

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the **SENATE** held on **Saturday, 28th September 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. Professor Akhtar Mahmood
4. Dr. Anita Kaushal
5. Dr.(Mrs.) Amita Rishi
6. Dr. Ajay Ranga
7. Dr. Amit Joshi
8. Dr. Ameer Sultana
9. Dr. Amar Singh
10. Ms. Anu Chatrath
11. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
12. Dr. Baljinder Singh
13. Dr. B.C. Josan
14. Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu
15. Shri Deepak Kaushik
16. Dr. Dalip Kumar
17. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhwa
18. Professor Emanuel Nahar
19. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma
20. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
21. Dr. Gurmit Singh
22. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua
23. Dr. Harsh Batra
24. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
25. Mrs. Indu Malhotra, DPI (Colleges), Punjab
26. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu
27. Smt. Kirron Kher
28. Professor J.K. Goswamy
29. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
30. Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta
31. Dr. Jarnail Singh
32. Dr. K.K. Sharma
33. Professor Keshav Malhotra
34. Professor Manoj K. Sharma
35. Professor Mukesh Arora
36. Shri Manoj Kumar Parida
37. Shri Naresh Gaur
38. Professor Navdeep Goyal
39. Dr. N.R. Sharma
40. Dr. Neeru Malik
41. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu
42. Dr. Nisha Bhargawa
43. Professor Pam Rajput
44. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
45. Dr. Parveen Goyal
46. Shri Prabhjit Singh
47. Principal Paramjit Singh

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

48. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
49. Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mahajan
50. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
51. Dr. Raj Kumar Chabbewal
52. Professor Rajat Sandhir
53. Professor R.P. Bambah
54. Professor Rajesh Gill
55. Professor Ronki Ram
56. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
57. Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, D.H.E., Chandigarh
58. Professor S.K. Sharma
59. Shri Sandeep Singh
60. Shri Sanjay Tandon
61. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur
62. Dr. Surinder Kaur
63. Professor Shelley Walia
64. Shri Satya Pal Jain
65. Dr. S.S. Sangha
66. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
67. Shri Sandeep Kumar
68. Shri Sanjeev Bandlish
69. Shri Tript Rajinder Singh Bajwa, Education Minister, Pb.
70. Dr. Vipul Narang
71. Shri V.K. Sibal
72. Professor Karamjeet Singh ... (Secretary)
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Shri Anilesh Mahajan
2. Dr. Amod Gupta
3. Shri Amanpreet Singh
4. Capt. Amarinder Singh, Chief Minister
5. Professor B.S. Ghuman
6. Professor Chaman Lal
7. Chief Justice, Punjab & Haryana High Court
8. Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi
9. Dr. Harjodh Singh
10. Dr. Inderjit Kaur
11. Shri Parmod Kumar
12. Shri Rajinder Bhandari
13. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
14. Shri Raj Kumar Bhatia
15. Shri Subhash Sharma
16. Shri Som Parkash Kainth
17. Professor Shankarji Jha
18. Dr. Satish Kumar
19. Shri Tarlochan Singh
20. Shri Varinder Singh.

The Vice Chancellor wished good morning to all Hon'ble members of this august House, on his own behalf as well as on behalf of the entire Panjab University fraternity, who have come to this special meeting of the Senate for the specific agenda. He also welcomed and greet each one of them and hoped that everything is fine at their ends.

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

The Vice Chancellor stated that before taking up the specific agenda, he would like to share with them something because he has completed one year of his tenure. He would like to inform them about the achievements made by the University. It is a well known University and the Senate as well as the entire fraternity of the University's is proud of its illustrious history, achievements and philosophy. University is known not only in India, but in the entire world. Its matter of great proud that, in this Senate, there are number of distinguished Scientists, Law Makers, Researchers and Statesmanship, who showed their presence and contributed a lot for the betterment of the University from time to time. Owing to the past legacy of 139 years, this University is known throughout the world. However, when he came and joined this University, although he came from a very big Institute/University, he could tell them that this University (Panjab University) is unparalleled. He reiterated that it is only because of the contribution of the entire fraternity, particularly the Governing Body as they had contributed every time for the development and growth of the University. He respected each and every member of the Senate and whenever there was anything, he consulted them to have their opinion as well as blessings, and that was why, on completion of one year, he has been able to contribute towards the system for which he would like to name few of them. With their blessings, support and fullest cooperation, which they had extended during the last one year, the University has got a very good ranking, although the overall ranking has slipped a little bit. But when they talked about the innovation, it is only University in the system, which has got number one rank, and it is a matter of great satisfaction and pleasure for all of them. They would be happy to know that in this race none of the University is ahead of them in terms of ranking so far as innovation is concerned. Similarly, so far as Pharmaceuticals is concerned, they have also excelled in the domain of Pharmaceuticals department and recently got satisfactory - US ranking. Further, they would also happy to know that they have won MAKATROPHY after a span of 14 years, which is also with the blessings of all of them. During this period, they have submitted a number of projects, and there is a favorable response to every project and they did not get any negative on any of them. Recently, they have got a very good sign. RUSA is planning to give them a grant of Rs.50 crore. Although they have a put in a lot of efforts for this grant, with their blessings, they are now able to get this grant. On the other hand, they have been devoting their valuable time for the smooth functioning of the University. Again the long pending issues relating to promotions of teachers, and with their help the same had been taken care of. At the same time, the issue regarding grant of two increments for Ph.D., which was overdue, has also been got settled with the grace of God and with your support and blessings. There are certain constraints as everything was fixed, and when they talked about anything that they are being repeatedly told that their posts are fixed as well as their grant. However, at least positive atmosphere has been created during the last one year that they are getting all the support from the senior Officers belonging to various Ministries. Hopefully, all these things would be in the situation of getting released and they would be able to work on that vertical and hopefully good results would be followed. The biggest challenge, which they might be facing in the new future for which their continuous input and support is absolutely necessary for the smoothing functioning and growth of the University, is that the University is to be assessed by the NAAC, which would be done in 2022 and that is a great challenge before the University and him as the head of the University. In fact, it is a great challenge for all of them. When they analyses the entire clauses, they must be aware that they are very-very poor on certain points. Although they could do that, owing to certain limitations and other things, they are not able to do that, e.g., the ratio between the students and the teachers in Panjab University is very poor and they are unable to improve it. This is the biggest challenge before them. Unless and until the priority is fixed as it is a very big and heritage Institute, they have a big challenge to do that. Secondly, he would like to

