

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Sunday, 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020** at **11.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### PRESENT

1. Professor Raj Kumar ... (in the Chair)  
Vice Chancellor
2. Ms. Anu Chatrath
3. Shri Ashok Goyal
4. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa alias Dayal Partap Singh
5. Professor Emanuel Nahar
6. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua
7. Principal (Dr.) Iqbal Singh Sandhu
8. Shri Jarnail Singh
9. Professor Keshav Malhotra
10. Professor Navdeep Goyal
11. Professor Rajinder Bhandari
12. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma alias Rabinder Nath
13. Principal (Dr.) Sarabjit Kaur
14. Dr. Satish Kumar
15. Ms. Surinder Kaur
16. Professor Karamjeet Singh ... (Secretary)  
Registrar

Principal (Dr.) R.S. Jhanji, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, and Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh, could not attend the meeting.

At the very outset, the Vice Chancellor wished good morning to each one of the esteemed members and welcomed them to the meeting.

### **Condolence Resolution**

The Vice-Chancellor said, "With a deep sense of sorrow, I may inform the Hon'ble members of the Syndicate about the said demise of Dr. Ramdhari Singal, former Chairperson, Department of Hindi, on 25.02.2020.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Dr. Ramdhari Singal and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed soul.

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

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

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

"(i) Panjab University has been declared winner in First Khelo India University games held at Bhuvneshwar, Orissa.

This gesture of the University was applauded by the members by thumping of desks.

- (ii) Professor Ved Parkash Upadhyay, former Chairperson, Department of Sanskrit, Dr. Zareen Fatima, Department of Urdu and Professor Yog Raj Angrish, Chairperson, School of Punjabi Studies, have been selected for Sahitya Academy Award.
- (iii) Professor Rajat Sandhir, Department of Biochemistry, has been sanctioned an India-Egypt Research project under the collaboration between Department of Science & Technology (DST), India and Academy of Scientific Research and Technology (ASRT), Egypt in the area of therapeutic Biochemistry and Biomedical Sciences. Only 25 projects have been selected out of 120 proposals. The project would envisage exchange of scientists between the two countries.
- (iv) Dr. Gurpreet, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, has been granted patent on her invention 'A METALOSOME ASSEMBLY AND A PROCESS OR PREPARATION THEREOF'."

The Vice Chancellor wished very-very happy women's day to all the Hon'ble members.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he would like to bring to their kind notice that Shri Ashok Goyal, Fellow and Syndic, has been honoured by the Blood Bank on February 8, 2020 for donating blood more than 100 times and 4 times a year.

This gesture of Shri Ashok Goyal was applauded by the members by thumping of desks.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he did not know that Professor Keshav Malhotra would make statement relating to him. He had never told this to anyone and made it a point that nobody comes to know that he is a regular blood donor. Somehow, when they were in the Syndicate on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2020, the function was there in the University itself, where he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) went and he came to know about this, but he did not know that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) had already crossed 100 times on 29<sup>th</sup> April 2019, the date on which his birth day fell. Now, he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) has come to know after they have published certain documents, though people had told him (Shri Ashok Goyal) that he should be telling others also, so that the others get inspired to follow him. He is a very media shy person and he did not want this to be publicized. Had he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) told him that he is going to speak about him (Shri Ashok Goyal), he would have stopped him (Professor Keshav Malhotra) as he did not want his name to be included because ultimately it is to be included...

Dr. Satish Kumar intervened to say that he should accept their compliments.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "So nice of you and thank you very much". That was why, he is responding.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that they appreciated his gesture.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, without his knowledge, Dr. Parveen Goyal put it on the Senate group also. The Secretary to the Vice Chancellor was the first person, from whom he got the congratulations and he was surprised how come he came to know. Subsequently, he was that it is on the Senate group. He thought that now the secrete is out. Somehow, what he wanted to speak before Professor Keshav Malhotra, now he should not be speaking because he wanted to say that instead of informing only, it should be recorded that felicitate them for these achievements and appreciations on

behalf of the Syndicate be sent to all. However, since his name has been mentioned, he did not know whether he could make this suggestion or not.

Referring to Vice Chancellor's Statement at Sr. No. (i), Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is such a big achievement that it has happened first time. They would not only congratulate the students, who actually are the architects of bringing these laurels to Panjab University making the University to bring the first Khelo India University Games held at Bhuvneshwar, Orissa. He thought that it should be their endeavour to support their sportsmen in all times to come.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that they all endorse the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this is a second big achievement of the University in sports. First is MAKA Trophy and second is First Khelo India University Games. He congratulated all the students, who had participated in different events and he believed that besides students, the credit also goes to the Director of Sports. Appreciations should also be given to Dr. Parvinder Singh, Director of Sports, Dr. Rakesh Malik and their team, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that it is really a great achievement and they felt very proud that the University is gaining space in the area of sports with each passing day. He congratulated the Directorate of Sports and his associates, including the Vice Chancellor and the patronage to these programmes.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she really appreciated the efforts of the students as well as the entire team of the University, who had been working so hard and have brought laurels to the Department as well as University because at one point of time, Punjab use to be No.1 in the sports, but now because of certain wrong activities, Punjab became No.2 and the Haryana got No.1. Now, it is a very proud movement for Panjab University to get such a great achievement.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that it is a great achievement for their University. The coaches and the teachers, who are working on *ad hoc*/temporary basis, have also contributed a lot in this regard and they are associated with University for the last so many years. He thought that some incentives should be given to the coaches, who have contributed a lot to achieve this big achievement.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he really appreciated the participants as well as organisers. He suggested that appreciations should be given to all, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that this is a very big achievement of the University. He suggested that appreciations should be given to all the officials and the participants, who had contributed to their level best. They should also appreciate those Colleges, which were actually involved in the First Khelo India University Games.

Ms. Surinder Kaur said that, first of all, she would like to congratulate all the sports persons for this big achievement. She suggested that they should help the students in different spheres, so that they are able to contribute to the maximum extent.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that, first of all, she congratulated the Vice Chancellor and his entire team. She requested the Vice Chancellor to felicitate all the participants as well as the teaching and non-teaching staff because support is required from the non-teaching staff from behind the curtain. So, all must be felicitated by the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had been asked to congratulate only the students and that was why, he had congratulated only the students in his previous statement. Now he would like to supplement by congratulating the Vice Chancellor, under whose leadership and also under the leadership of Director (Sports), they had been able to make this achievement. While encouraging the sports persons and also the Sports Department as had been rightly suggested by Professor Emanuel Nahar, they must take into consideration as to how they could take care of the interests of the coaches, who are working here on ad hoc/ temporary basis, so that they are further encouraged to help their sports persons.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Shri Ashok Goyal has rightly said that the Vice Chancellor deserved the compliments the most as immediately after his joining as the Vice Chancellor, the University had been able to win the MAKA Trophy and now they had won this first Khelo India University Games. Since he watch television on regular basis, he had watched the Award Ceremony of this event on the television, and he had felt very happy and proud of this great achievement. As a teacher he felt that they should organise function with the participants and interact with them, so that they are able to know their viewpoints as also as to what their requirements are and what kinds of problems/difficulties they faced at the ground level. He would also like to give special congratulations to Director Sports and his team, which had worked very hard. Certain people had apprehended that they would relax after winning the MAKA Trophy, but actually they did not relax at all as they had won first Khelo India University Games, which proved that they are Number 1 University in the Country in real sense.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that after winning the MAKA Trophy, winning of First Khelo India University Games, is a second great achievement of the University and it is a very proud moment for all of them. In this achievement the grounds men had a lot of contribution and they deserved to be honoured for that if they have to organise a function, they must do so instead of just issuing a letter of appreciation to them, so that they get motivated and they get encouraged and perform better in future also not at the National level, but International Level. At the moment, when they competed with other countries, perhaps they lack behind in the list of medal winners. Whatever is required to encourage the sports persons, must be done so that they could perform better. He therefore, suggested that the students/participants must be honoured on behalf of the Syndicate.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that Panjab University is the mother of all the Universities of this Region. So far as he remembered when he was the student and until now they have not seen any relaxation in the field of sports. The grounds are always filled with the players and the players make all out efforts to improve their game. Resultantly, the standard of Panjab University never gets lowered in the field of sports and the consistency is always maintained. The achievements of the University in the field of sports reflected the environment prevailing in the university. The students from outside preferred to take admission in Panjab University as the university has better infrastructure. All this have been achieved owing to the atmosphere prevailing in the University as well as hard work of the players. Therefore, he would like to congratulate all the persons involved in the field of sports, especially under his (Vice Chancellor) able leadership.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the message has gone all over the world that Panjab University is number one in the field of sports. The performance of the university in the field of sports is commendable. Naturally, the credit of this achievement goes to the sports persons and the Directorate of Sports and other who were involved in it. Therefore, they must appreciate and admire them and as suggested by one of his colleagues, a special function should be organised to honour them and

interact with them to know their necessities, which would further encourage them. This is a great achievement and they all are proud of it.

Professor Emanuel Nahar suggested that if any student was/is not able to appear in the examination owing to these games, he/she should be given a special chance to appear in the said examination.

The Vice Chancellor thanked the members for their sentiments. So far as he is concerned, he is also of the same opinion. It is really a great achievement after a long time. After winning the MAKTA Trophy, they have now won the First Khelo India University Games. In reaching at this stage, the affiliated Colleges had also contributed a lot. Despite decrease in strength of staff to the extent of more than 50%, they have been able to achieve new heights at the world level. He has been told that in certain disciplines the performance of the University students is to the world level. One of the students has won five Gold Medals alone, which is a great achievement and all times record. In spite of his busy schedule, he always attends the functions organised by the sports department from time to time and had started providing all kinds of facilities to the players. Though there was opposition, he went ahead with the fencing of ground. As told by Professor Rajinder Bhandari, Panjab University is the Mother University in this region and not an ordinary University. If he is not wrong, all the universities of the States of Punjab, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh have emerged out of this University. He would make aware the people about the feelings of the members and would arrange a grand function shortly with the help of Dean of Student Welfare and others.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as told by Professor Emanuel Nahar, certain persons have been appointed by the Directorate of Sports, who are being paid salary from a fund. They should take care of them, who had also contributed significantly towards this great achievement.

When the Vice Chancellor instructed the Finance and Development Officer to put up a detailed note, Professor Emanuel Nahar pointed out that he had already submitted a note in this regard to the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that in spite of the already earmarked funds, if additional funds are received by the University, some part of that fund should also be utilized on the sports activities.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the productivity and the efficiency of the people are directly related to job satisfaction. As told by Professor Navdeep Goyal, certain persons, who are working in the Directorate of Sports, have not been granted an increment during the last five years, owing to this they might get frustrated and would not be able to perform better. He, therefore, suggested that these points, particularly monetary benefits needed to be taken care of it.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that this performance has emerged from the efforts of put in by these people. Could they not regularize their services?

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not do this as there are several problems in it. He suggested that they must organise grand functions in their respective Colleges and invite all the sports persons from the nearby areas. He would try his level best that either he himself or his nominees would definitely attend such functions to be organised by the Colleges. He directed to Dean, College Development Council to ensure that every college organise the function, so that the students feel that they are also being recognised by their own Colleges. Since their main feeder is the affiliated Colleges, the nominees to be sent by him should see as to what facilities could be given to the sports persons in the Colleges.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that many of their institutions are spending crores of rupees on sports activities and are providing extra facilities to the sports person. Though he did not want to name DAV, when he was posted in Jalandhar, they used to spend Rs. 1.5. crore on sports alone.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay, thank you".

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that before they take up agenda for consideration, she has to say few things. Firstly, she would like to convey her thanks to him as well as her Fellow colleagues as Dean, Faculty of Law because a number of students had cleared Delhi Judiciary, PCS, HCS, etc. examinations. It would definitely help the other students in motivating them to prepare for competitive examinations. As such, she fully endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua that they must hold these types of events where they could honour the achievers and acknowledge their achievements. Secondly, their country is presently facing a very great threat of coronavirus. Daily they found in the newspapers that Panjab University is organizing seminars, workshops, conferences, cultural events, functions, etc. She personally felt that the Government of India is doing so much and they must support it because when these types of news items appeared in the newspapers, it meant that they are violating the instructions of Government of India in spite of UGC direction. Hence, if they agreed, all the programmes, functions, etc. must be postponed until 20<sup>th</sup> March 2020, so that they could help the Government of India in control this deadly virus.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has taken it into consideration, but if they wished they could discuss this issue in detail during the general discussion, so that they could get some more input.

Ms. Anu Chatrath suggested that a function should be organized in the Campus for the students of the affiliated Colleges, who have participated/won medals in Khelo India University Games.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would definitely hold a function for the purpose. The Principals of the Colleges should hold the functions in their respective Colleges and he would hold the function in the Campus for these students.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua enquired since the discussion is going, could they not hold the general discussion first.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not start a new practice/precedence.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he had moved a Resolution. Although he had gone through the entire agenda carefully, he is unable to find the Resolution, which he had proposed along with Shri Ashok Goyal. He added that the Resolution was moved well in time.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would see to it. Now, they should take up the agenda items for consideration.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that at least they should be informed as to why the Resolution moved by them has not been included in the agenda.

The Vice Chancellor instructed one of the officials to bring the Resolution moved by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Ashok Goyal.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that since the general discussions would definitely take place as they are meeting after a long time.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that why he is saying so because he has brought 12 agenda of Syndicate meetings of last year (January 2019 to April 2019, April 2019 to September 2019 and December 2019). He would tell them about the achievements of the last Syndicate about affiliated Colleges. There is no purpose of becoming members of the Syndicate. He has noted down the items relating to affiliated Colleges, so that they are made aware as to how they approve the agenda items. The Vice Chancellor would go after the meeting and officers, who would be here, are not entitled to take action. The Vice Chancellor would not be available to them before the next meeting of the Syndicate. No action was taken on the decision of the Syndicate meeting held in January 2018. He is not only speaking; rather, he has brought all the agenda of the meetings of the Syndicate held in the year 2019. That was why, he was asking that if the general discussions are held in the beginning, it is quite possible that there is some outcome of this meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to apprise them about the status of Resolution moved by them.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they have moved a Resolution about the affiliated Colleges, which are not promoting teachers from Assistant Professors to Associate Professors and the Colleges belonged to both categories, i.e., aided and unaided as well Colleges of Education. Their Resolution is that the teachers should be given promotion in accordance with the policy of the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that the Resolution has been proposed by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and he himself (Shri Ashok Goyal). Why the Resolution has not been brought to the Syndicate, he is asking about that?

The Vice Chancellor instructed the Dean, College Development Council to inform the members about the status of the Resolution.

The Dean, College Development Council informed that the Resolution had come to him and the same was returned to the Registrar with necessary comments.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Dean, College Development Council to give full information as according to him some input was required.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, if it is so, then full information should be provided to them because it is not a question of zero hour; rather, it is question of propriety of the agenda to be taken up in the meeting of the Syndicate. What is to be examined where the reference had been given of the UGC mandate? What is to be examined in that? In fact, it is the observation of the UGC and they had said that in spite of the fact that...

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be taken up during zero hour.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to tell them as to what is to be examined.

Ms. Anu Chatrath suggested that on this issue and on another issue wherein it had been recommended by the Faculty of Law that Research Centre should be created, including at University Institute of Legal Studies. In spite of recommendation of Faculty of Law, the item has so far not been placed before the Syndicate. In the meanwhile, files relating to both these issues be sought.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that not in the meanwhile, the Vice Chancellor should tell them about the status of their Resolution and about the issue raised by Ms. Anu Chatrath, thereafter, they would take up the agenda items for consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should be told as to what was to be examined.

It was informed that the Resolution, which was proposed by Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and whatever they had written in the Resolution that it should be got examined from the affiliated Colleges perspective and thereafter, the Resolution along with the relevant documents be placed before the Syndicate.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that since it is very important Resolution, they must have full information about the same.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that they should bring the Resolution and read out as to what the Resolution is.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be told as to what is to be examined from the Colleges perspective.

It was informed that if there are issues relating to promotions and increments of teachers of affiliated College, the facts relating to them needed to be ascertained.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that the issue is not relating to increment(s), only the issue of promotion is there. The people are being exploited in the Colleges and the UGC is sending reminders from time to time and the University, in spite of Resolution proposed by them, is neither placing the same before the Syndicate nor taking the issue seriously.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he is sorry to point out that he had asked the Dean, College Development Council twice that whatever conditions are imposed on the affiliated Colleges about the appointment of teachers and the same are being fulfilled. Suppose there is a condition of appointment of 7-8 teachers on each College, there would be about 40 teachers within a period of 4 years, whereas the teachers are not more than 4-5 in the Colleges. The teachers have been appointed only in the University record. In fact, the Colleges did not send cases to the University for approval of appointments. The Colleges fulfilled the condition(s) only for the sake of affiliation. If the members of the Syndicate are forced to move a Resolution, they could well imagine the situation.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should have been taken care of by the Dean, College Development Council. He did not know why it is pending for the last two years.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they should be told as to what problem is there. If they found the Resolution incorrect, they would withdraw the Resolution.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he did not know whether the Resolution has reached him (Vice Chancellor). The propriety demanded that the Resolution should have reached him (Vice Chancellor). They wanted to know as to what orders had been passed by the Vice Chancellor on the Resolution. However, if the Resolution has not reached him (Vice Chancellor), let him tell that they have simply resolved therein that the mandate of the UGC should be followed in the affiliated Colleges. Nothing more than that is there. What is to be examined in it? Could they go beyond UGC?

Ms. Anu Chatrath pointed out that earlier they were not implementing it in Government Colleges. Thereafter, they went to the High Court and the High Court passed orders directing them to consider and pass speaking orders. Even then, they rejected and the teachers again went to the High Court and after the orders of the Court, they have got promotions under the CAS.



Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that, in fact, the management of the Colleges deliberately did not promote teachers as Associate Professors. He could give example of different teachers. Although they are eligible for the last more than 4 years, they are not being promoted under the CAS. Even D.A.V. Management is not promoting the teachers under the CAS.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua requested the Vice Chancellor to call the file relating to the Resolution, so that the factual position comes to their knowledge.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that there is another agenda item relating to creation/recognition of research centres, which had been recommended by the Faculty of Law, at University Institute of Legal Studies and P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana. Though about a year has elapsed, the matter has not been placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that two-three issues needed to be thrashed out before the end of the meeting today. He requested the Vice Chancellor to call the files relating to those issues, so that the issues did not linger on.

The Vice Chancellor said that how could the information relating to such issues be sought and brought at such a short notice.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no need to obtain information on these issues.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to be patient. How all such things could not be brought simultaneously?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have only referred to the Regulation(s) of UGC in their Resolution and he did not want to refer to the Regulation(s) relating to Resolution because he is interested only in resolving the issue and not complicating the same.

Ms. Anu Chatrath and Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the meeting for the next meeting of the Syndicate should be fixed.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had talked to certain people and he would be fixing the date of the next meeting of the Syndicate very shortly.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that at least one meeting of the Syndicate needed to be held within a period of fortnight, so that the issue relating to affiliated Colleges, which are pending for the last so many days/months could be sorted out.

The Vice Chancellor reiterated that he had talked to certain persons and had decided to hold a meeting of the Syndicate at the earliest possible. Even a tentative date for the meeting has also been fixed, but keeping in view the uncertainty prevailing nowadays, they could not declare the date as final.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the tentative date should be fixed, which could be subject to change.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is looking into the possibility of holding the meeting on next Saturday or Sunday.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu pleaded that the meeting of the Syndicate should be held on Saturdays and not on Sundays.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

The Vice Chancellor said that, next time, they would hold the meeting on Monday. When a couple of members objected to it, the Vice Chancellor said, "Okay, the meeting would be held on Saturday".

