellence. According to him, this situation occurs

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

because of only two reasons, viz. shortage of faculty and lack of reputation. First of all, the faculty should be trained by giving new assignments.

Ms. Anu Chatrath requested the Vice-Chancellor that before he announced the resolved part, he should consider the written statement signed by 48 members in support of this agenda, which has been submitted to him.

At this stage, a din prevailed as certain members started speaking together.

The Vice Chancellor said that since this matter has come through the Syndicate, decision on this could only be reached after arriving at a consensus. So there is no opinion on these names, therefore, these persons are not to be continued. Whatever the senior members have advised him through the discussion and observations, the same would be taken care of. Accordingly, they would proceed further.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor announced break for lunch.

When the meeting was just to resume after the lunch, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that before the meeting is resumed, she want to place on record, the way he (Vice-Chancellor) had conducted the Senate meeting before lunch.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that since the Registrar has to go, from now onward, the Finance and Development Officer would act as Secretary of the Senate.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that before the meeting is resumed, she, on behalf of her friends, want to go on record, the way he (Vice-Chancellor) had conducted the proceedings of the Senate before lunch, that is not acceptable in the democratic set up. 48 persons gave written representation and as a mark protest, they have boycotted the lunch. If he (Vice-Chancellor) wanted respect, he should extend the same to others. At this point of time, some other members started speaking together, which created commotion.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the members to take up Item C-8 for consideration.

XI.

Considered **(Item C-8 on the agenda)** that minutes dated 22.05.2019 (Item 1, 4, 6, 8) of the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor, for framing and printing of Rules and Regulations of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree in accordance with the UGC minimum Standards and Procedure for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree as per Appendix, be approved with the following changes:

- (i) That point (c) under item 6 (I) of the minutes dated 22.5.2019, be deleted; and
- (ii) That Item 6(II) of the minutes dated 22.5.2019, be read as under:

“The Committee further RESOLVED the GATE/GPAT or any other national level test meant for admission to Ph.D./M.Phil. would be valid forever and the amendment be made in the Ph.D. Guidelines and be placed before the Syndicate for approval. However the validity of PU University Entrance test for admission to Ph.D./M.Phil. courses would be 3 years.

(Syndicate dated 28.5.2019 Para 20)

Senate Proceedings dated 22nd August, 2019

Professor Akhtar Mahmood started speaking; however, despite request from the Chair, several members started speaking together and a din prevailed.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the members many times to maintain the decorum of the House and let the proceeding of the House be continued in a decent manner.

At this stage, several members of the house started speaking together and din again prevailed.

The Vice-Chancellor requested all the members to let the house function in the decent manner. However, the members stood up and started shouting at each other. Thinking that the situation might go out of control, the meeting adjourned sine die. Thereafter, the National Anthem was played.

(Vikram Nayyar)
Officiating Registrar

CONFIRMED

(RAJ KUMAR)
VICE-CHANCELLOR