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

tell them that he is a member of so many Committees and they are also members of certain Committees, in future, everywhere all the grants, posts, development, schemes and projects, would be linked to ranking. He goes everywhere and motivates faculty members for the FIST. They would be surprised to know that they have sent four applications for FIST. They are unable to send several applications because the requisite faculty did not exist in those Departments; otherwise, they would have sent proposal and got crores of rupees under the FIST. Their two-three proposals have got through. Only owing to this, they are lacking behind. Secondly, when they talked about the grants, the grants would also be associated with this saying that since their ranking is very poor, they would not be able to give them grant. The main reason that, at the moment, RUSA is favourable, is only because they have good ranking. Pleading on the basis of that they have now reached at this stage. In nutshell, he said that they have got this only because of good ranking. So this is the challenge, which they have to take into consideration. It is a great challenge because thereafter the entire scenario would be got changed as the same would be based on ranking. Since this is the highest body and with their support and cooperation all these things would be got corrected. He is continuously putting in his best efforts.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor stated that now, he would like to tell them about the position of Dean of Student Welfare for which they all are here and the Hon'ble members would deliberate. He has a great regard for all the faculty members and he would like to take decision according to their wishes. Whosoever has remained Dean of Student Welfare until now, everybody is making efforts to the best of one's ability. We are not supposed to evaluate the work of the academicians. According to him, everybody try his level best to work efficiently according to his/her ability and performed. In fact, let me state that many faculty members approached him and they offered to work as Dean of Student Welfare and they stressed that opportunity should be given to them also as they are also competent and want to work for the University. Since present Dean of Student Welfare has already worked for three terms, he was of the view that the other persons should also be given an opportunity. It is in this background that he instead earlier that some other name should also be considered; otherwise he did not have any other reservations. However, whatever their opinion would be, they would decide accordingly. With these words, he asked the Registrar (Secretary of the Senate) to read out the agenda item for the members.

It was said that this is a special meeting in pursuant to the order dated 18.09.2019 of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court passed in LPA 1547 of 2019 and the agenda is to consider agenda item C-7 of the Senate meeting dated 22.08.2019 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:**
1. The Senate in its meeting dated 22.08.2019 considered the above said item. The tentative minutes have already been circulated.
 2. The Vice-Chancellor vide order dated 22.08.2019 allowed the following arrangement with immediate effect till further orders:

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

- (i) Professor Jagat Bhusan, Principal-cum-Professor, Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., Chandigarh as Dean Student Welfare (Men).
 - (ii) Professor Nandita Shukla Singh, Dean International Students, P.U., Chandigarh as Dean Student Welfare (Women).
3. Professor Emanuel Nahar challenged office order dated 22.08.2019 by filing CWP 23372 of 2019 in the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court.
 4. The Hon'ble Court dated 02.09.2019 passed order to restore *status qua ante* as it existed a day prior to meeting of the Senate i.e. 22.08.2019 by forthwith allowed the petitioner to continue as DSW.
 5. The University filed LPA 1547 of 2019 against the above said order dated 02.09.2019 on which the court has passed the following orders on 18.09.2019:

“.....in view of the peculiar facts and circumstances, these appeals are disposed of with a direction to the Panjab University, Chandigarh to convene a meeting of the Senate after issuing 7 days notice to all the Senators. The meeting be convened on 28.09.2019 at 11.00 a.m. in the office of the Senate of the Panjab University to consider the agenda item No. C-7 of the meeting dated 22.08.2019 and the entire proceedings of the meeting shall be videographed as was done earlier.

We may also add that we have not commented on the merits of the case and all the questions, raised in this appeal, shall remain open”.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he had suggested something in the last meeting that certain minor corrections, which needed to be made in the agenda. They have written 31st May 2020 or till recommendation of the Syndicate is considered by the Senate. Actually, the resolution of the Syndicate is “for one more year, i.e., up to 31st May 2020 and they will continue till recommendation of the Syndicate is considered by the Senate”. So the minor correction should be made.

The Vice Chancellor said, “Right, Right”. He said that before starting the discussion, he would like to add that because they have already discussed this issue at length and have taken many components and dimensions into consideration. He would now like to make an appeal to the Hon'ble members that let they resolve the issue here on the basis of consensus and for that purpose, he just humbly request that whosoever speaks, speak briefly and could come out with certain concrete suggestion on which the consensus could be arrived at.

Shri Sanjay Tandon stated that, last time, everyone had expressed his/her viewpoints on this issue. He would like to put 3-4 points before them. He was of the view that they should move ahead to resolve this issue. The issues could never be