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they are witnessing since long that the Syndicate meets in every month. It might not be a rule, but the practice existed and the same is being followed religiously. If the meeting of the Syndicate is skipped in the beginning, i.e., in the month of February, it did not look nice. He (Vice Chancellor) had held a special meeting one day in the month of February. Had the other items been included in the agenda on that day, it would have been better. He requested the Vice Chancellor to convene the meetings of Syndicate every month. Earlier, there was a practice not to hold the meeting in the month of June and in other months, the meeting is always held and they are witnessing it since 1992. He reiterated that the meeting of the Syndicate should be held in every month.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that now the meeting would have to be held in every week as the cases of grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation are to be decided.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari pointed out that they had received the notice for this meeting for Saturday and agenda papers, the date of the meeting has been mentioned for Sunday.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that the meeting was fixed for Saturday, but owing to certain exigency, they were forced to postpone it to Sunday.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the notice for the meeting stating that the meeting has been fixed for Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> March 2019, was received by him yesterday afternoon only.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Shri Ashok Goyal, Syndic and Fellow, Panjab University, for donating blood for more than 100 times;
  - (ii) Players, Coaches, Director (Sports), Deputy Director (Sports), teachers and non-teaching staff, who have contributed, in winning the First Khelo India University games held at Bhuvneshwar, Orissa;
  - (iii) Professor Ved Parkash Upadhyay, former Chairperson, Department of Sanskrit, Dr. Zareen Fatima, Department of Urdu and Professor Yog Raj Angrish, Chairperson, School of Punjabi Studies, on having been selected for Sahitya Academy Award;
  - (iv) Dr. Gurpreet, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, on having been granted patent on her invention 'A METALOSOME ASSEMBLY AND A PROCESS OR PREPARATION THEREOF'."
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. Nos. (1-(i), (iii) and (iv), be noted; and

3. the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate dated 13.12.2019 (**Appendix-I**), be noted.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That if any student was/is unable to appear in the examination owing to these games, he/she should be given a special chance to appear in the said examination.

2. Considered minutes dated 19.11.2019 (Item Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6 & 7) (**Appendix-II**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, for framing and printing of Rules and Regulations of M.Phil./Ph.D. Guidelines in accordance with the UGC minimum standards and Procedure for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Item related to regulations/rules for M.Phil./Ph.D. In the meeting of the Committee, a lot of discussion took place on one issue, which he would like to bring to the notice of the members. There is a condition in the new UGC Regulations that one could be Supervisor/Co-supervisor for maximum number of students and for Assistant Professors, it is 4, for Associate Professors, it is 6 and for Professor, it is 8. Earlier, same credit used to be given to both the Supervisors irrespective of whether he/she was a Supervisor or Co-supervisor. However, if they look into the recent guidelines of the UGC, they would find it to be divided. On the other hand, if they fix the limit at 8 students, two issues are emerging. Firstly, earlier the ranking of Physics used to come, i.e., US Ranking, which has slipped now and there are two reasons for the same – (i) the strength of faculty is depleting (if the faculty strength in the year 2014 was 30, has now been reduced to 19), (ii) the strength of research scholars has also reduced (if last year, the strength of research scholars was 150, it is decreasing continuously), because faculty members have hardly any vacant slot. Certain students have such problems that they have to keep Supervisor as well as Co-supervisor. Obviously, since they could take less number of students, the number of slots would definitely be less and if the number of slots is less, the students would also be less. Resultantly, the overall productivity would also be less. However, they could not violate the UGC Regulations also. Though they have kept the UGC provision, at the same time they have suggested that they must take up this issue with the UGC. Wherever there is Supervisor and Co-supervisor, because they are reducing their credit in promotion, they have to account for it in the counting. Another issue, which had come, is that the conduct viva of Ph.D. students through Skype. It is proposal from the office because they had witnessed several times nowadays that if they request the examiner, the examiner owing to connectivity and longer time involved, asked them whether the viva is allowed through Skype. Several Universities had already allowed viva through Skype, but there is no such provision in this University. It is good that the provision is made, but at the same time because it is public viva, permission would only be given if the situation demanded, i.e., if the examiner declined to come. They would not give him (examiner) the first option to conduct the viva through Skype.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that reason for not giving the first option to conduct the viva through Skype is that when the examiner comes to conduct the viva, he/she interacted with the research scholars/students and thereafter, he gave lecture to them and that lecture is counted in NAAC under activity. Hence, all the examiners who come to conduct the viva of Ph.D. students, they gave lecture. As such, he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) is right that Skype should not be the first choice. Moreover, the Universities which had followed Skype, are not satisfied. Unless and until there is networking amongst the teachers, it would not succeed. Hence, it should be written that only in emergent situation, the viva should be allowed to be conducted through Skype.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma remarked that the sanctity of Ph.D. viva should be maintained. Even if the viva is allowed to be conducted through Skype, it should be only in emergent situations.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that in the resolved part, it has to be mentioned that provision of viva through Skype be added in the existing regulations subject to the condition that it would be used sparingly in emergent or exception circumstances only.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is of the considered opinion that they should not put anything in black and white. They should make it open that if the examiner asks to conduct the viva through Skype, the same would be allowed. They should give a little bit autonomy to the Department also. It did not look nice to him in formalizing the same here.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, he is also going to say what the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor is saying that when there was no provision for conducting the interview through video conferencing, at that time also they had done it because a candidate, who had come to attend the interview from United States of America (USA) and owing to unfortunate happening, the interview was cancelled at the last moment, had to go back without attending the interview. The interview was conducted again and as a special case, his interview was conducted through video conferencing, though there was no such provision. Interestingly, the same fellow was selected. However, what Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra had said that in the absence of any such provision, they should authorize the Vice Chancellor to permit conduct of viva through Skype in case he is satisfied. Even if they wanted to give autonomy to the Department, the Department has to seek permission in writing. As such, the Vice Chancellor should be authorized for this purpose, but it should not be made a norm and the viva through Skype should be allowed under exceptional circumstances only.

The Vice Chancellor said that the viva through Skype is to be allowed only under exceptional circumstances to be highlighted by the external examiner.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No, Sir". Difficulty could be faced by any side. Citing an example, he said that at the moment, since there is a threat of coronavirus, neither they wanted anybody to travel nor anybody else wanted to travel. Hence, it could be both sides.

The Vice Chancellor nodded in affirmative.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that so far as maximum number of students to be guided/supervised by the teachers is concerned, it needed to be put in black and white that nobody could supervise or co-supervisor more than 8 candidates.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it already existed in the guidelines. However, a suggestion had come this time, but the same was not agreed to. An issue had come that the UGC should be approached to relax this condition.

It was pointed out that recommendation 7 of the Committee that "The request dated 15.11.2019 of Chairperson, Department of Geography to supervise two Ph.D. scholars over and above the permissible strength as an exceptional case, though is an emergency, is violative of the UGC regulations.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the candidate is already registered in the Department and the position in the Department is that each and every faculty member has maximum strength. If a faculty member/supervisor suddenly dies, should they leave the student in lurch? Keeping in view this, they have desired this as an exceptional case.

The Vice Chancellor said that whenever such cases emerged as told by Professor Navdeep Goyal wherein the supervisor died, it had been explicitly mentioned in the University Ordinances, especially Banaras Hindu University (BHU) that such students would be attached to the Head of the Department.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this could also be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that since the UGC is their funding agency, they should not ignore it in any manner.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that they should write that if the supervisor of the candidate died, the Head of the Department concerned be appointed supervisor in his/her place, provided he/she himself/herself is Ph.D. If the Head of the Department himself/herself is not Ph.D., how he/she could become a supervisor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that if the Head of the Department himself/herself is not Ph.D., the senior-most teacher of the Department should be appointed the supervisor of the candidate concerned.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to see it as a very nice wording had been mentioned in the Ordinance. In such a case, the Head of the Department could become supervisor of the candidate, so that his/her work did not suffer and as and when a vacancy occurred, the candidate could be transferred to the persons, who has speciality in the field.

It was suggested that they should not violate the UGC as they had several teachers in the affiliated Colleges, who are eligible to become supervisor of Ph.D. candidates.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that supernumerary would be given or the candidate would be given to the Head of the Department, when eligible supervisor(s) would not be available.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if all the faculty members of the Department had already maximum permissible scholars, instead of attaching the student to the Head of the Department, they should appoint a supervisor from the affiliated College.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the eligible supervisor is not available in the affiliated Colleges also, then the candidate should be attached to the Head of the Department.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should not make violations in it. The UGC is very clear that only the regular teachers could guide the Ph.D. students. Before strictures are passed by the UGC and the careers of the students are spoiled, it should be ensured. He pointed out that here in the University even Professor Emeritus are being allowed to supervise Ph.D. students.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the in-service teachers, who had been appointed supervisors, but later on they retired, could they not continue as supervisor(s).

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the retired teachers are continuing to supervise the research students.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as pointed out by Shri Ashok Goyal, they have to think about the Professor Emeritus. Whether they are to be allowed or not?

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to examine this issue in the Committee itself.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could not go beyond the Regulations/Rules.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Regulation/Rule is that the supervisor should be working on regular basis, but whether they should accept them (Professor Emeritus) regular or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how could they accept Professor Emeritus regular. Professor Emeritus is an honorary position.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that then they have to remove Professor Emeritus from the supervisorship.

It was suggested by a couple of members that they (Professor Emeritus) should be removed from the supervisorship today itself.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the issue regarding removal of Professor Emeritus from the supervisorship should be got examined, but no new Professor Emeritus should be appointed supervisor of Ph.D. candidates.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that this issue should be referred to the Committee.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma enquired as to what the maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the minimum time to submit the thesis is 3 years and maximum time is 6 years and with relaxation the maximum time limit is up to 8 years.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the Syndicate in its meeting dated 16<sup>th</sup> October 2019 (Para 4) had resolved that "all those Ph.D. candidates, who could not submit their Ph.D. theses within the maximum time limit fixed due to one reason or the other, be given a golden chance to submit their theses within a period of six months from the issuance of the circular". At the end, the maximum limit is 28<sup>th</sup> of April 2020. Now, she has a submission to make that because most of the supervisors are so busy at the moment and did not have time to get their students to complete the theses. In fact, the teachers/supervisors get time in the months of May and June. She, therefore, suggested that the last date for submission of theses by such Ph.D. candidates should be extended up to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2020 because the purpose, with which they took this decision, would only be fulfilled if they extended this date from 28<sup>th</sup> April 2020 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2020.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the background, with which the decision was taken, was that it was taken with very liberal heart that a time of six months should be given to such students, but at that time probably they did not take into account the time schedule of the teachers. Actually, the teachers would not be available in the months of May and June. Hence, Ms. Anu Chatrath is justified that keeping in view the spirit of earlier decision, if they extend it to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2020 recording that no further extension would be given. He thought that there is no harm in it.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

The Vice Chancellor said that he agreed with him (Shri Ashok Goyal) in principle, but they would not take any decision on it. The matter would be discussed in the next meeting of the Syndicate and final decision taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is correct that an item on the issue should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting and then final decision taken.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they have been informed that the maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis is 8 years. However, he would like to bring to their kind notice that the female candidates had been given relaxation of one year even by the CSR because the females had to face several problems. He, therefore, pleaded at least a relaxation of 6 months should be given to the female candidates.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that the maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. theses by the male candidates is 7 years and for female, it is 8 years. Hence, they had already given relaxation of one year to female candidates.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said, "Alright".

When Ms. Anu Chatrath pleaded that the last date (28<sup>th</sup> April 2020) for submission of Ph.D. theses by the candidates, who could submit the same within a maximum period of 8 years owing to one reason or the other, should be extended up to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2020, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice Chancellor is right that if the date is extended right now, the candidates would stop their work. Hence, the date should be extended in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that, on page 18 of the **Appendix**, grading system has been mentioned for pre-Ph.D. course work. He enquired as to why did they want to introduce grading system in the pre-Ph.D. course work? Is the grading system there in the UGC Regulations? If not, the grading system should not be introduced here. It is only a qualifying paper.

Professor Emanuel Nahar also said that the grading system should not be introduced here in the University. He also agreed with Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua that it is a qualifying paper.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they had introduced the grading system because they had introduced grading system in their all examinations.

To this, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that those are different examinations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that pre-Ph.D. course work needed to be kept qualifying. If grading system had not been introduced in pre-Ph.D. course work in other Faculties, it should not be introduced in this Faculty also. The grading system has neither been implemented in other Universities nor suggested by the U.G.C., it should not be implemented in Panjab University also. However, if they wanted to introduce the same, the reference of U.G.C. must be required. This introduction will affect on the selection. If the grading system is introduced in Panjab University and no system of grading is available in Guru Nanak Dev University, then would how they compare?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would be introduced only when the U.G.C. says on it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the decision was taken earlier in the matter but these things are coming only after re-examination by the Committee. But one should not discourage, he himself appreciate the efforts of the Committee by putting in the innovative steps in the interest of the students.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he was also the member of that Committee but it was not in his mind, what Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua is saying is absolutely right that it will affect at the time of selection.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he is not saying that it has been done wrongly, if the same is available in the U.G.C. guidelines then it should be adopted.

Principal I.S. Sandhu and Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be sent back to the Committee for re-examination.

Dr. Rajinder Bhandari asked whether the Ph.D. grading is being done at the time of submission of thesis of Ph.D. Some of the members answered that no grading is done for the submission of Ph.D. thesis. He (Dr. Rajinder Bhandari) further said if the same is not done in the case of Ph.D. thesis, then why it is here.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua while referring at Page 20 said that in the last para it has been mentioned that *"In case a candidate is not able to submit thesis by himself/herself, he/she can authorise a person to submit the Ph.D. thesis on his/her behalf with prior permission from the Chairman of the Department"*. He asked whether these are the part of the guideline or so.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that these are not the part of the Ph.D. guidelines, these are the additional recommendations which can form a part of the guidelines as nothing is defined in the guidelines how the thesis can be submitted.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the major problem arises at the time when in one day at the time of submission of thesis a candidate has to deposit the fees, clear the dues of the Library and submit the thesis. This exercise cannot be completed in a single day, at least 4 days are required to complete the process.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that at the time of submission of thesis, students have to face problem as due to some or other reason if a student is in foreign country then he has to face problem in submission of thesis while sitting in foreign country. The submission of thesis by him personally is not possible in that situation, therefore, one can authorise a person to submit the theses on his/her behalf with prior permission from the Chairman of the Department.

While intervening Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are two things, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua is saying something else and Professor Navdeep Goyal something else. This is the fact he would also like to place is that he never receives any approach for any kind of University work but at the time of submission of Ph.D. thesis they demand for 2-3 persons of the University to submit the thesis of Ph.D. The process of submission Ph.D. thesis is very cumbersome that a single person cannot complete the same in a single day, especially in the case of female students, it would be impossible to complete the process for her. In the case when the Chairperson does not support the candidate, then it would not be possible to complete the process of submission of Ph.D. thesis. Whereas Dr. Dua is saying not on the proposal that a person or his authorised person submits the Ph.D. thesis, he urges only on the difficulties to complete the process of submission of Ph.D. thesis in one day. This requirement needs to be re-examined.

It was clarified that the fee, which is being deposited by the students for submission of Ph.D. thesis, is charged on per day basis. If bracket for the same is created, there would not be any problem relating to it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee should re-examine the points made by the members taking into consideration the U.G.C guidelines and the guidelines of



the Central University, as nothing new is required to be adopted by the Panjab University.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. the recommendations 1, 4, 5 and 6 of the Committee dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2019, as per **Appendix**, be approved, with the stipulation that the recommendation regarding grading system in Pre-Ph.D. and M.Phil. course work, be not approved;
2. the Committee should examine the Ordinances of other Universities, e.g., Banaras Hindu University, etc. as well as Guidelines of UGC and explore possibility of appointing an eligible Supervisor from the affiliated Colleges, if the Supervisor of a Ph.D. student dies and all the faculty members of the Department had already maximum permissible scholars. However, if eligible Supervisor in the affiliated Colleges is also not available, the student concerned be attached with the Head of the Department;
3. the issue regarding removal of Professor Emeritus from the supervisorship be examined by Committee, but in future, no new Professor Emeritus be appointed as Supervisor of Ph.D. candidate;
4. the process/procedure for submission of Ph.D. thesis be examined and simplified.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That provision of viva through Skype be added in the existing regulations subject to the condition that it would be used sparingly in emergent or exceptional circumstances only with the approval of Vice Chancellor.

**3.**

Considered recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the following two eminent jurists, be nominated, on the Research Degree Committee in Law for two years i.e. 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2021, under Regulation 2 at page 408, P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007:

1. Justice Jasbir Singh
2. Justice B.S. Walia.

Information contained in office note (**Appendix-III**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 2 at page 408, P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, reads as under:

“2. A Research Degree Committee in Law shall be appointed by the Syndicate consisting of (i) the Dean of the Law Faculty (ii) two eminent Jurists nominated by the Syndicate and (iii) Chairperson/Head of the Department of Laws. The term of the Committee will be for a period of two years and the appointment of the members shall be made in time, so that the Committee can function from January following. Any vacancy occurring during the course of the term, shall be filled

by the Syndicate for the remaining term of the Committee.”

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.10.2015 (Para 16) (**Appendix-III**) has authorised the Vice Chancellor to nominate two eminent jurist on the Research Degree Committee in Law for two years i.e. 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2017, under Regulation 2 at page 408, P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whether it was formally discussed about the names of these two eminent jurists as one is the sitting judge.

The Vice Chancellor replied that it was formally discussed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whenever any names are placed/proposed, it is very difficult to discuss them. He suggested that, in future, such names should not be brought in the Syndicate. This should be discussed informally without taking into consideration the names as they would be in a difficult situation to discuss on the names or suggest other names for the same. The consent should be taken informally. Therefore, it is suggested that consent should only be taken informally only when the consensus has been obtained on the names in the Syndicate as it can cause embarrassment to the University. Another thing he would like to know from where these names are proposed and what is the criteria for the same.

Dr. Rajinder Bhandari asked whether this is for the first time or it has been brought in the Syndicate as per previous practice. He said that while discussing the names of the sitting Judges, the sanctity should be maintained. This should be taken into consideration either at the level of the Syndicate or at the level of the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to explain in the matter.

It was informed that from the year 2016-2018, the Syndicate authorised the Vice Chancellor for the same and it is the power of the Syndicate to decide as per regulations.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked when it was done for the year 2016-2018 then what is the status relating to 2018-2020.

It was informed that it was done on the basis of previous practice.

Ms. Anu Chatrath asked for the year 2018-2020, the panel was approved or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was not authorised the names were proposed in the House by the Vice Chancellor and it was agreed by the members of the House.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is talking informally that these names are not being proposed from the Vice Chancellor as he does not know them.

The Vice Chancellor said that he knows both of them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor knew only one member but not both which is known to him.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said being a member of the Syndicate, he did not know both of them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said he only want to know from where these names had come. He is not questioning on the names. It is understood if these are proposed by the members of the Syndicate/Senate. From where these names have come as now they are in the awkward position as they could neither say yes nor no.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that one is the Retired Judge and other is Sitting Judge, therefore, one should enquire about them from the internet search.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not questioning about the candidacy of these persons, he is only asking as to from where these names have come. There are no ifs and buts in the same, they said these are approved but they should be informed from where these names have come.

**RESOLVED:** That the following two eminent jurists, be nominated, on the Research Degree Committee in Law for two years, i.e., 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2021, under Regulation 2 at page 408, P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007:

1. Justice Jasbir Singh
2. Justice B.S. Walia.

**4.** Item 4 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**4.** To nominate two University Readers on the Academic Council for the term 01.02.2020 to 31.01.2022, under Regulation 1.1(m) at page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 1.1(m) *ibid* provides that not more than two University Readers are to be nominated by the Syndicate on the Academic Council. These members shall hold office for two years beginning from February 1.