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

resolved if they make it pride issue. Certain persons are determined that they would disrespect the Chair. They have to get out of this mindset, that they would get victory/success under all circumstances. But what happens is that at the end of the day the Institution/Organization suffers. So he is of the opinion that when this decision was taken, and if the decision was not acceptable to someone or certain persons, the first option they had, to approach the Chancellor, but the same was not exercised. Under this option, the matter/issue/difference remains within House. If they had difference of opinion, at least they had the option to approach the Chancellor stating that this is the problem, the same should have been resolved. Secondly, people are getting phone calls for the last three days that they should attend the meeting and vote in their favour. He is of the considered opinion that if on every issue or on every appointment/ promotion, they started having voting, the meeting, which should at the most be of 2-3 hours, shall continue for 8-10 hours, would continue for 7-8 days because everybody would saying that he would like to have voting on this particular issue. If the voting is the methodology, sometimes 'A' would be in winning position and sometimes 'B' would be in winning position. Then the organization would function on the basis of voting alone and not on the basis of consensus. Certain persons have approached the Court on this issue and it emerged in the Court that the senior-most Professor should be given the charge of Dean of Student Welfare post. They also started influencing/convincing the senior-most Professor that he/she should not agree to this proposal. The Vice Chancellor must have a seniority list of Professors and if first person on the seniority declines, the second on the seniority list should be given the offer and so on and so forth. As he (Vice Chancellor) had the list, he should have given the offer. If this did not materialize, here also certain senior persons are present, one of them could be given the additional charge of the post of Dean of Student Welfare. He would like to suggest that anyone of them could be chosen to resolve the issue. They should not make it a prestige issue. Professor Navdeep Goyal, who is one of senior-most Professor, is present here, he should be given the charge of Dean of Student Welfare post. Similarly, Professor Rajat Sandhir and Professor Ronki Ram are also present here. Anyone of them could be given the charge of Dean of Student Welfare post. Although the names were not suggested there, names could be suggested here and consensus arrived. If the decision could not be arrived at in the meeting of the Syndicate, decision could be arrived at here in the Senate. Why are they exposing their House outside? In the end, he would like to give his opinion that undermining of the Chair should not happen and they should work with the consensus. They should work together and the better sense should prevail and the decisions should be taken objectively and not subjectively. Here they are taking decision keeping in mind the name of the person. This should not be done as it would not prove to be good for any Institution. His proposal is that he (Vice Chancellor) should propose the names of three persons or anybody should propose three names. They should consider and discuss those names and arrive at a consensus and declare any one name. If worst-cum-worst this is the only solution, the matter should be referred back to the Syndicate. Then the matter should be discussed in the Syndicate and the decision of the Syndicate should be placed before the Senate for consideration. This is the only suggestion to them.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he had expected that the Vice Chancellor would clarify the position as the Hon'ble member(s) has/have explained. There were some discussion in the Court and may be the Court has ordered also and the people started lobbying with the senior-most person not to accept it. He just wanted that he (Vice Chancellor) should tell the House, is there any such order by the Court that the charge be given to the senior-most person. If there is no such order, where is the question lobbying that he/she should say no to the offer. Has any offer have been made by the University authorities to any of the senior Professor that he/she

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

should take the charge and somebody went to him to say that he/she should not accept it. He urged the Vice Chancellor to clarify the position.

On a point of order, Shri Sanjay Tandon tried to speak something, but Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not a point of order. Shri Tandon said that since his name has been taken, he would like to clarify.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he (Shri Sanjay Tandon) has said that this was discussed in the Court and people approached the person(s) concerned. In fact, a suggestion was given in the Court by both the parties that let the charge be given to the senior-most Professor till the meeting of the Senate, i.e., up to 28th September. That was the suggestion by both the parties, but still the Court chose not to accept that suggestion. So to say that the senior-most person should be appointed as Dean of Student Welfare is not within their jurisdiction.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that the item, which has come to them, has itself in great difficulty because it does not say as to who should be appointed and instead says these persons should be given extension or not, which meant that, if they say no, that meant, they are not satisfied with their work and if they say yes, they would be disregarding the Vice Chancellor's observation. His suggestion is since it has been discussed long enough as a lot of discussion has already taken place, he (Vice Chancellor) should take a decision now, instead of starting the discussion again, which would again lead them to nowhere. He (Vice Chancellor) should tell them whether he agreed with the recommendation of the Syndicate or not. If he (Vice Chancellor) did not agree with the recommendation of the Syndicate, then he should take votes. If the votes say that extension should not be given to these persons, the Vice Chancellor should start the process of making recommendation to the Syndicate and Senate. However, if the votes say that extension should be given to these persons, the matter ends. If the Vice Chancellor also agreed with the recommendation of the Syndicate, then also the matter ends. So why should they enter into the long discussion again. Hence, he (Vice Chancellor) should tell them as what is his opinion.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha stated that he would like to support, which Professor R.P. Bambah has just said. They already had long and sometimes acrimonious discussion at last session. The matter unfortunately had to go to the Court, which has not given the University a good name. The issue before them is very simple. As Professor Bambah has reminded them that it is direction of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court that at this session they should consider this Item C-7 and that Item reads "Extension in term of appointment of Dean of Student Welfare, Dean of Student Welfare (Women) and Associate Dean of Student Welfare should be granted up to 31.05.2020". This is the item on the agenda. On this item, they have a clear recommendation of the Syndicate, and that recommendation of the Syndicate, which was before them in the last session, is again before them. Thanks to the directive of the Hon'ble High Court. He is reading the resolved part recommended by the Syndicate 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, which they are doing now. At the moment, the issue before them, is a single issue. It is a very special meeting of the Senate convened upon the direction of the Hon'ble High Court and their mandate is to consider this recommendation and take a decision. Professor R.P. Bambah has pointed out that their decision could be that either they approve the recommendation of the Syndicate or reject it. There could not be any third option. Having another discussion or second alternative, is not going to serve any purpose. In the last meeting, a large number of Senators had proposed exactly what he is saying

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

now, namely that let they approve the recommendation of the Syndicate. Again, he thought that a memorandum signed by a number of Senators is going to be submitted or it has been submitted stating that the recommendation of the Syndicate be approved. Hence, he formally moves a resolution that they should approve the recommendation of the Syndicate.

Some of the members together said, “approved”.

Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that the moment she entered the Senate Hall and when she saw these books (Panjab University Calendars) on the table, it came to her mind that the former Vice Chancellors had been treating these Calendars as a Bible for the governance of the Panjab University Senate meetings and all the proceedings and decisions. Unfortunately, the matter relating to extension in the term of appointment of the Dean of Student Welfare went to High Court because 48 members gave in writing in the last meeting of the Senate that the recommendation of the Syndicate should be approved. Now, two very senior members, who are also the faculty members of the University, as also former Vice Chancellor, Professor R.P. Bambah and Ambassador I.S. Chadha have given a well reasoned suggestion, which she also endorsed, that the recommendation of the Syndicate, which is based on majority, should be approved because the Court has given them a limited scope – whether they are accepting the recommendation of the Syndicate or not accepting. If they are accepting the recommendation of the Syndicate, the matter would be over, and if not, the only option available with them is voting. According to her, no third option has been given to them by the Hon’ble Court. She would like to go on record that the observations, which came from the Hon’ble Benches, though the same had not been made part of the order, as a former student of this University and a family. which has given its entire life to this University, and this is her fourth term as a member of the Senate, and she is really felt very bad when the observations from the Hon’ble Court came regarding the governance of the Panjab University. So it was not expected from him (Vice Chancellor) and being on the Chair, he must respect the majority’s view. She fully endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor R.P. Bambah and Ambassador I.S. Chadha.

On the point of order, Professor Mukesh Arora said that former Vice Chancellors of this University treating this Calendar as a Bible, but he (Vice Chancellor) did not do so?

Professor Ronki Ram said that, according to him, the proceedings of the Senate are in order earlier as well as now also and there is no question of contention about that. In a democratic setup, opinions are expressed and difference of opinion are expected. Hence, Senate is the highly respectable body representing the whole of the society across the disciplines and different ideas. Thereby, it is unique for University having a Senate, which is hallmark of this Academic Institute. In this case, when the item came to the Syndicate and then to the Senate, no doubt, those items are properly framed and brought to the Syndicate/Senate, but still the discussion took place on such items in the Syndicate as well as in the Senate. Sometimes, because of difference of ideas amongst the respectable members of the Syndicate and Senate, many suggestions are given. However, after the suggestions, ultimately the things boiled down to the contents in the item(s) to the Senate through Syndicate and thereafter, the decision is taken. He thought as had been said by Shri Sanjay Tandon in the beginning that this could be a view, but that view has also been taken up in the earlier Senate. Some other views had also come at that time, but there was no consensus. As such, this is the beauty of the Senate that once the other views, which did not totally reflected the item, are not to be considered because they have a system to consider the views. When those views are not taken care of, then the view become the item. Thereby, this item is to be put for approval. If this item is approved, the consensus is arrived, but if it

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

is not approved, then they could find another way as per the Calendar. This is the way, they have contention.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that they had also met on 22nd August 2019 at 10.00 a.m. and after about 1¼ months, they have again come to the same position. He did not want to reply to any of the members, who have spoken before because whenever any controversy starts, allegations and counter allegations started and then there is no end. It is an unfortunate situation and everybody agreed to it and it should not have been there and everybody agreed to it also. It is also desired by everyone that there should have been unanimity between the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate. It is also the desire of everyone that the Senate should decide unanimously, but unfortunately certain such things have emerged, which could not be ignored by them. An issue of Panjab University goes to the High Court and for that he did not spare anyone, who is sitting here, including he himself, the Vice Chancellor and all others. Any issue belonging to the Home has gone to the High Court and the High Court has passed certain adverse comments against the governance of the University. Those adverse comments were not against any individual and instead the same were against the working of the entire Syndicate and the Senate, which include he himself and all of them and they could not escape from it. As such, it is not an issue of pleasure, but a matter of pain. The issue now before the House, is the grievance. Ambassador I.S. Chadha has suggested that the recommendation of the Syndicate should be accepted. He drew the attention of all the members towards the Item and requested to go through item again. In fact, the Item has two parts – (i) 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. Shri Ashok Goyal ji has said that it not **or** but **and**. Even if or is substituted by and, would there be no contradiction between these two sentences? If extension is given up to 31st May 2020, then from where “till the matter is considered by the Senate” comes. As such, this sentence becomes useless. They are saying that it should be approved, but what would be the purpose of approving it because the next sentence says that “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”. Are they also approving the strong reservation of the Vice Chancellor? Are they saying that the observation of the Vice Chancellor is correct? The situation, which Unfortunately has come before them is that if the first sentence implicitly was there, there would have been no problem. They usually consider and approve about 50-100 recommendations. Unfortunately, such a situation has come, where the Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor differed. It is true that certain persons have a view that the Vice Chancellor should have suggested the names, and it is an arguable point. If he (Vice Chancellor) has not suggested the names, today both the things are before them because the same Vice Chancellor was presiding over the meeting the Syndicate on that day and now the Senate meeting also. Ambassador Chadha, would the House not like to ask him (Vice Chancellor) that he is the Vice Chancellor of their University and the Chief Executive Officer also, what was his reservation and why he has given the reservation. Should they not want to consider his reservation? It is their right to accept or reject his reservation. He is neither speaking in favour of Professor Emanuel Nahar nor against him. The recommendation has come from the Syndicate and the House could accept or reject the same. He would like to tell them two things – Ms. Anu Chatrath has said that it is her fourth term, whereas he is the member of this Senate from the time of her father (Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath), i.e., for the last about 40 years. So far as he remembered, he did not know whether earlier voting had taken place on any appointment.

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Jarnail Singh pointed out that once or twice voting on appointment had taken place.

Continuing, Shri Satya Pal Jain said that his request to them is that it is an academic body, have they fallen so below that they could not arrive at a consensus after discussing the issue round the table. They should sit together and discuss the issue with open mind. Two different views have come from the Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor. They should reconcile by taking into confidence all the persons, who belonged to different shades. Hence, 4-5 persons should sit together, discuss the issue with open mind and arrive at a consensus. In this way, they would decide the issue in a unanimously manner. Could they not do this? Why have they taken such a harsh stand? He reiterated that 4-5 persons belonging to different shades should sit together, take into consideration the reservation of the Vice Chancellor objectively and arrive at a decision wisely instead of majority, which would be better, even though someone had very rightly said that majority is the option. He further stated that ultimately voting was the resolution and it happened everywhere. Even in Courts, if five Judges were listening a case, there might be difference of opinion amongst them, say three on one side and two on the other. So, the decision arrived at by the three was accepted and the judgement was taken as dissenting judgement. Hence, he requested the House that the more they endorsed these traditions would harm us in the same manner. In this fashion, there would be voting on the appointments of Professors, Readers too in future. Resultantly, instead of working in the field the work of lobbying in the Syndicate and Senate would get started. The person with whom there would be majority, would get selected and the person with whom there was no majority would not get selected. This trend is not right. He further stated that the decision should be such that it should neither give message that the Vice Chancellor was got defeated nor the Syndicate. Four-five persons from both sides could sit together, have a discussion of 15-20 minutes, and came out with a unanimous view. The House might be adjourned for this purpose. He stated that what he was trying to say was that if five-seven persons arrived at a decision with consensus, it would not only enhance the prestige of the University but of the House also. So they should take a decision after considering the matter with an open mind. It would be in the interest of everyone i.e. the House and the University as well.