2. The following Readers (Associate Professor) were nominated for the term 01.02.2018 to 31.01.2020:

1. Dr. Chanchal Narang  
Reader (Associate Professor)  
University Institute of Legal  
Studies  
P.U., Chandigarh

2. Dr. Gurjaspreet Singh  
Reader (Associate Professor)  
Department of Chemistry  
P.U., Chandigarh

3. An office note along with the list of Associate Professors (Department-wise) enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that two senior-most persons be nominated on rotation basis and whenever a person is promoted to higher post, the next senior most person should be nominated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the senior-most persons available at the time and in the case the senior-most person is promoted, then the next senior-most person be considered/substitute the senior-most person.

The Vice Chancellor said "Okay".

Dr. Rajinder Bhandari asked the senior-most person is to be considered for all the times to come.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it is on the basis of rotation on the same cadre.

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice Chancellor be authorized to nominate two senior-most University Readers, on the Academic Council for the term 01.02.2020 to 31.01.2022, under Regulation 1.1(m) at page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007. However, if any of them or both get promoted as Professor at any stage of their term, he/she/they be substituted by the next senior-most person(s).

**5.** Item 5 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**5.** To nominate two University Lecturers (Assistant Professors) (one from the Science Faculty and one from other Faculties) by rotation, on the Academic Council for the term 01.02.2020 to 31.01.2022, under Regulation 1.1(k) at page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 1.1(k) *ibid* provides that two University Lecturers (one from the Science Faculty and one from other Faculties) shall be nominated by the Syndicate, by rotation every alternative year for two years term beginning from February 1.

2. The following Lecturers (Assistant Professor) were nominated for the term 01.02.2018 to 31.01.2020:

1. Dr. Nishima Wangoo  
(Assistant Professor) Lecturer  
Centre for Nanoscience and  
Nanotechnology  
P.U., Chandigarh

2. Dr. Parveen Sheron  
(Assistant Professor) Lecturer  
Department of Punjabi  
University School of Open Learning  
P.U., Chandigarh

3. An office note along with the list of Lecturers (Department-wise) enclosed.

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice Chancellor be authorized to nominate two senior-most University Lecturers (Assistant Professors) (one from the Science Faculty and one from other Faculties) by rotation, on the Academic Council for the term 01.02.2020 to 31.01.2022, under Regulation 1.1(k) at page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007. However, if any of them or both get promoted as Associate Professor at any stage of their term, he/she/they be substituted by the next senior-most person(s).

- 6.** Considered minutes dated 02.12.2019 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding increase of one Unit each in B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) at PURC Ludhiana and LL.M., B.A.LL.B (Hons.) in PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, from the session 2020-21.

**NOTE:** 1. The Approval of the Bar Council of India is required to increase seats in B.A.LL.B (Hons.) at PURC, Ludhiana and LL.M. B.A.LL.B (Hons.) in PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur.

2. A copy of letter dated 26.12.2019 enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that, as a Dean, firstly, she would like to point out that it is the decision of the Committee after detailed discussion and evaluation under the chairmanship of the D.U.I., where they have recommended that one more unit consisting of 60 students in B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) be granted to P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana and PUSSG Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur and one year LL.M. Course (morning) at PUSSG Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur should be started with the intake of 20 students. She had personally visited both the Centres and found that they have enough infrastructure and she thinks if the teachers are unanimously recommending, then it should be considered with a positive mind.

Shri Jarnail Singh asked about the requirement of faculty.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no need of faculty there, only rooms are required.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the rooms which had been constructed there are also for the classes of M.B.A.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that if the classes of M.B.A. would be shifted to upper floor then there would be no difficulty, the Law Courses can be run at the ground floor as there is much sufficient space.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as per his knowledge the donor of the building at Hoshiarpur had clearly specified that the building is to be used only for engineering students, one year LL.M. Course can be run but starting the B.A. LL.B. course is not possible.

The Vice Chancellor said that if it is clearly mentioned by the donor of the building at Hoshiarpur that only Engineering Courses can be run, then how the B.A. LL.B. course can be started.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the condition of the donor should be strictly followed.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he does not have any objection in granting an additional unit of LL.B and starting of LL.M course, but firstly the existing unit should be strengthened. The existing faculty is on the regular basis or not. If it is on ad hoc basis, their posts should be advertised and filled.

The Vice Chancellor said that as the ban is imposed on the recruitment of regular faculty and he is trying to do in the matter but it is very long process.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there is no ban on the posts of Constituent Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that self-financing is also the part of the budget.

Shri Jarnail Singh said then how can they run the said courses.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that if they are approving one more unit, then on the basis of that they can seek permission of the competent authorities, which had earlier imposed restriction.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that exemption from the authorities can be obtained but it cannot be said that they should fill the posts at their own level.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that one thing that is required to be considered is that in B.A. LL.B Course at PUSGRC, the head of the Department should be from the law background. Therefore, the classes of M.B.A., Engineering and Law can be bifurcated as has been done in the Panjab University also where at one floor there is Political Science Department and at the ground floor the M.B.A. classes are being run. The separate Heads should be appointed by bifurcating the departments on separate floors which can also meet the requirements of the Bar Council so that they would not face any problem in future. She believed that the notice to this effect has also been sent to the Registrar with a copy to her in which the Advocate of District Courts, Ludhiana had written that in the regional centres of Panjab University, the Heads of the Departments are not from the legal background. If infrastructure is to be upgraded then they can also think in the matter of bifurcation.

Dr. Keshav Malhotra said that it is the internal policy of the University to appoint the Head of the Department on the basis of rotation. The Co-ordinator of the Law is from the legal background whereas the Director is handling the administrative work.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that in the ULS Department no person can be appointed with legal background as per the requirements of the Bar Council.

The Vice Chancellor said that this can be looked into.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he want to submit that as there are lot of students in Ludhiana who wish to study Law then there is no problem in starting the LL.B Course in Ludhiana.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no issue in running the LL.B. course in Ludhiana but he is worried about the Hoshiarpur.

Ms. Anu Chatrath that the case of Hoshiarpur can be got re-examined but the approval in the case of Ludhiana should be granted.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that there is need of strict bifurcation of faculty for running the LL.B course in Ludhiana.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the conditions of the Bar Council, a separate building is required to run the Law courses, which is the mandatory requirement. As the separate building is being constructed in Ludhiana, a bifurcation of the buildings should be done with separate Head.

The Vice Chancellor asked whether separate building or separate room is required.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that their (Bar Council) requirement is for separate building and not separate portion.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that some departments can be run on the bifurcation basis, e.g., Department of Economics, Political Sciences and M.B.A classes are being run in the same building in Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor said that case for starting the LL.B and LL.M. Courses at Ludhiana should be approved and the case of Hoshiarpur be kept pending.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that after approving the case of Ludhiana, it should be ensured that before the courses are started, the faculty is engaged. He asked as to why Ms. Anu Chatrath is not the member in the Committee.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that this can only be explained by the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is strange that the Dean, Faculty of Law, is not the member of the Committee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the matters relating to the Laws, Dean, Faculty of Law, should be included.

The Vice Chancellor said that in future it would be kept in mind.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that in the Inspection of the Department of Law by the Bar Council in which some serious objections were raised regarding regular faculty, that should be taken up with the U.G.C.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would see to it. He said that number of reminders and personal persuasions are being done by him for the same.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that by giving the reference of the objections raised by the Bar Council, the position of faculty can be strengthened.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the U.G.C. regulations relating to appointment of faculty should be considered and the *ad hocism* should be discouraged. New courses can only be started after the appointment of regular faculty by following the guidelines of the U.G.C. 2018 otherwise no benefit would be made. A letter will be sent by him to the Vice Chancellor on the basis of this.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is his irony that he has to inform to the higher authorities that in the time span of 5 years, how many new courses have been started, how many new buildings were constructed and what has been done for NAAC Accreditation. The second ironic situation that he had given in writing that he does not need anything and it is very difficult to run the University in such a situation. The University has the budget of Rs.560 crore and the University is getting Rs.235 crore. The file is being sent from the University and the Secretary remarked on the same to please go through the reference letter to this effect and the letter sent from the University was received back without any action. The main hurdle which has come to the notice is Rs.208 crore + 6% and nothing is more than that. It is the University where there is no development grant and running and renewal grant. There is no such type of University in the world.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that on these grounds they cannot say that the regular appointment will not be made.

The Vice Chancellor while replying said that they should go with him in the delegation for the funds.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per his knowledge they had given in writing that development grants are required.

The Vice Chancellor said that nothing is in it, if they help him and give a piece of paper, then he would be able to proceed further.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had given in writing and even the affidavit had also been submitted in the court.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is nothing in it, even the Secretary to whom the case was sent, he caught him from Pune to enquire in the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Finance & Development Officer should be asked about this. In fact, the affidavit was submitted by them in the Court to the effect that such grants are required.

The Vice Chancellor said before that they had written that some fixed amount is required.

Shri Ashok Goyal replied that it was only for the purpose of salary grant.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was not only salary grant but this quote has been continuing in all the correspondence.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this may be so. What has been written in such places is not known to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had only one paper available with him in which it had been written that Rs.208 crore +6% is required.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this was not being written by the University, it was written by the Government.

The Vice Chancellor asked why it was not discussed, whether all the intelligent people were in slumber for such a long time. Where the Vice Chancellor and the Governing body at that time was?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was not brought to the knowledge of the Governing body. He pointed out that this is a very serious issue; it should be informed that who has given the undertaking on the behalf of the University.

The Vice Chancellor replied that he does not know about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is also not known to the Syndicate/Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that several times, he has been informed by the Ministry by quoting the reference number and their directives.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was the directive of the Ministry but it was not given in writing by them.

The Vice Chancellor said that after hearing the members there, the directives to this effect were issued.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that after hearing they passed their own orders.



The Vice Chancellor said that the Court will pass the order according to its own version and not according to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened and said that it is not the Court, it is the Government.

The Vice Chancellor said that before the Government they were asked as to what was their requirement. For example, they (Governing body) said that they need development and other grants etc. But the Government refused and said that they would fix the amount with 6%.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened and said they demanded 12%.

The Vice Chancellor further replied that this means that their demand was not acceded to.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that their request of 12% was not acceded to but it was not that they had written to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that the remaining 6% should be reviewed in the next year. They should ask in writing to the Government why development grant and other grants are not being released. This condition should not be allowed to be imposed on other Centres. This should be discussed informally.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the officials of the University do not inform anything informally.

The Vice Chancellor replied that the employees had feeling of fear.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they (employees) do not inform informally whereas the Vice Chancellor does not bring the same formally.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that in Ludhiana they recommended 60 seats in B.A. LL.B. Course and One year LL.M. Course whereas 20 seats of LL.M. Course may be considered for Hoshiarpur.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that from where the teachers would come for the students.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the appointment of teachers would be made at their own level.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the teachers of B.A. LL.B. are not recruited there.

Ms. Anu Chatrath requested that as the Faculty has recommended and it is being considered for approval in principle. The matter relating to recruitment would be considered later on as the approval of the Bar Council is still pending. The conditions of the Bar Council are required to be met for the same.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that one should check the viability while considering the approval of one year LL.M. Course as how much of income the University would be able to generate from this course.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the approval relating to Hoshiarpur is not being rejected but it would be kept pending for the time being to check its viability. The matter relating to 60 seats of B.A. LL.B. Course in Ludhiana is approved, in principle.

The Vice Chancellor said that all the points should be looked into.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it is only the Law Department which plays an important role in the income of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not the Law Department, it is the University Institute of Legal Studies.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that what the Law Department can do, that cannot not be done by anybody in the World.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said she would like to add one more thing at this point which has been discussed by the Registrar that students are being permitted on medical grounds. An amount of Rs.40,000/- and Rs.1,00,000/- is being charged for the same. It had been decided that an amount of Rs.10,000/- out of Rs.40,000/- and Rs.20,000/- out of Rs.1,00,000/- would be deposited in the account of the Director, UILS where the students are allowed to attend the classes. The said sharing amount had not been deposited in the account of the UILS till date. Therefore, their share should be given to them so that they can recruit the teachers at their own level. If their due share is not given to them before the next meeting, the UILS would stage a dharna in the Syndicate Room.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it is very shocked to know that additional funds are being demanded. The students of Ludhiana and Hoshiarpur are not being provided the required infrastructure there, therefore, they are bound to come to the University campus. If they are allowing to attend the classes in Panjab University Campus then why they will attend the classes in the new additional unit of LL.B. Course. The majority of students are applying to study in the Panjab University Campus and they are even appearing for examinations in Chandigarh. He had no objection to it but it should be informed when there is faculty in the Regional Centres at Ludhiana and Hoshiarpur then why they are being allowed to study and appear in Panjab University Campus. Therefore, the unit of LL.B. is to be enhanced at the Panjab University Campus and not in Ludhiana and Hoshiarpur.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the students are being allowed to study in Chandigarh due to their personal problems.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that these are not the problems of the students, it is their problem and they forced the students to study there.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the viewpoint expressed by Principal I.S. Sandhu is correct, but the Institutions function like this.....

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the creation of additional unit at Ludhiana and Hoshiarpur would prove beneficial for the students who are working in Rayat Bahra and Chitkara Colleges and they are paying additional to them for the same. The students of Rayat Bahra and Chitkara Institutes would become the students of Panjab University.

**RESOLVED:** That P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, be granted one additional unit (comprising 60 seats) in B.A.LL.B. (Hons.)w.e.f. the session 2020-21, subject to the approval of the Bar Council of India.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the recommendations of the Committee regarding grant of one additional unit (comprising 60 seats) in B.A.LL.B.(Hons.) w.e.f. the session 2020-21 and start of LL.M. (1-Year) course (morning shift) with an intake of 20 students), at P.U.S.S.G. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, with effect from the session 2020-21, be kept pending and Vice Chancellor is authorised to constitute a Committee to examine the proposal holistically.

- 7.** Considered minutes of the Committee dated 07.11.2019 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 18.11.2018 (Para 11) to look into the various aspects of Pension Policy of Panjab University.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that report is very good and he has studied it thoroughly and tried to understand it.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened and said that he would like to point out some correction at Page 72 in the last para it is mentioned that "*the employees below the age of 35 who joined service between 1.1.2004 to 22.2.2006 are also entitled to exercise an option as provided in P.U. Pension Regulation 1.8 and those who joined at the age of more than 35 years or so...*" Point (a) should be mentioned for the employees below the age of 35 and point (b) for the employees at the age of more than 35 years. It is in two parts (a) and (b) and he got the necessary correction done in the same.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that firstly they should consider the pension regulations. The pension regulations were initially approved in the year 1991. At that time the interest of the bank was so high i.e., @ 14% or 16% and majority of people felt at that time that the Pension Scheme would fail. The scheme was such that corpus would be created from where the pension would be disbursed. These pension regulations were made the part of the Calendar but the same were not implemented. After that the situation changes and people start feeling that since the interest rates are falling and they should opt for pension. In the meantime, the Government had announced in the year 2004 that anybody who joins after 01.01.2004 would not be covered in the pension scheme. The impression in the minds of the people was that if they had abolished the pension scheme and people started approaching the MHRD. During this time, Dr. Manmohan Singh became the Prime Minister and being alumni of this University, he had a soft corner for the employees, and he agreed upon the Pension Scheme with little modifications. The Pension Scheme which was originally initiated and its regulations had to be changed, e.g., the insertion of the clause of 01.01.2004, whereas some regulations which had been found redundant after going through the complete pension scheme. Regulation 1.9 is bringing contradiction in it which says that all those who joined at the age of more than 35 years, if they do not give the option they will be covered under the Pension Scheme. It is also the part of the Scheme today as it has not been repealed and a person who joins at the age of more than 35 years is covered in the Pension Scheme according to the regulation. On the other hand while considering the Regulations at the initial stage it says that a person joins after 01.01.2004 would not be covered under the pension scheme. It is a contradictory situation. Similarly there are some other contradictions in it, one regulation allows and the other regulation binds the person. There were lot of cases which had not been done and their representations were being received which had been dealt with very clearly in the report. Because there are contradictory regulations, therefore, a legal vetting is very much required. In the mean time one issue relating to the notification of Punjab Government had also been raised in which the autonomous bodies are allowed to implement the old pension scheme up to 2012. They are not aware whether these are being implemented in other Universities or not. It should also be got examined from other Universities i.e., Punjabi University or Guru Nanak Dev University as they have to follow the Punjab Government for the same as by and large the University is following the Punjab Government. A lot of efforts were made by the University to consider the full pension after rendering 25 years of service, the regulations have been amended and got approved which has not been notified yet and the letter to this effect had already been received in the University. The latest rules of the Punjab Government should be re-examined. As has been said by the people that there are two regulations, one regulation is debarring the employees and not in their favour then its precedence will not be considered and the regulation which is giving benefit, its precedence will be considered/maintained. He suggested that the legal vetting of the whole document should be got done.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the report of the Committee along with the representations received in this connection should be sent to the legal expert for the legal examination and then it should be brought to the Syndicate.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that in the recommendations submitted by the Committee under the chairmanship of Shri Ashok Goyal, a large section of people is demanding that one option/chance should be granted to them. They also moved to Court and those people have struggled a lot before 2004 relating to pension. They were the part and parcel of these whole efforts. They should be called for discussion regarding the viability of their inclusion in the scheme and discuss regarding the fear that the scheme would be flopped by their involvement. All the things relating to the money that would be debited and credited should be discussed and it should be done keeping in view the interest of the non-teaching staff. He fully endorsed the recommendation No.1 of the report of the Committee. It should be done on priority basis and there is a lot of discontentment among the employees as they are fighting for the same from a very long time. This should be done as it is their legitimate claim.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that the representation of the employees, which they have given, is the same be got examined at the level of the authorities.