Smt. Kirron Kher stated that she seconded this very sensible suggestion and Mr. Jain being an eminent lawyer himself had said very rightly. She further stated that she desired that everything over here should be done with consensus and the divide which had come and the uproar which was being heard over here, last time it was horrifying to see people talk for hours, shouted at each other. Earlier, Ms. Anu Ji, with full respect to her, said that Bible was lying over here and this House had always respected the Vice Chancellors and they had respected it (Bible) too. She would like to remind to all, present over here, that this was not correct as ill-treatment was meted out to the last Vice Chancellor over here. Hence, the way the Vice Chancellor respected the Syndicate and Senate, the Senate and Syndicate needed to respect the Chair of the Vice Chancellor. Many people present over here were saying that our whole families had studied from here. She had also studied from here and she did not remember that such a bitterness/ugliness towards the Vice Chancellor had been there, that the Vice Chancellor's Chair had been politicized and that was a travesty. Groups had got formed over here. There is popular saying that "you scratch my back, I would scratch yours", unfortunately, that seemed to be the kind of agenda that seemed to be working here. She said that she would like to raise only one point that basically others names were there and the whole discussion seemed to be focused on the name of Professor Emanuel Nahar. With due respect to Professor Emanuel Nahar and his fantastic contribution as DSW to this great University, she said that she would like to ask one question that did giving third time extension to a gentlemen required too much quarrel.

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

Whereas logic told them that it should be somebody else because either one should be a very eminent Professor, who had come from the world to this University and this Institute needed to keep him here for the students and she was sure that there would be consensus for that. A very great personality, whom the University had brought for research or he/she was heading a Department. She further said that when she was speaking all this, many of them were not even listening to, their minds were closed and that was the tragedy of the situation and she thought they would do their willfulness and she felt very much pained that there was nobody else, and they had become so poor in context of our Professors and eminent people in this University that they had started doing their level best that it should only be a person, who was directly linked to a political party and not only that Sir it was absolutely wrong to do that. They should realize that and that was her thinking in this whole thing. Addressing to Ms. Anu Ji she stated that she remembered that last time, she (Ms. Anu Chatrath) was saying no & shouting over here at the top of her voice. It is very painful what she (Ms. Anu ji) did last time over here, she was shouting at the top of her voice. She (Smt. Kirron Kher) remembered it.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he had only to say that whatever Shri Satya Pal Jain had said was very right. Already there was too much discussion on the matter and perhaps today they did not have the scope of discussion. It was right that whatever happened, had happened unfortunately and the matter went to the Court. But, nobody could stop us from becoming wise now onwards. She said that the recommendation of Syndicate had come and nobody could accept this that the view of Vice Chancellor was not being respected. They have full respect for the views of the Vice Chancellor, but he thought at the same time, they expect the Vice Chancellor also to respect the views of the Syndicate and the Senate. The difference of opinion should not be a point of fighting, difference of opinion should lead to a decision. It was very good if a decision was taken with consensus, might be the Vice Chancellor was receptive towards the Syndicate on that or it could have been better had the Syndicate been receptive towards the Vice Chancellor's decision. Now, when there was difference of opinion before the Senate he thought consensus could still be there if the Vice Chancellor had said alright he go with the decision of the Syndicate, as Professor Bambah had suggested and as Ambassador I.S. Chadha had suggested. If in a democratic set up they were left with no option but to go for voting in spite of the fact that nobody wanted the decisions to be taken by voting, they were under obligation to take the decision by voting. If it could be avoided it was alright. In view of the limited scope of the meeting and the agenda fixed by the Court he simply suggested, he simply proposed, as had been shared by so many other members also that recommendations of the Syndicate for granting extension to all the three incumbents up to 31st May, 2020, be granted.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that he felt they had come in the same situation, in which they were earlier. At this stage the Vice Chancellor asked him to give suggestions only, if any. Principal Jhanji said that he would take only a minute or two, because earlier the discussion, which had taken place in the Syndicate, he did not want to repeat that again and again. The Court had not ordered for voting. It was said again and again that they did not have option. Why did they not have option? The Court had acted very wisely. The Court had reiterated it in its decision that it had emerged from the discussion that till the issue was resolved the position of DSW be given to a senior most person. It was a different thing that it did not become a part of the Resolution. At the same time it was also not written anywhere in the Resolved Part that voting was to be got done. The Court in its wisdom, and they should also understand that wisdom, did not resolve the issue and only said in the resolution that the matter should go back to the Senate and if the Senate could decide the matter, it would be better, otherwise the questions were still open in the Court.

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

Continuing, Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that under Regulations this matter should not have come to the Senate from the Syndicate when the Vice Chancellor had a strong reservation. They were not against any person specific. It was the same Emanuel Nahar, who was given one year's extension by the Senate last year despite all odds and all those, present here, speaking against the extension, were unanimous in giving the extension last year for one year. And the issue, which was coming up again and again in the matter was a very dangerous move. He could tell them that Press was sitting, videography was being done and it would be put up to the Court also. Right now, when the discussion was still going on, a person was taking the signatures of the members on the register, and it happened last time too when signatures of 48 members were taken. Principal R.S. Jhanji further stated that this agenda was fixed earlier too and it is fixed today too. At this stage din prevailed, as many members started speaking together. After the din, Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that he had two-three suggestions, firstly, as they had the list of senior most Professors of the University, both women and men, some members might sit together and decide the matter with consensus. Secondly, the matter should go back to the Syndicate and it might be brought to the Senate again with approved names and it would be got done over here. Thirdly the matter might be referred to the Hon'ble Chancellor of the University. He also suggested that we could suggest names and arrive at a consensus. At this stage din prevailed and the Vice Chancellor requested the members to maintain the decorum of the House.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh addressing the Vice Chancellor stated that names were already finalized. If it was not so, they might decide these in the House itself after discussion. He requested the Vice Chancellor to allow him to speak and to take his suggestions, as he was also a teacher of the University. He further stated that so far only one teacher had spoken on the issue and that teacher was also about to retire from services in near future. So, the Vice Chancellor should listen to him as he had to serve the University for another 20 years. Dr. Gurmeet Singh further stated that he did not take more than two minutes and he did not talk useless. Addressing to the Vice Chancellor, Dr. Gurmeet Singh stated that he (Vice Chancellor) had come with decided names and either the members, who raised their hands first, should be allowed to speak or the new people or tell them that those members, who were above the age of 50 would only be allowed to speak. He requested the Vice Chancellor to make his decision clear in this regard. He further stated that he would not take much time of the House. At this stage din prevailed. , the Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Gurmeet Singh to sit down. Accepting the request of the Vice Chancellor Dr. Gurmeet Singh stated that he respected him (the VC) and hence he was settling down. At this stage, the Vice Chancellor addressing the members, stated that he was again and again requesting them that they should arrive at an agreement on some formula, which was deemed appropriate to them. He further stated that he was having high respect for all the members. He said that there should not be any confusion he was very sorry that there was a confusion that he was having any type of thing in his mind. The Vice Chancellor reiterated that he respected all the members; however, he could not show it by tearing his chest, like Hanuman Ji. But, there should not be any doubt, they were the supreme body, they were supreme. The question should not arise on such type of things that it should be honored, it was two way. Yes, there should not be any doubt, again he told them. Yes, one thing, again he was focusing on the consensus and requesting each one of them. He wanted to say that five members from them , in which he wanted Prof. Bambah, Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Sanjay Tandon, Shri Satya Pal Jain and Prof. Ronki Ram, should sit together right now for four-five minutes and evolve a way out. He further stated that whatever will be the decision, would be acceptable to him.

Shri Jarnail Singh addressing the Vice Chancellor stated that he had a very strong objection to this. The issue was before the Senate, Senate had not authorized

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

anybody to form a Committee, who would decide the matter. It was the issue of the Senate. At this stage, din prevailed. After the din, the Vice Chancellor again requested that four-five members should sit together to arrive at a consensus.

Professor R.P. Bambah while intervening said he should clarify. He stated that the problem was that no consensus was legally valid. The thing was that the Dean was appointed on the recommendation of the Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor. If they send this back then only the Vice Chancellor could make a recommendation, five people could not make a recommendation. The Syndicate was not there in session, so the only way was either they accept the Syndicate's recommendation or reject. And then the Vice Chancellor & Syndicate started the process again.

The Vice Chancellor again requested Professor Bambah to sit with other members and arrive at a consensus.

Continuing, Professor R.P. Bambah stated that even if they sit together and arrived at a consensus, it would not be valid.

The Vice Chancellor stated that whatever advice they would give, would be acceptable to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that they were giving him the advice.

The Vice Chancellor reiterated his request for sitting together to arrive at a consensus to Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they were sitting. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) further stated that there should be transparency. Whatever was to be done, it should be done before the House.

Shri Sandeep Singh while addressing the Vice Chancellor stated that he (Vice Chancellor) should have called only the said five members and not others to the meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members were not accepting his request.

To this, Principal R S Jhanji remarked that since the agenda has been fixed, his (Vice Chancellor) request would not be acceded to.

Shri Naresh Gaur asked the Vice Chancellor to respect the decision of the Syndicate.

Principal R.S. Jhanji reiterated that the agenda was fixed, as the signatures of members had already been taken. Ms. Anu Chatrath while addressing Professor Bambah stated that she believed they were wasting time, let the matter be resolved by voting because they had to go as per the provisions. Shri Goyal while addressing the Chair stated that all the five persons, which he (Vice Chancellor) had named, had already given their views. On this, the Vice Chancellor stated that he was right in saying that they had already given their views but what he (Vice Chancellor) wanted to say/request was that the five members should sit together for once and if the same view came, it would be okay. Whatever they would decide, would be implemented and there should not be any problem to make effort to arrive at a consensus. Ms. Anu Chatrath while addressing the Chair stated that if they were not agreeing to the suggestions then why to delay the matter. Professor Bambah stated that these five people were not the Vice Chancellor/Syndicate. The only recommending body was the Vice Chancellor/Syndicate. These five people were not. They could only suggest to do

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

that and they could not say to do that. He further stated that they five people could not conclude. Only the Vice Chancellor/Syndicate could conclude. Shri Sanjay Tandon asked the Vice Chancellor to send the matter back to the Syndicate, as suggested by Prof. Bambah.

The Vice Chancellor while addressing Professor R.P. Bambah said that he (VC) was not doing any violation, but what he was asking is that they could be any suggestion to resolve the issue.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that they were acting under a directive from the Hon'ble High Court and that directive was to consider the recommendation of the Syndicate. They had no other option. Not doing that would be a violation of the directive of the High Court.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that his submission is that if there is any issue of violation, this Committee would also see to it.

Shri Naresh Gaur said there is no need of the Committee. They should go by the sentiment/decision of the Syndicate and let there be voting.

Shri V.K. Sibal stated that University's Calendar had been referred to as Bibal and if it was a Bibal then it should be respected. But, he expressed that he had serious doubts that whether the Bible had been respected, or not. He told the House that the item before the Syndicate was the appointment of the DSW and it became an issue of extension. When he looked into the Calendar he found that there was no room for extension in the case of DSW. Therefore, it could be an appointment. They could reappoint him and that is okay. But, the Syndicate had no power outside the Calendar to convert a proposal for appointment into a decision of extension. Shri Sibal also stated that there were these four people, who were to be given an additional charge. In the case of two of them there needed to be a recommendation from the Vice Chancellor also. He further stated that deliberately in the Regulations the Vice Chancellor has not been mention in other two. Secondly, in the three appointments, apart from DSW, there was a provision for renewal and there was a cap - three years or five years, but, there was no case, there was no mention of renewal in that. So, he thought in this case the Syndicate had gone wrong and the Senate was not looking into the legal aspect. He suggested that the matter should go back to the Syndicate to let it be examined. Many of the members endorsed the view point of Shri V K Sibal. Ms. Anu Chatrath requested the Vice Chancellor to take the view of every member because the matter was listed before the House.