Dr. Satish Kumar said their (employees) view point should be examined and the authorities should respond to them. If there is no major hurdle that should be accepted.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the Pension scheme and other such cases e.g. case of Dr. Prem Nath Sharma should also be got examined legally.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had also received the representation of 175 persons and he ensured that he would see to it.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that if on the lines of recommendations of the Committee, the pension scheme would be opened. If on the view point that it would create additional financial burden and the same is not allowed for them, it would be a great injustice to them. He felt that this scheme should be opened for them who did not opt at that time due to one or other reason and it will prove to be a better decision.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that first of all he would like to congratulate Shri Ashok Goyal to deeply study the representations of the employees and submitted a detailed report on the same. He and his team deserves Congratulations and also to the Vice Chancellor who constituted the Committee. But the reference of the PUTA and it was decided in the General body meeting of the Executives that a person who joins in today's date should be covered under pension. The current circular of year 2012 which has been received from the Punjab Government is also required to be considered. The said Circular should also be got legally examined along with the report of the Committee so that the work of all the employees would be done at one level.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the matter relating to the Circular of Punjab Government for the year 2012 is counter posing. Firstly the case relating to Pension Scheme for 2004 should be taken up as it is the legitimate right of the persons who joined before 2004.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said in the Executive Committee of the PUTA, this report had been considered as an achievement but the reaction of the teachers turned opposite for them. The teachers had reacted and desired that it should be done up to the year 2012 and at that the resolution was passed that the circular letter of the Punjab Government for the year 2012 should be adopted.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that people are not saying openly, what they are discussing outside the Panjab University. So much so, of course, the grievance must have been addressed to him (Vice Chancellor) also. That why the Committee has stopped only up to 2006 and why they have not extended the purview up to 2012? Notwithstanding the fact that the Committee has dealt only with those issues, which were placed before it. Nobody meant nobody, including the office has not brought to the notice of the Committee any such thing relating to grant of pension to the employees who have joined service up to 2012. Whatever was placed before the Committee, the Committee has given its findings on the basis of those documents. There was only three issues pending before the Committee, one was to define the contemporary period of those, who wants five year benefit; another was to open the option once again for those, who joined the service before 1.1.2004, and the third was representation of those, who had joined between 1.1.2004 and the date of notification of Pension Regulation, i.e., February, 2006. These were the three issues before the Committee and the Committee had tried to work only on these issues. Had this been also before the Committee, the Committee would have given its findings, but it is never too late. This representation has come now. If the pension scheme could be extended up to 2012, he was rather votary of the system where the pension scheme should be applicable to all, even those, who joined in 2020, but only if they are able to do it. The question is, this approach that they do it up to 2012 or nobody else. That is not the right approach. If they do it up to 2006 are not even for those who had grant before 1.1.2004, that is also not the right approach. They have to see whatever are their regulations and as per their regulations even if the compartment is full or it is closed, a person, who has got the reservation for that compartment, has to enter or has to be allowed to enter as he could not be denied entry to that compartment, even if somebody has to pull the chain of the train. So Professor Rajinder Bhandari is right, that they had entered, but nobody else should be allowed to be the beneficiary of this pension scheme, is completely a dangerous approach; rather, it is entry progressive approach. Generally, the approach is that let they walk forward together. The benefit should be given to them, so that they are also given the same in future. However, here the approach is if the benefit is not given to them, they would not allow even others to get the same. Anyway, the Committee has not gone into this aspect. The mandate of the Syndicate was to evaluate the pension scheme from all angles. The Committee was constituted by the Syndicate. The Vice Chancellor needed to be congratulated that beyond the mandate of the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor himself included in that Committee a legal expert, who is the Director of University Institute of Legal Studies also, so that the scheme could be read from the legal angle also. So they have tried to give legal interpretation. He just wanted to say that, is there any law on the earth, where they could deny somebody a benefit from the back date? They could give benefit from back date, but they could not snatch benefit from the back date. The Pay Commission would come, which is to be effective from 1.1.2016 and that could be effective, but they could not say that from 2016 their salaries had been reduced. It has to be read that they could not take any decision to the detriment of any employee from the retrospective effect. That is how, they have dealt with the regulation, which has come into force in 2006. By that regulation, nobody could snatch the rights of a person, who was already enjoying before 2006. So far as the issue of contradiction in regulation raised by Professor Navdeep Goyal is concerned, this is also a law of the land, not only the law of the land, but also the law on the earth that wherever there is/are contradictory regulations, they have to be read harmoniously to the advantage of the employees. This is also a settled law. First of all, there should not be any contradictory regulations, but if there are, that has to be read harmoniously in the interests of the employees. Now the question is about the opening of option. The Committee thought that had they opted in 2006 when the revised pension regulations were notified, they would have deposited some money taking it from the Contributory Provident Fund, i.e., equivalent to employer's share and deposited the same in the Pension Corpus. They did not opt at that time for whatever reasons, they have not mentioned to the Committee, but he could tell them so many

reasons as to why some people did not opt. Some people did not opt keeping in view the higher rate of interest, but all of them are not from this category. Some people could not opt in spite of the fact that they wanted to opt. What was their fault? So that is why, whatever amount they would have deposited in 2006, even if they are allowed to opt today, the same amount they have to deposit today. What is the difference? This amount which was due at that time along with interest has to be shifted to the Pension Corpus. Secondly, the Finance and Development Officer raised the issue in the meeting of the Committee that according to regulation, they are right, but the problem is that they would not have enough finances to meet the pension liability, especially for those, who would be allowed to exercise the option for pension now. Meaning thereby, there is no ambiguity in the regulation, which was the mandate for the Committee to work upon. The problem lay somewhere else, which does not cover in the regulation that funds are not available. Now let them state here that existing pension scheme minus those whether they are allowed the option or not. He just wanted to know from the Finance and Development Officer through the Vice Chancellor whether that scheme is self-sustainable. They say that people thought that the pension scheme would fail. If they have to speak in those terms, let them see the fate of that pension scheme, which is working even now. What he was trying to say is that under the garb of financial constraints, they could not change the interpretation of the regulations. They have to interpret the regulations in their true spirit, and thereafter, they have to address the problem, which arises out of the true interpretation of the regulations. However, he is with those who say that the pension scheme had been extended up to 2012. He did not want to comment on this simply because this is their claim. They have given the representation to the members of the Syndicate. They all are with them as they had already said that they want to extend the pension scheme to be extended for all times to come. However, if that is not possible, at least at par with the Punjab Government where they say that it had been extended up to 2012. Reserving his comments whether it had been extended or not, on the basis of the claim made, he thought that, this also needed to be considered without having any misconception about the Committee's working that why did they not cover the people up to 2012. Now, this is to be decided whether this letter of 2012 had to go to the same Committee or had been suggested for legal vetting. If it is to be sent for the legal opinion or legal vetting, this 2012 also should be sent there and it should be examined in totality.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the whole issue should be got legally examined.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to bring to their kind notice one thing that it is totally misconceived to say that the pension scheme has been totally discontinued after 1.1.2004. In Punjab only (Baba Farid University of Medical Sciences, Faridkot), the pension scheme was introduced in 2007. In Haryana also, they had started the pension in 2006 and in spite of the dictate of the Government of India, in Banks the pension continued up to July 2010. Hence, to say that 1.1.2004 is the cut off date, is wrong. Secondly, the instructions, which had come from the Government of India regarding 1.1.2004, had been notified in December 2003 from the prospective date, but in the Panjab University, they had acted in a reverse manner as they had implemented the Pension Scheme in 2006 effective from 1.1.2004. These things, if at all decided to be sent for legal vetting, these observations should also be sent along.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should also be ascertained as to how much financial burden would be there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, as a representative of PUTA, he is duty bound to bring to their kind notice that the Punjabi University, Patiala, had extended pension up to 2012.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Ms. Anu Chatrath pointed out that a letter in Punjabi has been appended with the representation. Perhaps, none has gone through this letter. According to this letter, pension is mandatory w.e.f. 1.1.2004.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that propriety demanded that this representation along with Punjab Government letter should also be got legally examined.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. recommendation 2 of the Committee dated 07.11.2019 mentioned at page 72 of the Appendix, be modified as under:
  - (a) That the employees below the age of 35 years who joined service between 1.1.2004 to 22.2.2006 are also entitled to exercise an option as provided in P.U. Pension Regulation 1.8; and
  - (b) Those, who joined at the age of more than 35 years during this period are automatically covered under this scheme by operation of Clause 1.9 unless they specifically elect to be governed by CPF Scheme.

As mentioned herein above, the service benefits cannot be amended retrospectively to the prejudice of such employees. As per the settled position of law, the benefits which accrued to the employees who joined service prior to 23.02.2006 cannot put in a category which is detrimental to their rights.

2. After incorporating above-said modifications in the **Appendix**, therevised recommendations of the Committee dated 07.11.2019, be got legally examined in the light of the observations made by the members.
3. The case will be again placed before the Syndicate after legal vetting.

8. Considered minutes dated 27.12.2019 (**Appendix-V**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor pursuant to the decision of the earlier Committee dated 03.12.2019 (**Appendix-V**) with regard to open bids received in response to invitation of RFPs for On-line fee Collection and Management System.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 27.12.2019, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

9. Considered minutes dated 08.01.2020 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Leave Cases Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired have all the cases been placed before the Syndicate or another meeting of the Committee has been held.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that all the cases have not come to the Syndicate. Another meeting of the Committee has been held. The new cases, which have been recommended by the Committee now, would come in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra to consider the remaining cases in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked the Registrar to ensure that all the remaining cases of teachers are placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Continuing, Professor Keshav Malhotra requested the Vice Chancellor to tell them as to when they are holding the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that one of the leave cases belonged to him, but the same is not urgent.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that people had faith in him and they knew that since he (Professor Malhotra) is in the Syndicate, he would take care of their interests.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Leave Cases Committee dated 08.01.2020, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

**10.** Considered recommendations (Sr. Nos. 1, 3, 4,5, 6, 7 & 8) of the Committee dated 15.01.2020 (**Appendix-VII**), constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that there was an issue in the Item under consideration. The Committee has recommended appointment of certain persons, but only selective cases have been placed before the Syndicate, i.e., 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8.

The Vice Chancellor enquired are the recommendations of the Committee in accordance with the Regulations/Rules because last time the Committee had made recommendations contrary to Regulations/Rules?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that nothing like that has been recommended this time. However, why the recommendation(s) of the Committee has not been placed before the Syndicate by the office. According to him, the recommendations of the Committees should not be placed before any University body/authority partially. However, the office could make its observations. Instead of making observations, the office has placed the recommendations of the Committee before the Syndicate selectively, which is wrong. Even if complete recommendations of the Committees, including those which have been rejected, are placed before the Syndicate, then also the rejected cases would not be approved.

It was pointed out that so far as the case at Serial Number 2 is concerned, no decision has been taken by the Committee. Why the same needed to be placed before the Syndicate.

To this, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that even if the case at Serial Number had been placed before them, they would have accepted the recommendation of the Committee for examining the same and would not have appointed the person concerned. What he meant to say is that after the report of the Committee, if there is something, which is not to be accepted, the office could give its note/observation separately, but to place the recommendations partially did not look nice.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to what partial the office has done in the Item under consideration.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that the cases at Serial Number 2 and 4 have not been placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that both Professor Navdeep Goyal and the Registrar are right. In these cases, the Committee has not made any recommendation. Neither they have denied nor they have approved. As such, until there is no recommendation, how



would it come to the Syndicate? What the Committee has done is that until the Certificate is submitted by the candidate, they would not consider his/her case. This meant, neither there is negative recommendation nor positive. Resultantly, it would not come to the Syndicate, but they should not have included this item in their minutes. Problem here is that they place the entire minutes before the Syndicate. Earlier also, he had pointed out that actually whatever comes to the Syndicate, comes as recommendation of the Vice Chancellor, but they bring the minutes to the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Correct".

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that what in it is that until the Committee did not make any recommendation, it should not be placed before the Syndicate, but if there is negative recommendation, it would definitely come to the Syndicate. However, if the Committee has sought just relevant papers, why the same should come to the Syndicate? This needed to be told to the Committees.

Professor Navdeep Goyal drew the attention of Hon'ble members towards case at Serial Number 4. In fact, in this case, the Committee has made a recommendation and the issue is that when the case had come to the Syndicate for the first time, he had told that this case should be re-examined in its entirety. Now the case has been re-examined and recommended again, although if they see, the recommendation is not complete and the complete recommendation/case needed to be brought to the notice of the Hon'ble members. In fact, the father of this candidate was also an employee of the University and he died in an accident when he was merely a minor and he could not be offered job at that point of time. His grandfather was also working in the University and his mother left the family. In a way, this boy has been nourish/raised by his grandfather. They had found that even his grandfather died during the job. Hence, it is a unique and extreme compassion case. Secondly, though it is not covered under the rule, they had earlier appointed several such persons. They should consider such extreme compassion cases with the positive minds, especially when they had done such cases earlier.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if someone is minor at the time of death of his/her father, he/she is appointed on compassionate grounds as and when he/she becomes major.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that if someone is minor at the time of death of his/her father, he/she could be appointed on compassionate grounds on attaining the age of major.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa remarked that the case is deserving one, but the arguments are not correct. He should be appointed on compassionate grounds on the basis of death of his father during job.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he should be appointed on the basis of death of his father during job; otherwise, it would become a precedent for others.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay, done".

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations (Sr. Nos. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8) of the Committee dated 15.01.2020, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That Mr. Puneet grandson of late Shri Babu Lal be appointed as Peon on humanitarian grounds in the pay-scale of Rs.4900-10680 plus Rs.1650/- G.P. (with initial pay of Rs.6950/-) plus allowances admissible under the rules.

- 11.** Considered if, the following Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), be executed between:

1. Panjab University, Chandigarh, India and Università Telematica Pegaso, Italy for promoting international and intercultural understanding, research and exchange between the two institutions.
2. Interdisciplinary Centre for Swami Vivekananda Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Research for Resurgence Foundation, Nagpur to establish a strong academic collaboration, by undertaking joint responsibility and activities in their respective field of excellence, research, resources, knowledge and human.
3. Department of Philosophy, and Centre of Phenomenology & Cognitive Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Centre for Philosophy of Science, University of Pittsburgh for joint funding to various Governments(s) agencies for research projects and to implement academic exchange.
4. Department of Philosophy and Centre of Phenomenology & Cognitive Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Department of Philosophy Rutgers University to implement academic exchange and resource sharing of infrastructure for implementations of projects and development program, through various schemes.
5. Department of Philosophy and Centre of Phenomenology & Cognitive Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles to implementation academic exchange and to implement resource sharing of infrastructure for implementations of projects and development program, through various schemes.
6. Panjab University, Chandigarh and Kyushu University, Japan for establishing UNESCO Chair at Kyushu University, Japan.
7. Panjab University, Chandigarh and Alliance Franciase, CAVILAM, France, for Staff of student exchange opportunities, Cooperate on the development of, and articulation of, academic programming, Development of other mutually beneficial programs, Organising joint conferences, workshops, seminars, Exchange of scholarly information particularly with regard to French & Francophone Studies, Undertaking Joint Research Projects.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that it was also discussed last time and it has been mentioned at page 99 of the documents provided to them that “exchange of students and development of study abroad and short term programme”.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if there is no urgent, the consideration of the item could be deferred to the next meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since they are holding the next meeting shortly, the consideration of the item under consideration should be deferred.

The Vice Chancellor said that although they are holding the next meeting of the Syndicate shortly, it would be better if the item is through right now. He, therefore, requested the members to go through the item carefully and if there is nothing wrong, the same should be approved.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he has pointed out these short-term courses, because what problem they are facing in these is.....

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa intervened and enquired as to what is viewpoint of Dean of University Instruction and Dean, College Development Council, in this item as both are the Academic Heads.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is right, they (both Dean of University Instruction and Dean, College Development Council) give the views on such items.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Universities, which are executing MoUs with Panjab University, what they do is that they gave affiliation to those institutions, which did not meet the conditions of Panjab University. They had executed MoUs with several Universities, e.g., Nottingham and a lot of Institutions had got affiliation of Nottingham University. After studying for two years, the students started saying that the University had executed MoU with such and such University and their College should be attached to them. Therefore, whenever they draft the MoUs, they needed to see that the courses, which have been mentioned therein, are to be offered by them in the Campus or in India. Where are they using the MoU executed with the Panjab University? Had they the entitlement to offer/run courses in India after entering into an MoU with Panjab University?

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa remarked that it is both ways.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how could they do this. If they offer courses in India, they would become their own (P.U.) competitors.

The Vice Chancellor said that the MoU are placed before the Syndicate after getting the same examined carefully.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that a very serious issue is involved in it and serious in the context that many of the foreign Universities are being run by the funds given by the alumni. He had raised his voice many a times that they must involve alumni in it so that they keep linked/connected to the University. The alumni, who are faculty members in other Universities, including abroad or are entrepreneurs of Industries, they also needed to be involved. Hence, it should be thoroughly examined. As had been pointed out about the misuse of MoU, the same should also be taken care of, so that institutes are not opened here in the name of foreign Universities.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to get it examined.

The Vice Chancellor said that all the MoUs would be got vetted and brought again.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired as to who would be involved in the vetting. He suggested that the persons like Professor Ronki Ram, who had also taught in foreign Universities, should be involved in the vetting.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that it should also be assessed whether "Research for Resurgence Foundation, Nagpur" is a body or a University.

**RESOLVED:** That the following Committee be constituted to vet the above-mentioned Memorandum of Understanding (MoUs):

1. Professor Navdeep Goyal ... Chairperson
2. Professor Ronki Ram
3. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua

**12.** Considered if, Dr. Khushwinder Kaur, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, be re-appointed afresh, purely on temporary basis for another one year w.e.f. 07.03.2020 with break on 06.03.2020 (Break day) or till the posts are filled in, on

regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-VIII**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** Dr. Khushwinder Kaur was re-appointed afresh as Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry (purely on temporary basis) for one year w.e.f. 06.03.2019 by the Senate in its meeting dated 26.05.2019 (Para XXXIV (I-15)).

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that Dr. Khushwinder Kaur, be re-appointed afresh as Assistant Professor in the Department of Chemistry, purely on temporary basis for another one year w.e.f. 07.03.2020 with break on 06.03.2020 (Break day) or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier. The letter of appointment to Dr. Khushwinder Kaur be issued in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

- 13.** Considered request dated 15.01.2020 (**Appendix-IX**) of Abhinav Chodha S/o Shri Vinod Kumar that the condition of producing the migration certificate, be waived off, for confirmation of his admission in B.Com. LL.B (Hons.) 5<sup>th</sup> Semester from Amity University, Noida to Rayat College of Law, Rail Majra, District Ropar. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-IX**) was also taken into for consideration.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 13.12.2019 (Para 6) (**Appendix-IX**), while cancelling the admission of Mr. Abhinav Chodha S/o Shri Vinod Kumar to B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) has further resolved that it be enquired as to who and under which authority permitted Mr. Abhinav Chodha to appear in the examinations and how his results were declared; and if not, how he was admitted to 3<sup>rd</sup> Semester for which 50% of the papers required to be cleared.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that though the regulation did not permit, at the same time, his problem seemed to be genuine and serious also because the University is blackmailing him. They had tried so many things, but the Migration Certificate has not been issued. In fact, last time, they had taken the decision to cancel his admission, but he believed that it would be inhuman. Therefore, they should now revoke that decision, but his admission would be kept provisional because the Migration Certificate has to be submitted.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has been learnt that the student is saying that he could not submit anything more.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that for that also, there are steps, which could be taken and the UGC & Ministry of Human Resource & Development could be involved in that. The University could not blackmail the student like this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have to do something because the University is behaving with the student in an unlikely way.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that despite their (Vice Chancellor and Registrar) personal intervention, the University is not issuing the Migration Certificate. In fact, there is a larger question, they must stand for the cause of the student on this issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that they should allow the student to continue provisionally. They would neither stop him from appearing in the examination nor cancel his admission, but to waive off the submission of Migration Certificate would also not be correct.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if the student got relief from the Court, they would not have any problem.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there is a larger question involved. Their Institution is not strictly to follow the rules, but has to see sometimes above that. Here one of the students is being blackmailed by a private Institution. What role should they play in that case? Should they accede to the pressure? In fact, they should not succumb to the pressure; rather, they should firmly stand with the student and support him to the maximum extent, so that such a blackmailing never occurs.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to what could they do? They could only give time to the student to submit the Migration Certificate.

Ms. Anu Chatrath remarked that without Migration Certificate, the admission of the student is provisional.

The Vice Chancellor said that he himself had dealt with them directly, but they said that they would not issue the Migration Certificate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that they might have been demanding money from the students.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that they (Institute) would definitely demand fee from the student.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that Migration Certificate is a right of the student and nobody could deny it. Nobody could force someone to reach somewhere against his own whims and wishes.

The Vice Chancellor said that it must be examined by someone because it is pending since long and the University is in a very embarrassing situation. When the Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa to facilitate it and see as to what could be done in this case, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa gave his nod.

When the Vice Chancellor said that let them move forward, Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what has been done in this case. The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa would pursue it and as to what could be done. The Vice Chancellor further said that the office position should also be listened.

It was informed that the examinations are underway. The student is continuing provisionally and the Registration Branch has still not given clearance to him. As they knew the facts, even if he appeared for the final semester examination, degree could not be issued to him after the declaration of result without submission of Migration Certificate and without degree, he could not be enrolled by the Bar Council.

Ms. Anu Chatrath remarked that he could either go to the Court or he could make representation against that institution to the higher authorities.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that as members of the Governing Body, they must stand against such atrocities.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not be any kind of violation of regulations.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that according to him, the final decision on the issue must be taken before the commencement of examination. If degree could not be awarded to him without the Migration Certificate, he could obtain the same through Court orders. He suggested that the student should be given sufficient time to submit the Migration Certificate.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if time is given to the student to submit the Migration Certificate, there would be pressure on the student, which might affect his performance in the examination.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in the case of students of affiliated Colleges, they did not permit them to appear in the examination without submission of Migration Certificate. Here they are doing for the student of another Institution, but in the case of their own students, they are not allowing. Why should they disturb their system?

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that even if all the students migrated, they would happily issue them the Migration Certificate.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what the discretion of the Syndicate on this issue. If they could do it, why should they wait anymore? Let the office tell whether they could do it or not. If they could not do it at all, in that situation, were they not trying to beat along the bush by befooling themselves and befooling the student, his parents and others? It is being said that tomorrow the student might go to the Court and would get orders for award of Degree. That meant, if the Syndicate allowed him to continue provisionally with the condition that he has to submit the migration certificate within a stipulated time. What would be the value of that decision? It did not mean that they should allow the student to continue the provisionally, even if it is not within their jurisdiction.

The Vice Chancellor said that despite jurisdiction, the point made by Sh. Jarnail Singh that they did not allow the students of their own affiliated Colleges without Migration Certificate, has weight.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then they should not put burden on Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa. What would he see? If Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa had any solution to the problem, he could tell them the same right now.

Ms. Anu Chatrath pointed out that when it is not within their jurisdiction, what could they do in examining it? In the representation, it has been mentioned that besides this, other communications had been addressed to Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource & Development, New Delhi, but in spite of that the Migration Certificate has not been issued by the University. If the University is not issuing the Migration Certificate even then, what could he (Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa) do?

Continuing, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that there are lacs of students in the University and if the parents of each and every student started making representation, would they place all before the Syndicate for consideration. Whatever is placed before the Syndicate, is the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor. If they started placing the representation of every parent of the student before the Syndicate, under which provision they would do the same. Moreover, the official version should also have been mentioned in the item.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they could bring representation of each and every parent of the student before the Syndicate as the same is evident from the next item, which is also of the similar nature.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that whatever they are doing to the student at the moment, is nothing else but harassment. It is being said that it is a two years old case. Neither they are permitting him without Migration Certificate nor denying.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had once denied and cancelled his admission, but thereafter, they again re-opened the case.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the simple cases of Migration belonging to their own affiliated Colleges are being straightaway rejected by the University, whereas the case of this student is being placed before the Syndicate again and again. They should be informed as to who is behind this case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Syndicate has full sympathy with the student and his parents and they wanted to find a way out if they could help him, and if not, then at least it should be conveyed to the student that they could not do help him in any manner. As suggested by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa that the matter should be got examined, the whole matter should be got examined to find if there is any way out.

The Vice Chancellor said that if it is not within their jurisdiction, what would they examine?

When it was said by a couple of members that the request of the student is rejected, Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that he has a suggestion to make and the suggestion is that the student should be given a last chance to submit the Migration Certificate within a period of 1-2 months.

Ms. Anu Chatrath suggested that the student should be given a chance to submit the Migration Certificate within a stipulated period failing which his admission should be automatically cancelled.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That Mr. Abhinav Chodha S/o Shri Vinod Kumar, be given one month's time to submit Migration Certificate, failing which his admission would stand cancelled.

- 14.** Considered if, Shri Ajay Sood, Advocate, be engaged, for defending the University in the First appeal No.1004 of 2019 New India Assurance Company Limited Vs. Panjab University, Chandigarh, before the Hon'ble National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi at a lump sum legal fee of Rs.75,000/- + to and fro travel expenses by Shatabdi (Executive Class) + Rs.3000/- per day toward food, boarding and lodging at New Delhi as he has successfully defended the Fire Insurance Claim filed by the University before State Dispute Redressal Commission, U.T. Chandigarh. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-X**) was also taken into for consideration.

**NOTE:** The FDO has observed that the total recoverable claim is more than Rs.50.00 Lacs, 50% of which has been deposited by the Insurance Company with the Hon'ble State Commission.

He has further observed that keeping in view the stakes involved in this case, may consider to allow it to be referred to

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Syndicate for consideration & approval in the forthcoming meeting.

After some discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That Shri Ajay Sood, Advocate, be engaged, for defending the University in the First appeal No.1004 of 2019 New India Assurance Company Limited Vs. Panjab University, Chandigarh, before the Hon'ble National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi at a lump sum legal fee of Rs.75,000/- + to and fro travel expenses by Shatabdi (Executive Class) + Rs.3000/- per day toward food, boarding and lodging at New Delhi as he has successfully defended the Fire Insurance Claim filed by the University before State Dispute Redressal Commission, U.T. Chandigarh.

- 15.** Considered request (**Appendix-XI**) of Ms. Monika mother of Ms. Deepankita Syal, student of B.A. 1<sup>st</sup> year in Government College for Girls, Sector 11, Chandigarh, that her daughter be allowed to opt History Culture of Punjab in place of Punjabi at graduation level. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XI**) was also taken into for consideration.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 13.12.2019 (Para 9) while rejecting the recommendations of the Committee dated 15.11.2019 that a student who has passed Punjabi as an additional subject at 10<sup>th</sup> level, be allowed, to opt History & Culture of Punjab, for further studies at graduation level has further resolved that the student (Ms. Deepankita Syal D/o Mrs. Monika and a student of B.A. 1<sup>st</sup> year in Government College for Girls, Sector 11, Chandigarh), who has passed Punjabi as an additional subject at 10<sup>th</sup> level and had been allowed to opt the subject of History and Culture of Punjab instead of Punjabi (Compulsory), be asked to appear in the Punjabi examination (Semester I) as a deficient subject/paper.

After detailed discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the Syndicate decision dated 13.12.2019 (Para 9), be reiterated.

- 16.** Considered recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that Shri Surinder Kumar Thind, Assistant Registrar (Retired on 31.08.2018), VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur, be confirmed in his post/s w.e.f. the date mentioned below:

<b>Date of Appointment as Superintendent</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation as Superintendent</b>	<b>of as</b>	<b>Date of appointment as Assistant Registrar</b>	<b>of</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation as Assistant Registrar</b>
26.08.2014	26.08.2015		17.03.2016		20.06.2017

Information contained in office note was also taken into for consideration.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.10.2019 (Para 24) had resolved that the item C-24 on the agenda be placed before the Syndicate again along with the enquiry report, Court orders and other relevant documents.



2. An enquiry report in respect of complaint against Shri Surinder Kumar Thind, Assistant Registrar, VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur and orders dated 29.08.2019 passed by Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP-1723-2019 are enclosed.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier also it had been sought as to where the Enquiry Report. If they go through the Enquiry Report, several more serious issues are emerging. It needed to be found as to who had kept the Enquiry Report under the carpet. Enquiry Report is saying that major penalty should be imposed on this person (Shri Surinder Kumar Thind). It could not be ascertain as to where the Enquiry Report had gone.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired is it known to everybody from the office?

It was informed that if the look into the entire case, this person is a big defaulter and a court case had also been filed against him.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is true, but where was the Enquiry Report and wherefrom it has now found.

It was informed that they have received this Enquiry Report in the month of December 2019.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that looking into the circumstances, it is abundantly clear this person could not be spared. Secondly, full enquiry needed to be conducted as to where this report had been lying. How he was promoted as Assistant Registrar, in spite of serious charges against him?

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that admittedly he (Shri Surinder Kumar Thind) had retired in August 2018. They could not confirm him from the back date. He (Professor Navdeep Goyal) is also right that it needed to be found as to where the Enquiry Report was lying for such a long period.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is demanding confirmation as Assistant Registrar, which could not be allowed.

Ms. Anu Chatrath pointed out that since he (Shri Surinder Kumar Thind) has to give a sum of Rs.8-9 lacs, owing to which they had withheld his Rs.30-40 lacs. Since the Court has allowed, a sum of Rs.8-9 lacs should be deducted from this amount and the remaining amount should be released to him.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that this person was promoted as Superintendent in the year 2014 and they are writing his date of confirmation as Superintendent as "28.08.2015". This meant, he was not confirmed as Superintendent. He is unable to understand that when he (Shri Surinder Kumar Thind) was not confirmed as Superintendent, how he was promoted as Assistant Registrar. So far his knowledge goes, none is promoted as Assistant Registrar unless and until he/she is confirmed as Superintendent. At present also, a representation has come and the same perhaps been marked by the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor to the Establishment Branch. The representation is of Assistant Registrar (General) regarding her confirmation.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the law is absolutely clear that if the incumbent has crossed the maximum probation period, one is deemed to be confirmed. Hence, they should not go into the technicalities. Admittedly, he (Shri Surinder Kumar Thind) has retired as Assistant Registrar.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that here what is being done is that without confirmation in the lower post, none is promoted to the higher post.

Ms. Anu Chatrath pointed out that it has been written that Shri Surinder Kumar Thind has retired as Assistant Registrar on 31.08.2018.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he might have crossed the maximum period of his probation, but if the enquiry held him guilty, what would happen.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the entire case needed to be examined from the very beginning. How he (Shri Surinder Kumar Thind) had become Assistant Registrar? Whether he was eligible/entitled to become Assistant Registrar? Secondly, it also needed to be enquired as to where the Enquiry Report was lying for so a long period.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the case where the person had retired in the year 2018, could not be reopened by them. It might invite litigation.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that under the system existing in the University one could not be promoted as Assistant Registrar unless and until he/she is confirmed as Superintendent or Personal Assistant. The person under consideration would have been promoted Assistant Registrar (Officiating).

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it is law that the post on which the person was working on his/her date of retirement, he/she has to be given the pensioner benefits accordingly. However, under the system prevailing in the University, 4-5 five persons are sent on leave just before their retirement and same number of persons is promoted against their vacancies.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the issue of giving retirement benefits is a separate issue. It is the need of the hour that keeping in view the report and the issues pointed out by the members, the entire issue needed to be re-examined. At the same time, it also needed to be examined as to where the Enquiry Report was lying for such a long period.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that had the Enquiry Report been placed before the Syndicate before superannuation of Shri Surinder Kumar Thind, the procedure would have been different.

It was clarified that this Item was placed before the Syndicate in its October 2019 meeting and at that time, it was desired that along with the Item, the Enquiry Report as well as the orders of the Court should be placed before the Syndicate. The attention of the Hon'ble members was drawn to page 165, wherein it has been mentioned that "let the report from the Registrar/DDO, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be called....." That meant, the report had not come up to 22.10.2019. Now, there are two issues – (i) relating to confirmation of Shri Surinder Kumar Thind; and (ii) as to where the report was lying for such a long period.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that this is the report of the Committee, which had been constituted in the year 2018 and in 2019, there as a separate Committee. This meant, the report had come in the year 2018 itself.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever is being suggested by Professor Navdeep Goyal should be done.

When Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what has been done, Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that (i) the report had come in the year 2018 itself and the same was deliberately misplaced. Hence, it should be enquired into as to where the report was and who is responsible for this?

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to whether Shri Surinder Kumar Thind has retired as Assistant Registrar.

It was informed that Shri Surinder Kumar Thind was not confirmed as Superintendent, but has retired as Assistant Registrar (Officiating).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what is the impression from the Item "To consider recommendation of the Vice Chancellor that Shri Surinder Kumar Thind, Assistant Registrar (Retired on 31.08.2018)? How are they saying that he has retired as Assistant Registrar?"

It was clarified that Shri Surinder Kumar Thind has retired as Assistant Registrar (Officiating) as the confirmation is done later on.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that leave aside the issue of confirmation. Has he retired as Assistant Registrar on 31.08.2018? How he was promoted as Assistant Registrar, when he has not become Superintendent? When it was replied that they did not know about it, Shri Ashok Goyal said that then it is very-very serious issue. Hence, it needed to be looked into. Secondly, the Committee should also look into and fix accountability and responsibility as to who is responsible for keeping this case in their chests and befooled the Syndicate and also the higher officials of the University.

Ms. Anu Chatrath drew the attention of the members towards page 166 which showed that the report of the Committee had come in December 2018 and prior to that he had already retired as Assistant Registrar. The Committee headed by Professor Rajat Sandhir was constituted on 04.07.2018. It meant that when the inquiry was pending with the Committee, he retired as Assistant Registrar. When the report came to him (Registrar) on 10.12.2018, he wrote "Examine and put up office note immediately". As such, in the meanwhile, he (Shri Surinder Kumar Thing) had already retired. When pointed out by Professor Navdeep Goyal that when the issue came next time, the report was deliberately misplaced, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it is true.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, that was why, they are saying that the entire issue should be thoroughly examined.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she is requesting for expediting this issue because 3-4 cases relating to him are continuing in the lower Courts and he has to give a sum of Rs.14 lacs. If he has a sum of Rs.30-40 lacs in his Provident Fund/General Provident Fund, Rs.14 lacs should be given to the parties concerned and the Advocate(s) should be asked to get the case settled.

**RESOLVED:** That a Committee be constituted to examine the issue in its entirety. The Committee be also requested to look into and fix accountability and responsibility as to who is responsible for keeping this case in their chests and befooled the Syndicate and also the higher officials of the University.

**17.** Considered –

- (i) if the videography of Polling Booths for the Senate Election to be held in the month of August/September, 2020 be made to avoid the controversy and complications (if any) at a later stage.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup>March 2020

Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XII**) was also taken into for consideration.

**NOTE:** 1. The total Budget provision for Senate Election 2020 is as under:

Sr. No.	Year	Amount
1.	2019-2020	Rs.60,00,000/-
2.	2020-2021	Rs.60,00,000/-

2. The total expenditure was Rs.22,07,461/- on videography in the Senate Election 2016.

(ii) the following proposed rates of voter's lists (**Appendix-XII**) for the Senate Election-2020:

Sr. No	Constituency	Price in Senate Election 2016	Proposed rate for Senate Election 2020
1.	Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University	Rs.1/- per page subject to minimum of Rs.40/-	Rs.1.50/- per page subject to minimum of Rs.60/-
2.	Readers and Lecturers on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University	-do-	-do-
3.	Staff of Technical and Professional Colleges	-do-	-do-
4.	Professors, Sr. Lecturers and Lecturers of Affiliated Arts Colleges	-do-	-do-
5.	District wise Voter's List	-do-	-do-
6.	Registered Graduates Register	-do-	-do-
7.	Principals of Technical and Professional Colleges	-do-	-do-
8.	Heads of affiliated Arts Colleges	-do-	-do-

**NOTE:** 1. The decision of the Syndicate dated 01.05.2016 (Para 46) with regard to revision of rates of voter's list for Senate election 2016 is enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).

2. After 4 years the cost of paper and printing charges has gone up. The price of the lists of voters may also be increased proportionately.

(iii) the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that the following proposed rates and Honorarium for the Senate Election to be held in the month of September, 2020, be approved:

Sr. No.	Item	Rates in Senate Election 2016	Proposed rates for Senate Election 2020
1.	Processing Booth-wise	Rs.0.50 per entry	Rs.0.60 per entry

2.	Proof Reading	Rs.1.50 per entry for two persons	Rs.2.00 per entry for two persons
3.	Checking of eligibility by Superintendent/A.R.	Rs.1.50 per form	Rs.2.00 per form
4.	Sale of C.D. relating to District-wise vote list	Rs.200/- per C.D.	Rs.250/- per C.D.
5.	Fixed Honorarium to the D.R. & A.R.	Rs.12,500/- each*	Rs.15,500/- each*
6.	Fixed Honorarium to the Superintendents <b>(S)</b>	Rs.10,000/- each*	Rs.13,000/- each*

**NOTE:** \*Honorarium is to be paid to the D.R. & A.R. and Superintendent/s of Election Cell as these officials will have to sit late hours on working days and also to attend the office on Saturdays, Sundays and other holidays for 4-5 months without any break till the completion of Election work.

The Vice Chancellor said that under this Item, the budget of election as well as certain rates have been revised.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has appeared in the newspapers that the budget for election of Senate 2020 is the same, but they have revised the rates. How the expenditure would be met? It had been mentioned in the news item that the budget for the Senate election 2016 was Rs.60 lacs and the budget for the Senate election 2020 is also Rs.60 lacs.

It was said that in the Senate election 2016, out of the budget of Rs.60 lacs, some amount remained unspent.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired have they taken decision(s) as to where the booth is to be created and how many minimum number of votes are required for creation of a booth as also what is to be accepted as Identity proof from the voters.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that such decisions are available in the report of this Committee. When enquired by Professor Keshav Malhotra as to whether he is satisfied, the reply was given in affirmative. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma further clarified that they had recommended that the Identity Proofs, which are accepted by the Election Commission of India or State Election Commissions, be accepted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that meant, any Identity Proof accepted by the Election Commission.

On a query made by Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the Booth at Jammu has been recommended to be abolished as minimum of 500 votes were not there.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the members of the Committee (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Professor Rajinder Bhandari) to also look into the creation of booths at other stations.

Ms. Anu Chatrath suggested that the voters list should also be got updated because if contestants approached 500 voters, only 10-20 voters cast their votes. They have made their voters list unnecessarily bulky.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he had suggested that in the first instance, even the life member/voter should be allowed to cast vote only for five Senate terms.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that one day, Professor Rajinder Bhandari fixed the meeting and he was also called to that meeting. On the day of the meeting, he got himself ready, but later on, he learnt that the meeting has been postponed. Perhaps, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma had even reached the venue of the meeting. Ultimately, it was found that Professor Rajinder Bhandari had told that the meeting should be held on Tuesday instead of Monday. Later on, it came to his notice that the meeting was held on Tuesday, but on that day, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) was not called to the meeting. Anyhow, he could tell that the updation of voters list could not be done at this belated stage. How the updation could be done, and that too, in a very-very mechanical manner, is by inserting a column for mentioning the registration number of each and every voter and he had told this to the office people. The people, whose registration numbers are very old, would be asked to give their status by such and such date, failing which their votes would be cancelled. From the registration number, they could gauge that the voter might have reached the age of 90 years or so. They are quite sure that they would not receive more 5% replies. Resultantly, 95% of the votes would be cancelled. The problem basically is of the dead voters. Second problem is about the duplication of votes, but when the registration number is to be mentioned, this problem would automatically be solved. Though it would take some time, but the problem would be eliminated.

Ms. Anu Chatrath suggested that at least in future election, it must be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that though they might have recommended, it should be resolved that only those Identity Proofs be accepted in the Senate Elections, which are accepted by the Election Commission of India.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that they should look into carefully before creating polling booths in the affiliated College upon whom major penalties have been imposed by the University under Regulations 11.1 and 11.2 as also in the affiliated Colleges wherein the Directors have been appointed. When Shri Jarnail Singh requested Dr. Dua to name the Colleges, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that Regulations 11.1 and 11.2 have been implemented in certain Colleges in Ludhiana, Hoshiarpur and at certain other places, in those Colleges polling booths should not be created.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that when the mistakes are on the part of the Colleges, why should they punish the voters?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he is suggesting this because they (Colleges) influenced the voters.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari asked as to why the voters of those areas should be asked to cast their votes at some other places, which might be far away.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua clarified that he is talking about the polling booths of teachers and not about the Registered Graduates' Constituency.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. to avoid the controversy and complications (if any) at a later stage, the videography of Polling Booths for the Senate Election to be held in the month of August/September, 2020, be made;
2. the following rates of voter's lists (**Appendix-XII**) for the Senate Election-2020:

Sr. No	Constituency	Price in Senate Election 2016	Rate for Senate Election 2020
1.	Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University	Rs.1/- per page subject to minimum of Rs.40/-	Rs.1.50/- per page subject to minimum of Rs.60/-
2.	Readers and Lecturers on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University	-do-	-do-
3.	Staff of Technical and Professional Colleges	-do-	-do-
4.	Professors, Sr. Lecturers and Lecturers of Affiliated Arts Colleges	-do-	-do-
5.	District wise Voter's List	-do-	-do-
6.	Registered Graduates Register	-do-	-do-
7.	Principals of Technical and Professional Colleges	-do-	-do-
8.	Heads of affiliated Arts Colleges	-do-	-do-

3. the following rates and Honorarium for the Senate Election to be held in the month of September, 2020, be approved:

Sr. No.	Item	Rates in Senate Election 2016	Rates for Senate Election 2020
1.	Processing Booth-wise	Rs.0.50 per entry	Rs.0.60 per entry
2.	Proof Reading	Rs.1.50 per entry for two persons	Rs.2.00 per entry for two persons
3.	Checking of eligibility by Superintendent/A.R.	Rs.1.50 per form	Rs.2.00 per form
4.	Sale of C.D. relating to District-wise vote list	Rs.200/- per C.D.	Rs.250/- per C.D.
5.	Fixed Honorarium to the D.R. & A.R.	Rs.12,500/- each	Rs.15,500/- each
6.	Fixed Honorarium to the Superintendents (S)	Rs.10,000/- each	Rs.13,000/- each

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That only those Identity Proofs be accepted in the Senate Elections, which are accepted by the Election Commission of India.