Shri Sanjay Tandon objected to this and stated that view had already come and the matter might be taken back to the Syndicate. He further stated that if they start taking view of everybody, present in the House, it would take another 10 hours.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that meetings (including meetings of elections) were being held here regularly but he had never seen such type of tension before, particularly on the faces of members. Addressing the Vice Chancellor, Shri Jain stated that he (Vice Chancellor) had suggested names of five people and he (Shri Jain) did not have any objection if one or two more names were added in it. He further stated that there was no harm in discussing the matter informally by making efforts. He further stated that in this manner Shri Ashok Goyal might convince us that Professor Emanuel Nahar was right for the post of DSW or they might convince Shri Ashok Goyal that someone else was better than Professor Emanuel Nahar. While addressing to Ambassador Chadha, Shri Jain further stated that he was astonished to hear from him (Ambassador Chadha) that the Court had ordered that the Senate had to decide the matter by voting

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

once it was in House and if not, it could not be done. He further stated that in Courts, during hearing, sometimes Judges differed in opinion. In this situation, they adjourned the proceedings and after discussing the matter inside the Chamber they come and sit. Those who practiced law, knew this. He also stated that his this statement would be recorded and he knew that the video recording of the proceedings might go to the Court. Shri Jain also quoted a case of Arunachal Pradesh, which was being heard by the Constitution Bench of Supreme Court, wherein the five Judges, hearing the case, differed in opinion on some issue. The Judges went inside for fifteen minutes for discussing the issue and after discussion they came back and resumed the proceedings. In context of the matter, he further stated that there was no harm in acceding to the request of the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor had just given a suggestion. They, the members, might accede to his request and change one of the officers recommended by the Syndicate for the post DSW or recommend all of them. Some people over here were feeling that this agenda item would be cleared with the help of majority and it was quite possible that this item might got cleared with majority. Shri Jain also endorsed the view of Shri Shelly Walia that if consensus did not arrive then majority might be the last resort and there was no doubt in it but they should all try till last. If with consensus the Vice Chancellor and the Senate could decide something unanimously, they should must try till last. The impression over here that they had got this much of signatures from the members and if the matter was put to voting they would succeed in getting the agenda item, passed. Afterwards, either of the messages, that would go to the outer world i.e. the Vice Chancellor had got defeated or the Syndicate Group had got defeated, would not be in the interest of the University. Nobody's interest was there in it. Hence, he advised the members to give a try to the suggestion of the Vice Chancellor; otherwise, the option of voting was there. Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that Shri Jain said that they are not taking the Vice Chancellor's opinion into consideration, but, the Vice Chancellor was not a member of the proposed Committee. On this, Shri Jain asked Ms. Chatrath to be a part of the said Committee or also to have someone too in the said Committee.

Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that unnecessarily they were delaying the matter, the matter has already been discussed. She requested the members to have a look on the Court orders. The Court orders clearly says that all other pleas which the University has raised before the Bench are open to be raised at the time of argument on 30th. The Single Bench has clearly held and she would read out the conclusive part of the Single Bench, which had not been modified by the Double Bench. She would read only the last Para (Para 21 of the Judgement) says, "Regarding the balance of convenience, given that the petitioner was originally appointed as Dean of Student Welfare since 27th November, 2016 and had been continuing as such ever since, it would be appropriate to maintain equilibrium, continuity and also in the interest of justice and equity not to rock the boat at this stage, until a final decision is taken by the Senate". So she wanted that only this line should be read...

Shri Satya Pal Jain intervened to say that when Double Bench hear the petition against the Single Bench, the orders of Double Bench prevailed and this is the principle of law. Moreover, when the Judgement of the Double Bench on the LPA came, the decision/order of the Single Bench is always merged in it.

To this, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she would read the orders of the Double Bench. When Shri Satya Pal Jain questioned her, she said that they were resolving this issue by giving the responsibility to 5 members to find an amicable solution.

Shri Satya Pal Jain intervened to say that she was not willing to resolve this issue as she thought that she had the majority.

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

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

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that they should not worry as she was reading the orders of the Division Bench also.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to calm down and sit down; otherwise, nothing would be recorded.

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

Shri Sanjay Tandon remarked that she (Ms. Anu Chatrath) herself delaying the matter, whereas she was alleging that the others were delaying the matter.

Ms. Anu Chatrath suggested that first they should get the voting on this very issue whether they agreed for appointing a 5-Member Committee or not. When Principal R.S. Jhanji remarked whether voting is to be held on each and every issue, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that voting is required when they are making it their prestige issue. When a couple of members tried to intervene, she remarked that if they respected one, they would definitely get respect in return. If they ignored the majority view of the Syndicate and Senate, where would be the democracy and the University Calendar? Democracy says that whatever is the majority view, the same would prevail.

Shri Sanjay Tandon remarked that democracy did not say that one should speak even if the Chair did not allow him/her.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that without any delay and without any mudslinging because where what was being done, who met whom, what group met themselves, Vice Chancellor sat with whom and come after making what strategies, he did not want to say anything about it. He also did not want to say as to what resolution was passed in the last meeting and what resolution was shown in the Court. Actually, the University was reprimanded by the Court and it had to concede that such a resolution was not passed by the Senate. Without any further delay, he just wanted to propose that it should be resolved that the recommendations of the syndicate as per agenda C-7 of the meeting of the Senate, being held today, i.e., 28th September, 2019, be approved and professor Emanuel Nahar, Professor Neena Capalash and Professor Ranjan Kumar be given extension as Dean of Student Welfare, Dean of Student Welfare (Women) and Associate Dean of Student Welfare, respectively up to 31st May, 2020. He requested that it should be made part of the recording as this Resolution had been signed by the 47 members out of 68 present members, and one of them, i.e., 68th was Professor Emanuel Nahar, who was not present in the House at this moment. As such, out of 67 members, 47 members had signed this Resolution. Now, he was submitting the Resolution to the Chair to make it a part of the proceeding. Now, he was reading the names of the members, who had signed this Resolution and the names were – his own name (Shri Ashok Goyal), Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu.

At this stage, a din prevailed as several members started speaking together. Even during the commotion, Shri Ashok Goyal continued to read the names of the signatories and some of the names were audible and some were not.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was reading the names because the University had taken a stand in the High Court that they did not know whether the signatures were genuine or not. That was why, he wanted to read the names of the

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

signatories of the Resolution or let the Vice Chancellor confirm that the signatures on the Resolution are genuine, which he is handing over to the Chair; otherwise, he would read all the names. Then he again started reading the names – Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. K.K. Sharma, Naresh Gaur...

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal not to read all the names of the signatories and requested him to sit down.