- 18 (i).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (ii).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

- (iii).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor of Physics (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (iv).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Screening-cum- Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor of Physics (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (v).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Screening-cum- Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor of Physics (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (vi).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor of (ECE) (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (vii).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic level 12) to Associate Professor (Mechanical Engineering )(Academic level 13 A), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (viii).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic level 12) to Associate Professor (CSE)(Academic level 13 A), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (ix).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Screening-cum- Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (CSE) (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (x).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic level 10) to Assistant Professor (Academic level 11), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Computer Science and Application, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xi).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic level 10) to Assistant Professor (IT) (Academic level 11), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xii).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage 3) to Associate Professor (EEE)(Stage 4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xiii).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (EEE) (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xiv).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (EEE)



(Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

- (xv).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Biotechnology) (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xvi).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Biotechnology) (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xvii).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Biotechnology) (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xviii).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Biotechnology) (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xix).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Mathematics) (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xx).** Considered minutes dated 23.01.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Mechanical Engineering) (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.
- (xxi).** Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professors (Academic Level 13A) to Professor (Academic Level 14), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xxii).** Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12) to Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xxiii).** Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Laws, PURC, Ludhiana.
- (xxiv).** Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12) to Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xxv).** Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic level 13A) to Professor (English) (Academic level 14), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

- (xxvi). Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic level 12), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.
- (xxvii). Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage -2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.
- (xxviii). Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.
- (xxix). Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies.
- (xxx). Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xxxi). Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13 A) to Professor (Sociology) (Academic Level 14), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xxxii). Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13 A) to Professor (Academic Level 14), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Sociology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xxxiii). Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 10) to Assistant Professor (Sociology) (Academic Level 11), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xxxiv). Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor(Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Sociology) (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xxxv). Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Sociology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xxxvi). Considered minutes dated 02.03.2020 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Evening Studies, MDRC, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xxxvii). Considered minutes dated 03.03.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic level 13A) to Professor (Academic level 14), under

Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Art History and Visual Arts, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

- (xxxviii).** Considered minutes dated 03.03.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic level 13A) to Professor (Academic level 14), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Art History and Visual Arts, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xxxix).** Considered minutes dated 03.03.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (xl).** Considered minutes dated 03.03.2020 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic level 12) to Associate Professor (Academic level 13A), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for Human Rights and Duties, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that although they have received the papers relating to this Item only just now, there are certain corrections, which needed to be carried out.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if such a bulky agenda is provided to them on the tables, when would they go through it and without going through it, what would they do? The agenda along with the relevant papers relating to the interviews, which had been conducted earlier, should have been provided to them along with the main agenda, so that they could have come to the meeting after going through the agenda papers.

When a couple of members enquired as to what is to be done, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that corrections needed to be made and if those corrections are to be made right now, it would take some, Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Karamjeet Singh (Registrar) should sit together and make the recommendations, on behalf of the Syndicate, after carrying out the corrections.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that, anyway, he is abstaining because he had said earlier also that such items as well as the papers relating to them should not be brought as table agenda. Still such an important Item has been brought as a table agenda, he is abstaining as a mark of protest.

The Vice Chancellor said that both of them, i.e., Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Karamjeet Singh (Registrar) should see to it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the promotions have been recommended in the month of January 2020 and all the promotees are waiting for their promotions, they should not delay their promotions anymore.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma clarified that he is not opposing the promotions.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as is being suggested they (he himself and Professor Karamjeet Singh) would look into these and make recommendations, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is also not right way that two persons would carry out the necessary corrections and make recommendations, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that a full-fledged Committee comprising 4-5 persons should be constituted to examine the matter completely. If the case belonged to Campus, the Committee might comprise people from the Campus.

The Vice Chancellor proposed that these two persons, i.e., Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Karamjeet Singh (Registrar) would sit, carry out corrections and make recommendations, on behalf of the Syndicate.

**This was agreed to.**

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he would like to make a point on the Item relating promotions under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), and the point is that Dr. Bhupinder Pali is an Assistant Professor in Punjabi at University School of Open Learning. About one and half years had elapsed and the Syndicate had approved his case, but nothing has been done so far.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that in the case of Dr. Bhupinder Pali, it had been decided that his case be referred to the same Committee, which had already been constituted, but the same has not been placed before the Committee so far. He requested the Vice Chancellor to ensure that the case of Dr. Bhupinder Pali is placed before the Committee at the earliest.

**19.** Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that:-

- (i) the following Personal Assistants be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Date of Appointment	Date of Confirmation
1.	Mrs. Indra Rani, UIPS	03.03.2011	02.06.2016
2.	Shri Jasmer Singh, Office of the Vice Chancellor	25.01.2012	03.06.2016
3.	Shri Parmod Singh, Dr. H.S.J. Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital	07.01.2013	04.06.2016
4.	Shri Sunil Malhotra, Estt. I	05.07.2013	01.10.2016
5.	Shri Daljit Singh, Deptt. of Mathematics	13.11.2014	01.02.2017
6.	Shri Naresh Kumar, Office of the Dean College Development Council	06.06.2016	01.09.2018

- (ii) in order to streamline the process of confirmation of Class 'A' Non-teaching employees, the authority be delegated to the Vice-Chancellor for the purpose, as has been done in the case of Class 'B' employees.

**NOTE:** An office note enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that a representation has been received from the Assistant Registrar (General) regarding her confirmation, the same should be referred to the Committee under the chairmanship of Shri Ashok Goyal, which had already been constituted.

At this stage, Professor Keshav Malhotra made a statement relating to promotion of Dr. Bhupinder Pali and same shifted to Item 18.

**RESOLVED:** That:

- (i) the following Personal Assistants be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person</b>	<b>Date of Appointment</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
1.	Mrs. Indra Rani, UIPS	03.03.2011	02.06.2016
2.	Shri Jasmer Singh, Office of the Vice-Chancellor	25.01.2012	03.06.2016
3.	Shri Parmod Singh, Dr. H.S.J. Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital	07.01.2013	04.06.2016
4.	Shri Sunil Malhotra, Estt. I	05.07.2013	01.10.2016
5.	Shri Daljit Singh, Deptt. of Mathematics	13.11.2014	01.02.2017
6.	Shri Naresh Kumar, Office of the Dean College Development Council	06.06.2016	01.09.2018

- (ii) in order to streamline the process of confirmation of Class 'A' non-teaching employees, authority be delegated to the Vice-Chancellor to confirm Class 'A' non-teaching employees, as has been done in the case of Class 'B' employees.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That, as suggested by Professor Navdeep Goyal, the representation of Mrs. Mahesh Johar, Assistant Registrar (General) regarding her confirmation be referred to the already constituted Committee, for consideration and making recommendation.

At this stage, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that before taking up the next Item on the agenda, the Resolution proposed by he (himself) and Shri Ashok Goyal should be circulated amongst the members.

Ms. Anu Chatrath requested the Vice Chancellor to ensure that both the issues, i.e., Resolution proposed by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Ashok Goyal and creation/recognition of Research Centre at University Institute of Legal Studies should be brought to the Syndicate before the start of general discussion.

The Vice Chancellor said that let some time be given to the office and it should not be insisted that it should be done right now.

Ms. Anu Chatrath suggested that let the files relating to these two issues be brought and they are not asking for taking any decision.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa pointed out that the Vice Chancellor could bring table/emergency agenda, but since it is the era of Whatsapp and the group existed, the table/emergency agenda should be put in the same. The table agenda has not been prepared just two hours before the start of the meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is the old agenda.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup>March 2020

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that he (Vice Chancellor) should see the large heartedness of the Syndicate that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma has just lodged his protest, but he did not oppose. They have approved the bulky envelope 'closed'.

The Vice Chancellor said that the minutes of the Selection Committees used to come to the Syndicate as 'table agenda'. When Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No Sir", the Vice Chancellor said that he had been told this.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that even the minutes of the Selection Committees, which had been held in the month of January 2020, are being provided to them today only. At least, these should have been provided to them along with the main agenda.

- 20.** Considered if, Clause 9(ii) of guidelines for freeship and tuition fee/lab charges concession for the session 2019-2020, at page 278 of Handbook of Information 2019, be amended as under:

<b>Existing clause (ii) of guideline 9</b>	<b>Proposed clause (ii) of guideline 9</b>
Freeship would mean Tuition Fee + Lab Charges concession only, not to be claimed by the students as a matter of right	Freeship would mean Tuition Fee + 50% of Users & Maintenance Charges.

Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XIII**) was also taken into consideration.

**RESOLVED:** That Clause 9(ii) of guidelines for freeship and tuition fee/lab charges concession for the session 2019-2020, at page 278 of Handbook of Information 2019, be amended as under:

<b>Existing clause (ii) of guideline 9</b>	<b>Proposed clause (ii) of guideline 9</b>
Freeship would mean Tuition Fee + Lab Charges concession only, not to be claimed by the students as a matter of right	Freeship would mean Tuition Fee + 50% of Users & Maintenance Charges.

- 21.** Considered minutes dated 09.01.2020 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding revision of treatment charges of various types of treatments being provided at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Committee dated 09.01.2020, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

- 22.** Considered, and

**RESOLVED:** That the following changes in the admission criteria for admission to M.E./M.Tech. Courses at UIET, be made for the session 2020-2021:

<b>Existing criteria for mode of admission</b>	<b>Changes in criteria for mode of admission</b>
<b>Mode of admission (for all courses)</b> Preference will be given to GATE qualified candidates. Candidate appearing for PU-CET (PG) will be given admission if some seats will be left vacant after the GATE qualified candidates admission and	<b>Mode of admission (for all courses)</b> (i) PU CET (PG)-2020 Entrance Test will be conducted for all PG courses of all branches of UIET. (ii) CET Cell will prepare subject wise merit list of all appeared candidates

Existing criteria for mode of admission	Changes in criteria for mode of admission
<p>according to the following criteria: Academic weightage: 50% Entrance Test:50%</p> <p><b>Name of the PG Courses at UIET</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. M.E. Electrical Engineering (Power System)</li> <li>2. M.Tech. (Material science &amp; Technology)</li> <li>3. M.E. (Biotechnology)</li> <li>4. M.E. (Computer Science &amp; Engineering)</li> <li>5. M.E. (Electronics and Communication Engineering)</li> <li>6. M.E. (Mechanical Engineering)</li> <li>7. M.Tech. (Microelectronics)</li> <li>8. M.E. Computer Science and Engineering (Cyber Security)</li> <li>9. M.E. (Information Technology)</li> </ol>	<p>&amp; merit will be no cut off/qualifying marks.</p> <p>(iii) The following order of preference is recommended for admission to PG course offered at UIET:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. GATE qualified candidates on the basis of their valid GATE score.</li> <li>B. CET (PG) appeared candidates on the basis of rank scored by them in CET (PG)</li> <li>C. B.E./B.Tech. percentage of marks.</li> </ol> <p>(iv) After exhausting all the candidates of GATE score and CET PG, then admission shall be done on the basis of B.E./B.Tech. Percentage.</p>

- NOTE:**
1. There is no change in respective eligibility conditions and scheme of tests.
  2. The above changes in admission criteria for M.E./M.Tech. courses had been approved by the Vice-Chancellor vide letter No. 3583/UIET dated 13.02.2020 (**Appendix-XV**).

**23.**

Considered recommendations dated 17.01.2020 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Academic and Administrative Committees of Department of English and Cultural Studies that the admission to M.A. (English), be made on the basis of 100% weightage of Entrance Test instead of earlier weightage of 50% + 50% (Academic + Entrance Test).

Initiating discussion, Shri Jarnail Singh enquired as to why this is only to be considered for English and not other subjects.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua asked what are the criteria the University guidelines?

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is only being done by the teachers to curtail their work load and put the responsibility on the authorities that the students would be admitted as per the list given by them. If a candidate could not perform well in the Entrance test, then his proficiency can be judged from his/her performance in 10<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup> and B.A. in the subject which is not being evaluated. This is only to cut down the burden of the teachers, as by doing so, all the workload would be shifted to Controller of Examinations.

The Registrar while explaining the matter said that in the subject of M.A. English, the problem which is faced is that the students of Panjab University are not getting admission in Private Universities. To solve their problem, the condition of 100% weight age for the entrance test has been recommended.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa asked whether this entrance test is subjective or objective.

The Registrar replied that this test is objective.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said this entrance test should be subjective as it is the literature subject.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said this test is both objective and subjective.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said in the other courses also the students are being admitted after following the pattern of 50+50% weightage. Why there is discrimination in the subject of English. A uniform policy should be made for the same and not on the basis of the requirements/convenience of the Departments.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said he did not agree on it as to maintain the academic standards, the recommendations of Joint Academic and Administrative Committee should be acceded to. Their autonomy should not be disturbed. He said that the policy on the basis of uniformity should not be made.

Ms. Anu Chatrath asked what has been done in the Item No.23.

The Vice Chancellor replied that only subjective entrance would be approved.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that only subjective should not be approved as students are coming from different faculties like Engineering etc.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is no entrance test in the Department of Evening Studies and students from Lovely University and Engineering faculty started coming. Those students who wish to study English opted the English Elective subject and studied functional English at Graduation level, they were not admitted whereas the Engineering students are being admitted. Therefore, the said item should be approved

**RESOLVED:** That admission to M.A. (English), be made on the basis of 100% weightage of Entrance Test instead of earlier weightage of 50% + 50% (Academic + Entrance Test).

## 24

Considered if:

- (i) the draft advertisement to fill up the posts of Clerks & Clerk-cum-data entry operators, Security Guards, Steno-Typists and Junior Technicians (G-IV), on DC Rates as approved by the DC, Chandigarh Administration, be approved and published in the newspapers; and
- (ii) the detailed instruction for the said posts, be also approved and uploaded on the P.U. Official Website.

**NOTE:** A chart showing the sanctioned, filled up positions on regular basis, appointed on daily wage/temporary/contract basis was enclosed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this item needed thorough discussion.

The Vice Chancellor said this job is already much delayed. Owing to shortage of manpower, the whole work of the University is suffering a lot.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since this was provided to them as supplementary agenda and they did not have enough time to go through it, they did not know anything about it. As such, it should be deferred.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of the Item, be deferred.



- 25.** Considered if, the following amendment in the existing policy for grant of Basic Pay + D.A. & G.P. as approved by the Syndicate dated 13.12.2019 (Para 14), be made, to extend the benefit to 09 Library Assistants working on fixed emoluments on contract basis, to meet with the audit objection:

<b>Existing Policy as approved by the Syndicate vide Paragraph 14 in its meeting held on 13.12.2019</b>	<b>Proposed Policy</b>
<p>That the following clauses, be added in the decision of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 (Para 5) regarding implementation of the policy for grant of Basic Pay + D.A. &amp; G.P. to the daily wage employees:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the benefit of Basic pay + D.A. + G.P. be granted from the 1<sup>st</sup> of next month in which one completes 10 years of service, but not prior to the date of Syndicate decision i.e. 28.02.2018</li> <li>2. the maternity leave availed by the female employees as admissible under P.U. Rules be allowed to be treated as duty for the purpose of calculating 10 years' service of the temporary/contract/D.W. employees.</li> <li>3. Gap period in service less than one year be ignored, but if the gap period is of one year or more, that period be not taken into consideration for calculating 10 years' service.</li> <li>4. the above benefit shall be granted subject to availability of vacant sanctioned positions.</li> </ol>	<p>That the following clauses, be added in the decision of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 (Para 5) regarding implementation of the policy for grant of Basic Pay + D.A. &amp; G.P. <b>to the Temporary employees, Ad hoc appointees, employees employed on casual basis, Contractual employees and the like):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Change.</li> <li>2. No Change.</li> <li>3. No Change.</li> <li>4. No Change.</li> </ol>

Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XVII**) was also taken into consideration.

Initiating the discussion on Item 25, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there are two things. Firstly, as it has been allowed in the case of clerical staff, this should also be allowed in the case of Library Assistants. Secondly, as they had put in 15-20 years of service and had also crossed the age of 40-45 years, these factors should be considered and whatever benefits they are entitled to, should be given to them.

**RESOLVED:** That following amendment in the existing policy for grant of Basic Pay + G.P. & D.A as approved by the Syndicate dated 13.12.2019 (Para 14), be made, to extend the benefit to 09 Library Assistants working on fixed emoluments on contract basis, to meet with the audit objection:

<b>Existing Policy as approved by the Syndicate vide Paragraph 14 in its meeting held on 13.12.2019</b>	<b>Proposed Policy</b>
<p>That the following clauses, be added in the decision of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 (Para 5) regarding implementation of the policy for grant of Basic Pay + D.A. &amp; G.P. to the daily wage employees:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the benefit of Basic pay + D.A. + G.P. be granted from the 1<sup>st</sup> of next month in which one completes 10 years of service, but not prior to the date of Syndicate decision i.e. 28.02.2018</li> <li>2. the maternity leave availed by the female employees as admissible under P.U. Rules be allowed to be treated as duty for the purpose of calculating 10 years' service of the temporary/contract/D.W. employees.</li> <li>3. Gap period in service less than one year be ignored, but if the gap period is of one year or more, that period be not taken into consideration for calculating 10 years' service.</li> <li>4. the above benefit shall be granted subject to availability of vacant sanctioned positions.</li> </ol>	<p>That the following clauses, be added in the decision of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 (Para 5) regarding implementation of the policy for grant of Basic Pay + D.A. &amp; G.P. <b>to the Temporary employees, Ad hoc appointees, employees employed on casual basis, Contractual employees and the like):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Change.</li> <li>2. No Change.</li> <li>3. No Change.</li> <li>4. No Change.</li> </ol>

**26.**

Considered –

- (i) Enquiry Report (**Appendix-XVIII**) submitted by Shri P.L. Ahuja, Enquiry Officer against Shri Yogesh, Clerk, Department of English (now Senior Assistant, Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies & Development), Panjab University, Chandigarh, be accepted.
- (ii) If the above Enquiry Report is accepted, the penalty to be imposed on the delinquent official- Shri Yogesh, Clerk, Department of English (now Senior Assistant, Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies & Development), so that he be asked to explain his position in the event of imposing penalty (if any) under Rule at page 119 of P.U. Calendar, Volume- III, 2016.

**NOTE:** 1. As per Regulation 3.1 appearing at page 117 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the Syndicate is the appointing authority of Class

'B' employees belonging to the category of Assistants.

2. Regulation 3.3 appearing at page 119 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 speaks that the appointing authority shall be the punishing authority.
3. The minor and major penalties stand defined under rule 3 at page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
4. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.07.2019 (Para 19) (**Appendix-XVIII**) considered the enquiry report submitted by P.L. Ahuja against Shri Yogesh, Clerk, Department of English and it was resolved that the Item on the agenda, be kept pending.
5. The above matter was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 09.11.2019 as Item 10 (**Appendix-XVIII**) and it was resolved that in the light of the discussion, the consideration of the item 10 on the agenda, be deferred.
6. A detailed office note containing the facts and opinion obtained (in the similar case of Shri Subhash Chand), from Legal Retainer regarding promotion of Shri Yogesh, Sr. Assistant is enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

Initiating the discussion on Item 26, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the enquiry report of Sh. P.L. Ahuja, there is only charge that he had proceeded on medical leave, is established. In case of medical problem, a person is not in a position to get the prior permission. The remaining other charges are not being found established and he is not proved guilty.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he had thoroughly read the enquiry report and it was found that this clerk has unblemished record of 7 years of service. He has been given the letters of appreciation from both the previous Chairpersons. There is only one problem that he did not pick the call of the Chairperson at 7:00 p.m. which has been aggravated to this extent.

The Registrar said that as mentioned in Point No.(ii) "If the above enquiry report is accepted" the penalty to be imposed on the delinquent official needed to be decided.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma suggested that a punishment of Censure be imposed

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. Enquiry Report submitted by Shri P.L. Ahuja, Enquiry Officer against Shri Yogesh, Clerk, Department of English (now Senior Assistant, Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies & Development), Panjab University, Chandigarh, be accepted; and

2. Minor penalty 'Censure' be imposed on Shri Yogesh, Clerk, Department of English (now Senior Assistant, Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies & Development), Panjab University, Chandigarh, under Rule 3A(i) at page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2019.

**27.** Considered Survey Report (**Appendix-XIX**) of newly proposed –

- (i) Institute namely- Regional Institute of Co-operative Management, Sector-32, Chandigarh for grant of temporary affiliation for starting BBA-1<sup>st</sup> year (one unit) for the session 2020-21.
- (ii) College namely- Guru Nanak Law College, Ferozepur, to undertake and access the availability of land/ building/required infrastructure and other facility for starting the new proposed Law College for running LL.B. (3 years course)-one unit i.e. 60 seats for the session 2020-21.

Initiating discussion on the Item, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is regarding opening of some new College namely Regional Institute of Co-operative Management, Sector 32, Chandigarh. The undertaking which has been given by them is at Page 140 which reads that the salary shall be paid as per U.G.C./University norms to the faculty engaged for the B.B.A. programme at the Institute. The problem arises at this point is that they did not make recruitment on permanent basis. The undertaking relating to salary is not required, the undertaking that faculty on permanent basis will be provided as per norms is very much required for the same. The course will only be run with the provision of permanent faculty. At point No.(ii) there is no mention about the visit of the Committee at Guru Nanak Law College, Ferozepur.

The Registrar said that the papers relating to it had been missed to be incorporated by chance.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua that two reports are included in it jointly wherein the authorities asked them to raise the walls but they do not know where are the walls?

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that this should be placed in the next meeting along with the complete documents.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the Law College should be allowed as the permission had already been granted.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that complete documents/undertaking relating to the recruitment of faculty should be provided. There is a ritual in Chandigarh that they would only pay the salaries according to their demand but they would not consider recruitment of faculty on permanent basis. They should be made clear that this type of practice would not be accepted. As regard point No.(ii) relating to Law College at Page 143 all the documents relating to land are enclosed. But his query is that the documents of the trust are not available in it or it is also not known whether the land is on the basis of single ownership or in the name of trust as it will affect of the future of the colleges. Therefore, a copy of the "Chajra" along with the building plan is required to be enclosed.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that till the time the item should be deferred.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur that it should be got verified after constituting the Inspection Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the work of the Survey Committee cannot be done by the Inspection Committee. It is not the job of Inspection Committee to deal with the site and building plan as it is to be done by the Survey Committee.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they know about the culture of the Private Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Survey Committee had recommended subject the following items but that "*subject to the following*" had not been complied with till date.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the strength of the said College is about 3500 but not more than 200 students are coming there to attend.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is not the College. The Survey Committee should verify first that all the facts submitted by them is correct. As per his knowledge the report of the Survey Committee is not complete.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that a separate Committee is required to be constituted consisting of Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Shri Jarnail Singh.

Ms. Anu Chatrath suggested the name of Dr. Devinder Singh, Department of Laws.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that only the members of the Syndicate members should be proposed to be included in the committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the member other than the Syndicate is to be added, then it should be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now this issue has been raised by the Vice Chancellor and he would like to submit that the Syndicate is being run by the members from outside. Syndicate members should be authorised to run the Syndicate at their own level.

Ms. Anu Chatrath and Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua asked what about the status of point No.(i).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that point No.(i) relating to Regional Institute of Co-operative Management, Chandigarh is O.K. and there is objection on point No.(ii).

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, Ms. Anu Chatrath and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the College mentioned at point No.(i) is not approved as the undertaking and other related documents are not enclosed with it.

The Registrar said that the (i) should be approved subject to the production of the desired documents.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it cannot be understood after going through the same that what is the difference between (i) and (ii)? (i) is the institute run by the Government of India and its case should be submitted separately being the Government Institute at has its own huge building.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. The Survey Report in respect of Regional Institute of Co-operative Management Sector-32, Chandigarh for grant of temporary affiliation for starting BBA-1<sup>st</sup> year (one unit) for the session 2020-21, be approved.

However, an Undertaking along with complete documents to the effect that the Institute would appoint faculty on regular basis, be obtained; and

2. So far as the Survey Report in respect of Guru Nanak Law College, Ferozepur, is concerned, the following Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to examine the case:

- (i) Dr, Rabinder Nath Sharma
- (ii) Shri Jarnail Singh
- (iii) One member to be nominated by the Vice Chancellor

**28.** Considered minutes dated 29.01.2020 (**Appendix-XX**) of the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate, to prepare the Roster in consonance with the directions of the UGC enshrined in its letter dated 05.03.2018 for teaching positions, i.e., Assistant Professors of P.U. Constituent Colleges.

Initiating the discussion on the Item, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a simple roster is attached relating to the constituent colleges which is alright.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the item No.28 is clear and they should come forward to Item No.29.

The Vice Chancellor said that Item No. 28 is O.K.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what the status of Item 28 is? Who prepare the Roster?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Roster is prepared on the basis of fresh appointments.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that whether this roster should be treated at par with affiliated colleges of the University or it should be dealt with at par with the institutes of Panjab University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would remain as the roster of the college. Roster is prepared on the basis of combination and they considered it as a combined unit.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they considered all the Colleges in one unit then what is the purpose of it?

The Vice Chancellor intervened and said that all the posts are transferable in the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this should not be treated as one unit. They should take a contentious decision whether they have to consider all the 6 Colleges as one unit or not.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that in the entire state of Punjab there are 50 colleges and they had also covered under the combined reservation/advertisement.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to create one cadre then why are not being clubbed with the University.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said if the cadre is separate then the reservation should be separate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why the University is not clubbed with the Regional Centres also.

Professors Navdeep Goyal said that no, it is not so, as per the Calendar the constituent colleges are to be considered as affiliated colleges. Therefore their cadre will remain separate.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said then why there is requirement of the roster?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that roster should be prepared as the selection would not be done without the roster and Government will not allow the same.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should be asked on what basis they had prepared in the roster?

It was informed that it has been enquired how these constituent colleges are considered as one unit. This roster has been prepared by considering all the colleges in one unit.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that where is the decision relating to it?

It was informed that it was decided in the committee of the roster that all the constituent colleges would be considered as one unit.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what is the justification for it?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said there is some advantage in it, in all the colleges there is one or two posts of Hindi/English in all the constituent colleges and total of all the posts comes to 7-8 posts. It would have even distribution in both general and reservation. On the other hand, if it is considered as an individual unit, then it would be off sided. It would be difficult for the distribution of reservation and general category if there is one single post.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this will result in implications at the later stage.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that if they have to treat P.U. Constituent Colleges as single unit for the purpose of roster, then they have to make the persons recruited against these posts transferrable otherwise they have to make recruitment institute-wise.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the above mentioned recommendations were submitted there but it should be discussed whether these have to be accepted or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he may agree also on what they have suggested but only after application of mind. That is why he is asking what is the justification for it?

The Vice Chancellor said that the Registrar considered the P.U. Constituent colleges as one unit on the basis of the directions of the Punjab Government and the other reason is that these persons are also being transferred at regular intervals.

Dr. Rajinder Bhandari said he would like to know the process of recruitment of Faculty in P.U. Constituent Colleges. Are the appointments would be made by the office of the Vice Chancellor or by the Punjab Government.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he had already discussed with the Registrar that the requirement of posts would be submitted by the Principal of the Colleges. In his College there is no post of Computer teacher, in some places there are

32 posts of B.Com. where as in his college there is one post in B.Com. and he will not demand even a single post for it. An individual College should be considered as individual unit then the roster can be prepared by considering them as an individual unit.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that if the Constituent Colleges are considered as an individual unit then out of cadre transfer cannot be made.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as per his view there is advantage in considering the Constituent Colleges as a single unit.

Dr. Rajinder Bhandari said that one should not consider the difficulties being faced, there should be some parameters for consideration of Constituent Colleges in one single unit. If the appointment is to be made by the Vice Chancellor or the Governing Body then how can they would be considered as an individual unit. Therefore, firstly the parameters should be decided in the matter.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the affiliation of P.U. Constituent College at Balachor has been done separately not with the other three P.U. Constituent Colleges.

Ms. Anu Chatrath and Shri Jarnail Singh said that the affiliation of three P.U. Constituent Colleges had been granted together whereas the affiliation relating to one College of Balachor had been made separately.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Punjab Government had formally or informally directed several times that this should be disposed off at the earliest.

Dr. Rajinder Bhandari said that these P.U. Constituent Colleges are similar with the Government Colleges where the appointments had been done at the single level.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said if these are the simple Arts colleges, how can they equate them with the Government Colleges. It should be re-examined.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be decided in the best interest of the University.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he had no objection in considering the P.U. Constituent Colleges as a single unit, if the members felt there is need for discussion, the same should be got re-examined.

Ms. Anu Chatrath asked whether the Punjab Government had released the funds.

The Vice Chancellor said that reminders have been received from the Punjab Government to fill up the posts in Punjab.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are not saying that posts are to be filled up, they are saying that recruitment is to be made. But what is the link between the recruitment and the roster? The Punjab Government is not objecting on the issue whether the Constituent colleges are considered as single unit or individual college.

Ms. Anu Chatrath pointed out that the recruitment will only be made after deciding on the roster.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked what is the basis of treating the P.U. Constituent colleges as a single unit?



Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in these Colleges there are temporary and guest faculty. If the roster is prepared as single unit, then there is a possibility that where the incumbent belong to SC category, the post might be got unreserved and so on and so forth. If the single unit will be considered then they will get various type of posts and they would not be debarred unnecessarily. The roster list should be made on the alphabetical subject-wise basis. If the 8 posts will advertise, then the roster of 8 posts will be made. When the roster will be prepared, it cannot be understood on the particular subject, which type of category of post would fall.

The Vice Chancellor said that this would result into a great dissatisfaction as they have the justification that the Governing body for the recruitment is at one place. This should be treated as single unit and it should be resolved to treat it as single unit and whatever the anomalies will arise, will be sorted out at a later stage.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that no anomalies would be there.

The Vice Chancellor said that even if Professor Navdeep Goyal is sure that there would be no anomalies, they should sit together on the issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the P.U. Constituent Colleges will be treated as single unit then there will be less problems.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the remote areas, procedure of transfer of students will be a continuing process.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that some other problems relating to it would also come.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that besides taking care of these problems, the problems explained by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua should also be taken care of.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the name of Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu should be added in the committee for re-examining the matter.

Dr. Rajinder Bhandari asked what is the resolve part of Item 28?

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Committee dated 29.01.2020, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

**RESOLVED:** That a Committee, be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to look into the issues, which might arise later on and create complication, and make recommendations.

## **29.**

Considered if the Roster for post of Assistant Professors be approved, pursuant to U.G.C. letter dated 16.12.2019 received from Under Secretary, New Delhi, and Legal Opinion obtained from Shri Subhash Ahuja, Advocate. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** Roster for post of Assistant Professors provided in a separate volume.

Initiating the discussion Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is referring to the person mentioned at S.No.765 in the Roster. Actually, the person had been selected on the reserved position, whereas in the roster the post has been mentioned as “unreserved”. There are mistakes in the Roster which have to be rectified. This roster cannot be passed till the mistakes are rectified.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that how many times this roster would be rejected. This had also brought in the earlier meetings also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal replied that the wrong roster cannot be approved.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari asked whether the corrected Roster would come in the next meeting?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the persons make the desired corrections in the Roster, then the roster would be correct.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members should sit together and sort out the matter

**RESOLVED:** That since incorrect Roaster could not be approved, consideration of Item 29 on the agenda, be deferred. At the same time, the Vice Chancellor, be authorised to constitute a Committee to examine the issue.

**30.** Considered minutes dated 25.02.2020 and 03.03.2020 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice Chancellor to consider the names of advocates for empanelment on the Panjab University Panel.

Initiating the discussion on the Item, Shri Ashok Goyal said that this should be kept pending. It should be got examined by a Committee to be constituted by the Vice Chancellor consisting of the members of the Syndicate.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari asked whether it has also been received earlier through the Committee.

Shri Jarnail Singh pointed out that there is one correction at Page No.168 at s.no.(v), the name of Shri Manjeet Saini be replaced with Ms. Manjeet Saini.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of Item 30 on the agenda, be kept pending. In the meanwhile, a Committee of Syndics be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to examine the issue.

**31.** Information contained in **Items R-1 to R-13** was read out and ratified, i.e. –

**R-1.** (i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed afresh the following faculty at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 07.02.2020 for 11 months i.e. up to 06.01.2021 with one day break on 06.02.2020 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Dr. Lalit Kumar	Associate Professor
2.	Dr. Vishakha Grover	Associate Professor
3.	Dr. Puneet	Assistant Professor
4.	Dr. Poonam Sood	Assistant Professor
5.	Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal	Assistant Professor
6.	Dr. Sunint Singh	Assistant Professor
7.	Dr. Neha Bansal	Assistant Professor
8.	Dr. Rose Kanwal Jeet Kaur	Assistant Professor

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

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed afresh at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., Chandigarh:

- (i) the following faculty purely on temporary/ contractual basis w.e.f. 15.10.2019 for 11 months i.e. up to 14.09.2020 with break on 14.10.2019 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation and Name of appointment
1.	Dr. Satya Narayan	Associate Professor - (temporary)
2.	Dr. Maninder Pal Singh Gill	Associate Professor - (temporary)
3.	Dr. Rajdeep Brar	Assistant Professor - (Contract)
4.	Dr. Prabhjot Cheema	Sr. Lecturer-(Contract)

- (ii) the following faculty purely on temporary/ contractual basis w.e.f. 13.11.2019 for 11 months i.e. up to 12.10.2020 with break on 12.11.2019 (Break day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation and Name of appointment
1.	Dr. Shally Gupta	Professor (Contract)
2.	Dr. Neeraj Sharma	Associate Professor (temporary)
3.	Dr. Ikreet Singh Bal	Associate Professor (temporary)
4.	Dr. Simranjit Singh	Senior Assistant Professor (temporary)

**R-2.** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation (Item 3) of the faculty of Engineering & Technology dated 16.12.2019 (**Appendix-XXII**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has nominated following three experts as a member of Research Board in Engineering & Technology for the term 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2021, under Regulation 3(d) at page 445 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007:

1. Professor S.K. Sharma  
Professor Emeritus  
Panjab University, Chandigarh
2. Professor Navdeep Goyal  
Department of Physics  
Panjab University Chandigarh
3. Professor S.K. Mehta  
Department of Chemistry  
Panjab University, Chandigarh

**R-3.** (i) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Committee dated 22.01.2020 (**Appendix-XXIII**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the students from Law Courses to attend classes (provisionally) from one institution to the other within the Panjab University System of Institutions on medical and sports grounds, for one semester only at a time and they will have to pay facility charges duly approved by the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 (Para 39) as under:

1. Students from PU Regional Centres/PU Campus @ Rs.40,000/- per semester.
2. Students from Colleges/Institutions affiliated to PU @ Rs.1,00,000/- per semester.

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Committee dated 06.02.2020 (**Appendix-XXIII**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the students from Law Courses to attend classes (provisionally) from one institution to the other within the Panjab University System of Institutions on medical and sports grounds, for one semester only at a time and will have to pay facility charges duly approved by the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 (Para 39) as under:

1. Students from PU Regional Centres/PU Campus @ Rs.40,000/- per semester.
2. Students from Colleges/Institutions affiliated to PU @ Rs.1,00,000/- per semester.

**R-4.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Mr. Onkar Singh, Senior Technician (G-II) to the post of Laboratory Superintendent (G-I) and Mr. Dilbagh Singh, Mr. Surendar Kumar, both Senior Technician (G-II) to the post of Senior Scientific Assistant (G-I), Department of Chemistry in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+Grade Pay Rs.5400/- with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances, w.e.f. the date they report for duty and their salary be fixed as per University Rules.

**NOTE:** All other terms and conditions of service rules of the discipline and conduct as contained in the University's Calendar Volume-I & III and other rules and instruction framed there under from time to time shall be applicable.

**R-5.** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation dated 16.12.2019 (Item No. 7 (2)) (**Appendix-XXIV**) of the Committee of Faculty of Science and in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council and Syndicate, has allowed the following addition in the existing eligibility criteria for M.C.A., M.Sc. (IT) and PGDCA with effect from the academic session 2020-21 and the same be incorporated in the prospectus CET (PG) and Hand Book of Information 2020-21:

- (a) B.Voc. (Software Development), B.Voc. (Hardware and Networking) & B.Voc. Multimedia (Graphics & Animation) courses with Mathematics in 10+2 be considered eligible for admission to M.C.A. course from the academic session 2020-21.

- (b) B.Voc. (Software Development), B.Voc. (Hardware and Networking) & B.Voc. Multimedia (Graphics & Animation) courses be considered eligible for admission to M.Sc. (IT) and PGDCA course from the academic session 2020-21.

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

**R-6. Withdrawn**

- R-7.** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Ramesh Chand, Photographer-cum-Draftsman (G-II), Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology (AIHC&A), Panjab University, Chandigarh as Excavation Assistant (G-I), in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400 with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as per University rules w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant post in the Department of AIHC&A. His pay will be fixed as per University Rules.

**NOTE:** 1. The above matter was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 13.12.2019 (23 (R-7)) and after discussion it was resolved that the information contained in R-7 be brought again.

2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXV**).

- R-8.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has condoned the shortage of lectures of the following students of Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies and Development, P.U. (**Appendix-XXVI**) for the academic session 2019-2020:

1. Mr. Amarjeet Singh, M.A.-I, Semester-I
2. Mr. Vinod Kumar, M.A.-II, Semester-III

- R-9.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Dhriti, Assistant Professor purely on temporary basis, University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET) w.e.f. 01.02.2020, with the condition that she will have to deposit salary in lieu of short of one month notice period, under Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U., Calendar Volume-III, 2019, due to her family reason as mentioned in her request dated 16.01.2020 (**Appendix-XXVII**).

**NOTE:** 1. Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019, reads as under:

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

2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXVII**).

**R-10.** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation (3) of the Academic & Administrative Committee dated 19.11.2019 (**Appendix-XXVIII**), and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the change in pattern in the conduct of PU-CET 2020 (PG) for admission to M.A. (Journalism & Mass Communication) as under:-

<b>Old scheme of test</b>	<b>New scheme of test</b>
1. Article writing on current events.	1. Article writing on current events.
2. Precis writing	2. Precis writing
3. Feature, writing on personalities, reviews etc.	3. Feature, writing on personalities, reviews etc.
<b>4. English Comprehension</b>	<b>4. Current affairs and General Knowledge</b>
5. Interpretative Passage	5. Interpretative Passage

**NOTE:** A copy of letter dated 24.01.2020 of Chairperson, School of Communication Studies, P.U., enclosed (**Appendix-XXVIII**).

**R-11.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Paper Setter/Examiners of the Institute of Social Science Education and Research B.A. (H.S.) Sem.-I, III, IV for December 2019 examination.

**R-12.** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has:

1. approved the request dated 04.12.2019 of Shri Vineet Punia, Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News for extension in Extra Ordinary Leave (without pay) for further period w.e.f. 01.01.2020 to 30.06.2021 on the previous same terms and conditions.
2. granted further extension till further orders in term of appointment of Mrs. Renuka B. Salwan, Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News (appointed on temporary basis against the leave vacancy of Shri Vineet Punia).