Though there was a pandemonium as certain members started speaking, still Shri Ashok Goyal continued to read the names.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that he felt ashamed to belong to this kind of a House. He thought that this House symbolizes the Parliamentary Democracy and when it symbolizes Parliamentary Democracy, they should follow procedures of the debate in the House of Commons and House of Representatives. If they were going to send this kind of a message to the Judges/Judiciary, which he would like to honour for taking this stand, which is visibly objective. Believe me Sir, it is not a clash of ideas. As a Vice Chancellor, his request to him is to follow the recommendation of the High Court to re-consider the matter. They had only two options – consensus or voting. If there was no consensus on having the consensus, then ask for voting. He urged the Vice Chancellor to follow the democratic procedure.

The Vice Chancellor said that still he was requesting them that he could add two more names, i.e., the names of Sh. V.K. Sibal and Ms. Anu Chatrath for arriving at consensus.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say as to what had happened to the proposal made by him, which was signed by 47 people. He enquired as to what he (Vice Chancellor) was doing. He requested to Vice Chancellor to receive the proposal made by him in writing and then do whatever he wished.

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

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter would be resolved within a few minutes and whatever was being suggested by them would be decided. Why were they worrying so much? At least they should listen to as to what was being proposed. No one is running away. In fact, he was of the opinion that five of them namely Shri V.K. Sibal and Mrs. Anu Chatrath besides three already suggested should sit together at least for five minutes and whatever would be suggested by them would be agreeable to all, including him.

Certain members jointly said that this proposal was not acceptable to them.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood suggested that the matter should be referred back to the Syndicate.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that several hon'ble members had put their viewpoints in a democratic way. In the Parliamentary democracy also when an issue is not get resolved, the voting is the last resort. None is afraid of the voting. People win and lose in voting. He was a member of that Lok Sabha of which the Government led by Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee got defeated by a single vote. He also remembered that incident of voting in which Shri Krishana Kant contested election to the Rajya Sabha from Haryana. 32 persons went for casting their votes and 32 returned after voting and all of them were present at the time of counting. However, to their astonishment only 10 votes were found to be cast. Chaudhary Devi Lal was unable to identify as to who

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

had cast the votes. Proposals are made in every Parliamentary democracy. Similarly, one proposal has been made by them that the recommendation of the Syndicate should be approved and another proposal has come from Shri V.K. Sibal that the matter should be referred back to the Syndicate. One thing, he wanted to make clear, although six parliamentarians were present here, if voting is to be held, the same would be secret. If someone give in writing something after getting it signed from so many people, the same no validity. Everybody knew as to where the people were found at the time of secret voting and they all were witness to it in the election of the Syndicate. However, the effort of the Vice Chancellor should be that since proposal from both the sides had come, he (Vice Chancellor) should give his ruling. If he (Vice Chancellor) felt that now he had no reservation, which he had got recorded in the Syndicate, the House would accept the recommendation of the Syndicate. However, if the Vice Chancellor still has the same reservation, then he should go for the voting.

The Vice Chancellor said that, with their permission, he was adjourning the meeting for some time.

After the adjournment, when the meeting resumed, the Vice Chancellor again welcomed the members, including Shri Manoj K. Parida, Advisor to Administrator, Union Territory, Chandigarh, who was attending the meeting of the Senate for the first time, and all the Ministers.

Shri Satya Pal Jain requested Shri Ashok Goyal to announce the consensus, which they have arrived at.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, keeping in view the sentiments of the Syndicate and also of this House, they should accept the recommendations of the Syndicate and approve what has been recommended by the Syndicate as they would create smooth way of working together in the best interest of the University. They all would give due respect to the Chair and expect that the Chair would also respect them, which would be in the interest of all of them. So far as the reservation of the Vice Chancellor was concerned, the same would be removed/sorted out, but it would not be a part of the resolution. He again proposed that the recommendation of the Syndicate, which would go a long way in the best interest of the Chairman of the Syndicate and Senate (Vice Chancellor) and also of the Hon'ble members of the Syndicate/Senate and it would also give solution to any problem, which would emerge on day-to-day basis.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood requested the Vice Chancellor to kindly delete the second part of the resolution of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor thanked all the members and stated that he would like to summarize the entire discussion in a formal way so that there is no ambiguity. Although taking into consideration the entire history and the deliberation, he had strong reservation on this particular issue, he tried his level best to come to a consensus and they have taken opinion of various members, who put in their best efforts and given direction and he appreciates the same. Since the seniority matter was also there and a suggestion in this regard had also come on the floor of the House. He was having an agreement on that also if anything came out on seniority issue. Had any consensus arrived at, it would have been better, but no consensus was arrived at on this issue. After lengthy discussion and respecting the opinion and sentiments and emotions of the House as also in the best interest of the Institution and academics, and thereafter, this great Institution and at the same time, taking into consideration the sentiments of each and every Hon'ble members and on the post upon which with the grace of God and also of the Chancellor, he has been entrusted this opportunity to serve

Senate Proceedings dated 28th September, 2019

as Vice Chancellor of this University, he agrees to accept this already structured resolution. Thereafter, he thanked each and every member of the House.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Satya Pal Jain requested the Vice Chancellor to read out the resolution.

It was informed that the resolution is "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".

RESOLVED: 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.

Professor R.P Bambah said that he would request the House to express their appreciation for the way the Vice Chancellor has resolved the issue and they should also thank him.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that they all appreciate the Vice Chancellor for the positive attitude in respecting the sentiments of the House. Whatever reservation the Vice Chancellor has, would be sorted out by them.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he is really grateful to the Chair. The Vice Chancellor has taken extra pains to put everyone together. He would only say that sometimes certain heated arguments took place, but they should not take them to heart. They all belonged to one family and live together and would continue to live together. He appreciated everyone who had participated in this. Now, the people who have this point in mind should sit with the Vice Chancellor and if there is any dissension on this, the same should be sorted out.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that Shri Sanjay Tandon had given a good suggestion and earlier Shri Satya Pal Jain had also given a very good suggestion, but by then it was already too late and they could not move forward. But he is hurt with the words which have been used by the Hon'ble members of Parliament, Mrs. Kirron Kher.

At this, several members including Shri Satya Pal Jain requested Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa not to say anything more.

Since several members continued speaking together, din prevailed.

Hereinafter, the National Anthem was played and sung.

Karamjeet Singh
Registrar

CONFIRMED

RAJ KUMAR
VICE-CHANCELLOR