**NOTE:** To strengthen the Office of the Director, Public Relations, Dr. Bharat, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U. will assume additional charge of the post of Assistant Public Relation Officer (APRO) w.e.f. 01.01.2020 till further orders.

**R-13.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has extended the last date for fresh enrolment in Registered Graduate Constituency for Senate Election 2020 till 30.04.2020.

**Referring to Sub-Item 31 R (xii),** Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that the appointment of Director Public Relations (Ms. Renuka B.Salwan) was approved till the leave vacancy of Shri Vineet Punia.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is not so. He thought that perhaps it could not be so.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it is not mentioned in the orders that her appointment is upto the leave period of Shri Vineet Punia, it is absolutely wrong. It had been specifically told by him that his leave may be sanctioned and the appointment be made till his leave period. As this appointment is linked with him, her appointment should be made till that date i.e., upto his leave period.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this had already been mentioned that her appointment is against the leave vacancy and leave vacancy means till the leave period.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor not to hang the Sword of Damocles of "Till further orders". Even where the person is being appointed against the term post, the term of "till further order" is being used there. At point No.(ii) no decision to this effect had been taken. It is mentioned that "to strengthen the office of Director Public Relations, Dr. Bharat will assume the additional charge of the post of Assistant Public Relation Officer till further orders". What did it mean? If it is ratified, it would mean that the Syndicate had appointed him. They are not against any individual, but Public Relation is a specified job, which can only be performed by a person, who has got formal education in that subject. First thing is that, is there any request received from the office of Director Public Relations to strengthen his office? Till date, no APRO had ever been deputed in the University. If the request is received, it should be dealt with in consultation with the DPR office and a person with expertise in the field of Mass Communication should be deputed. This is not acceptable to them in any case.

Ms. Anu Charath said that this appointment would affect the teaching of UILS as this job is for 24 hours. Moreover, he is Warden and it would affect his teaching.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is a very capable and intelligent person, that's why he had been deputed.

Ms. Anu Charath said that it would create a burden of workload on him.

Referring to **Sub-Item R (iii)**, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that a new practice has been started in which the students of Private and Law Colleges/Regional Colleges are coming on the medical/sports grounds to attend the classes. As per the practice Rs.1,00,000/- is to be deposited to attend classes for the first semester and so on and so forth. The students who could not clear the Entrance test of the University had taken the admission in the said Colleges. From there, they enter the University for attending the classes and appear in the Examinations after paying the fee of Rs.10,000/-. This type of message is going to the Society, is unethical as per his point of view. Such a huge amount should not be charged for it. The fee should be abolished. It is considered as a business and it is a backdoor entry.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that if it is a backdoor entry, then it should be banned.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they are answerable for all these things to the Society.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the medical certificates of all the students in such cases are from the reputed doctors from P.G.I. and other reputed medical institutions.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is understandable if the treatment of any person is going on in PGI or Fortis.

Ms. Anu Chatrath replied that the Committee had examined the matter in detail and guidelines have been framed which had been approved by the Syndicate.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he has the right to speak on the issue which has been very much discussed in the Society. They blamed that one should check the names of the parents of these students. These students are the sons/daughters of the rich people and their children are making entry from the backdoor. Firstly they have to clear the entrance test they are required to pay Rs.1 Lac or Rs.40,000/- to attend the classes. This is not fair. This should be controlled.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that firstly they are not the duffer students. For example the merit of 100 students had been prepared and 50 students had joined in Chandigarh and the 51<sup>st</sup> students had gone outside for admission then it does not mean that he is duffer. This is a matter of chance. They are being permitted on the medical, sports and extra ordinary circumstances. Before 15-20 years, when there was terrorism in Punjab, at that time the students were also permitted to study in Chandigarh. It is not a backdoor entry. It is the place where they should facilitate them. What is the difference between a student who is studying there and the other who is studying in Chandigarh? His sports career would be spoilt if he is not being permitted to attend classes in Chandigarh. Secondly a candidate who is being permitted on medical ground, for him a certificate from PGI, GMSH, Sector 16 and GMCH, Sector 32 is required. Due to the view point of Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, a big question on the authenticity of the said certificates has been raised.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he would like to say with full authority and confidence, these are being considered as the shops and the students of Rayat Bahra or Dharmkot College of Ferozepur who desirous of studying in Chandigarh can do the same by paying a huge amount of Rs.1 Lacs or so.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they are not in favour of fringing anybody's right. If they are given the admission to these students by evicting the students, then he is with Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma on his view point. But it is not being done.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that on the one hand they are talking about idealism and ethics but which is being done in the University, is not acceptable. The students who can afford to pay a huge amount of Rs.1 Lacs or Rs.40,000/- are enjoying to study in Chandigarh whereas the students from poor families who cannot afford have a feeling of heart burning in their minds.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that this is a matter of his(student) choice that he took admission in that course in a particular institute. Nobody had forced him to study there.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the view point expressed by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma is absolutely right and had a meaning

**RESOLVED:** That

- (i) the information contained in Item 31 R(i) to R(v), R(vii) to R(xi) and R(xiii) on the agenda be ratified;
- (ii) the information contained in Item 31R(xii) be ratified, as under:
  - (i) approved the request dated 04.12.2019 of Shri Vineet Punia, Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News for extension in



Extra Ordinary Leave (without pay) for further period w.e.f. 01.01.2020 to 30.06.2021 on the previous same terms and conditions;

- (ii) granted further extension in the term of appointment of Mrs. Renuka B. Salwan, Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News (appointed on temporary basis against the leave vacancy of Shri Vineet Punia); and
- (iii) the appointment of Dr. Bharat (mentioned under note of **Sub-Item R (xii)**), University Institute of Legal Studies, as Assistant Public Relation Officer (APRO) w.e.f. 1.1.2020 till further orders, be not approved.

**32.**

Information contained in **Items I-1 to I-10** was read out and noted, i.e., –

**I-1.** This is in continuation of this office order No.499-508/Estt. I and 509-18 dated 21.01.2020 (**Appendix-XXIX**), in term of Senate decision dated 14.12.2019, the Vice Chancellor has approved:

- (i) the promotion of the following persons from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13 A) to Professor (Academic level 14), with effect from the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.10,000/- under UGC career Advancement Scheme (as per UGC Regulations dated 18.07.2018) at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name of the Teacher	Department	Date of Promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A) to Professor (Academic Level 14)
1.	Dr. Vikas	Chemistry	02.06.2019
2.	Dr. Sonal Singal	Chemistry	28.10.2018
3.	Dr. Gurjaspreet Singh	Chemistry	07.11.2018
4.	Dr. Navreet Kaur	Chemistry	29.10.2018

- (ii) the Promotion of the following persons from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 10) to Assistant Professor (Academic Level 11), with effect from the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100/- + AGP of Rs.7,000/-, under UGC Career Advancement Scheme (as per UGC Regulations 18.07.2018) at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name of the Teacher	Department	Date of Promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 10) to Assistant Professor (Academic Level 11)
1.	Dr. Savita Chaudhary	Chemistry	27.08.2018

2.	Dr. Gurpreet Kaur	Chemistry	27.08.2018
----	-------------------	-----------	------------

- NOTE:**
1. It had been certified that the candidate fulfilled the requirement for promotion under CAS, UGC Regulation, 2018
  2. It had also been certified that the selection had been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
  3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXIX**).

**I-2.** This is in continuation of this office order No. 9586-95/Estt I dated 22.10.2019, 9614-23/Estt. I dated 22.10.2019 and 9624-33/Estt. I dated 22.10.2019 (**Appendix-XXX**), in term of senate decision dated 14.12.2019, the Vice-Chancellor has approved:

- (i) The promotion of Dr. Anil Kumar Thakur from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 12) to Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A), Department of Laws, w.e.f. 15.09.2018, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP of Rs.9,000/-, under UGC Career Advancement Scheme (as per UGC Regulations 18.07.2018) at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University, The post would be personal to the incumbents and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.
- (ii) The Promotion of the following persons from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 12) to Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A), with effect from the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP of Rs.9,000/-, under UGC Career Advancement Scheme (as per UGC Regulations 18.07.2018) at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name of the Teacher	Department	Date of Promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 12) to Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A)
1.	Dr. Shipra Gupta	Laws	18.07.2018
2.	Dr. Ajay Ranga	UILS	24.07.2019
3.	Dr. Gurmeet Singh	Hindi	27.07.2019

- (iii) The Promotion of the following persons from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A) to Professor (Academic Level 14), with effect from the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs. 37400-67000/- + AGP of Rs. 10,000/-, under UGC Career Advancement Scheme (as per UGC Regulations 18.07.2018) at a starting pay to be fixed under

the rules of the Panjab University, The post would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name of the Teacher	Department	Date of Promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 12) to Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A)
1.	Dr. Supinder Kaur	Laws	07.06.2019
2.	Dr. Jyoti Rattan	Laws	04.07.2019

- NOTE:**
1. It had been certified that the candidate fulfilled the requirement for promotion under CAS, UGC Regulation, 2018
  2. It had also been certified that the selection had been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
  3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXX**).

- I-3.** The Vice-Chancellor has approved that the share of gratuity, Ex-Gratia, Leave Encashment of Mrs. Faleetan Devi, in respect of terminal benefit of Late Dr. Kuldeep Kumar, Assistant Professor, Department of Physics, be sanctioned to Mrs. Rachna Kaushal along with her share, as per the Legal Heir Certificate and affidavit given by Ms. Faleetan Devi, Mother-in-Law of Ms. Rachna Kaushal and the share of the minor children Ishaan Koundal & Ipsita Koundal be deposited/kept as separate FDRs till they attain majority and their mother Rachna Kaushal will not be permitted to withdraw the amount till their minority.

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

- I-4.** The Vice-Chancellor has executed the following Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between:

**A.**

1. Panjab University, Chandigarh and Red Cross Society, U.T., Chandigarh for collaboration to work with the following broad objectives:
  - (a) Building the resilience of communities to disaster and climate change through education, research and awareness programmes.
  - (b) Strong emphasis on disaster risk management on natural, manmade hazards and related environmental technological and health hazards and risk.
  - (c) Preventing new risk, reducing existing risk and strengthening resilience.
  - (d) Collaboration with Red Cross for internship programmes of PU Students.

2. Panjab University, Chandigarh and Agriculture and Farmers Welfare Department, Government of Haryana, Krishi Bhawan, Sector-21, Panchkula to establish academic research on agriculture, health, environment, water conservation, socio-economic issues, etc.
3. Panjab University, Chandigarh and National Mission for Manuscripts, New Delhi for manuscripts of department of Vishveshvaranand Vishwa Bandhu Institute of Sanskrit and Indological Studies, Panjab University, Sadhu Ashram, Hoshiarpur for digitization of Manuscripts.
4. Panjab University, Chandigarh and Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur for helping increase the placement of students by both training their faculty on the latest technologies and enhancing the coding skills of both faculty and students of colleges affiliated to P.U.
5. University Institute of Engineering and Technology (UIET), Panjab University, Chandigarh, between Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Institute of Technology, Jalandhar to promote academic and research cooperation and the development of these two institutions as Centres of Excellence of Higher and Technical Education and Scientific Research, the two institutions agree to the certain broad terms of cooperation.

**B.** Panjab University and Sports Authority of India, a society existing and registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, a field arm of the Ministry of Youth Affairs & Sports (Government of India) and having its registered office at East Gate, Jawaharlal Nehru Stadium Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi 110003, India, hereinafter referred to as SAI "Academy" as the University has been accredited Swimming Academy for a period of 4 years, under Khelo India Talent Development Programme, vide letter dated 28.11.2019 issued by Head, KITD, Ministry of Youth Affairs & Sports, Govt. of India.

**NOTE:** 1. The above MoUs was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 13.12.2019 (Para 18) (**Appendix-XXXII**) and it was resolved that the Vice-Chancellor, be authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, on the issue of execution of above said MoUs after having recommendations of the Committee comprising Professor Rajat Sandhir and Dean Research.

2. A copy of minutes dated 13.01.2020 of the Committee enclosed (**Appendix-XXXII**).

**I-5.** The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits in respect of Late Shri Kali Charan (Plumber, Construction Office, P.U. who expired on 25.10.2019, while in service) in favour of his son Mr. Pankaj Kumar:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Ex-Gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 141 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
- (iii) Encashment of Earned Leave up to the prescribed limit under rule 17.4 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

**I-6.** The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Mrs. Karamjit Kaur Wd/o Late Shri Baldev Raj, Work Inspector (Chargeman G-I), Construction Office, Panjab University, who expired on 06.12.2019, while in service:-

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Ex-gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 141 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
- (iii) Encashment of Earned Leave up to the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

**I-7.** The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Mrs. Kamla Devi W/o Late Shri Satpal, Work-Inspector (re-designated as Chargeman G-1), Construction Office, Panjab University, who expired on 09.12.2019, while in service:-

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Ex-gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 141 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
- (iii) Encashment of Earned Leave up to the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

**I-8.** The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Mrs. Sumitra W/o Late Shri Shiv Bahadur, Security Guard, Security Staff, Panjab University, Chandigarh, who expired on 10.12.2019, while in service:-

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

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup>March 2020

- I-9.** The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

<b>Name of the employee and post held</b>	<b>Date of Appointment</b>	<b>Date of Retirement</b>	<b>Benefits</b>
Dr. Ramanjit Kaur Johal Professor Department of Public Administration	18.12.1998	29.02.2020	(i) Pension/Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 & 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.  (ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

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

- I-10.** The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the employee and post held</b>	<b>Date of Appointment</b>	<b>Date of Retirement</b>	<b>Benefits</b>
1.	Shri Mangal Singh Senior Technician (G-II) Department of Geography	24.09.1977	29.02.2020	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.

2.	Ms. Sunita Mahajan ASO (Hindi), Stenographer Department of Hindi, P.U.	26.09.1981	31.01.2020	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
3.	Shri Mehar Chand Sharma Jr. Engineer (Civil) (CDC as SDE) Construction Office, P.U.	15.10.1985	29.02.2020	
4.	Shri Jagdish Chand Senior Assistant College Branch, P.U.	22.01.1985	29.02.2020	
5.	Shri Bal Krishan Chargeman Grade-I Construction Office, P.U.	01.04.1986	31.03.2020	
6.	Shri Tilak Raj Chargeman Grade-I Construction Office, P.U.	12.10.1985	31.03.2020	
7.	Shri Tilak Raj Library Restorer Department of History, P.U.	19.09.1978	29.02.2020	
8.	Shri Shiv Shankar Singh Record Lifter UMC Branch, P.U.	24.04.1973	31.03.2020	
9.	Shri Gurnaib Singh Peon Girls Hostel No.3, P.U.	12.01.1976	31.03.2020	

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

**When the discussion on the agenda items was over, the members started general discussion.**

1. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it had been noticed that Selection Committees are being sent for the appointment of Principals. Ineligible persons were being appointed on which the decisions of the Syndicate had already been taken. These appointments are contradictory to the decisions of the Syndicate. A particular case had been brought to the notice of the Dean College Development Council immediately when the interviews were going on. In Mata Ganga Giri College, two decisions of the Syndicate were flouted, first is that the Principal of the said College was transferred to Arya College, which was cancelled later on. The major question is that when there is no vacant post, how could it was advertised and the panel was sent for selection. The second decision was relating to transfer from Degree to Education College which should not be allowed, as it is a clear violation of the Calendar. This had been done, which was also informed and later on a letter was also sent from the office of the Dean College Development Council. The Principal of the Mata Ganga Giri College was forced to join in the Arya College. This is a

very serious matter as the directions of the Syndicate and University Officers are being flouted. Therefore, one had to be very careful in sending the persons for the Selection Committee. If the directions of the Syndicate and orders of the University are not being accepted then it is a very serious matter. These type of appointments should be checked seriously on the basis of their points and eligibility. After checking on the said basis, this should be considered for approval.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if this was brought to the notice of the Dean College Development Council then it should be checked simultaneously.

2. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is one another issue in which it has been passed in the Board of Finance and in the Syndicate also that if there is a post under technical staff equivalent to the group which has not been converted into group I, II, III and IV. On the request received by the department that post would be converted. That has been passed in the Syndicate but it is also mentioned that the same would be placed in the Senate for its final approval. It is requested that the same should be passed in anticipation of the approval of the Senate as this would not create any issue in the Senate as it is not a major problem. The permission of the Vice Chancellor should be given to deal with the case in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor asked the house whether the same can be considered or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it can be done as it is not a controversial issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if there is any input from the office the same should be taken into account.

The Vice Chancellor replied that it is O.K., it would be looked into.

3. Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she had also raised two issues in the morning. One is relating to the situation which at present is being faced by the country is of CORONA VIRUS. When they read the newspapers in the morning, they knew that there were cultural programmes, seminars and workshops organised in the Panjab University. It is very well known to them as due to the closing of financial year, they have to conduct the said seminars and workshops. At this point of time when there is restriction on organising the seminars and workshops by the Government, the University is organising the seminars/workshops at a very large scale. Her view is that a circular should be issued to all the departments that till 20<sup>th</sup> March, all the welcome parties, farewell functions, seminars and workshops would be postponed.
4. Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she would like to bring to their notice that decision under Para 4 of the meeting of the Syndicate dated 16<sup>th</sup> October, 2019, says that the candidates who could not complete the Ph.D. thesis due to any reason, be given a special golden chance to submit the same up to 28.04.2020. The supervisors could not be in a position to complete the work of supervision till 28<sup>th</sup> due to their busy schedule. They can spare the time in the month of June, therefore, she requested that it should be extended till 30<sup>th</sup> of June.



Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma suggested that it should be extended till 30<sup>th</sup> July, 2020.

The Vice Chancellor said that this would not be considered like that. The academic session would end on 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2020, therefore, the extension upto 30<sup>th</sup> July, 2020 is not acceptable.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa requested that the vacation is upto 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2020 at least 15 days should be given to complete the thesis work.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that 30<sup>th</sup> June was suggested by Ms. Anu Chatrath was due to the reason that grace period of vacation would be taken into account.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as suggested by other members, 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2020 should be fixed and it can be extended in cases of hardship as a special case.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that earlier it was pointed out by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that no violation to the University guidelines should be done.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that theses were always being condoned earlier and there is no violation in it.

5. Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the other issue is relating to the employees who are working for more than 15 years in the University hostels, they were recruited according to the requirement. The data relating to them was transferred in the Establishment branch from the last 1.5 to 2 years. They should be adjusted to the vacant posts of the departments which had also been brought in the Agenda item. It is total injustice not only to the candidates but also to their families.

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

6. Professor Emanuel Nahar said he would like to brought the same issue which Ms. Anu Chatrath had discussed. There are 93 employees who are working in the Hostels from the last 10-15 years. The Committee was constituted but neither D.S.W.(Men) nor D.S.W. (Women) had been included in it. It had been recommended by the Committee that no benefit would be given to them.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that as per the judgement of High Court and Supreme Court, the master roll employees could not be denied the benefits. They have to give the annual increments and other benefits to such employees.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be looked into.

7. Shri Jarnail Singh said that this issue had already been raised in the Senate, that the employees which were employed when the building of Hoshiarpur Centre was donated by the donor, should be regularised after following the proper procedure.

The Vice Chancellor replied that a meeting relating to the Hoshiarpur Centre would be held in due course.

8. Shri Jarnail Singh said while quoting the case of teacher Dr. Kamya Rani at Law College, Hoshiarpur wherein there are two type of categories of teachers relating to salaries. It was informed by the office that these two categories were clubbed into one category. These teachers were not being paid the salary for 2 months and it is a very heart burning situation for them. They equally performed their duties for a whole year as compared to the regular teachers.

Ms. Anu Chatrath endorsed the view point of Shri Jarnail Singh and said that it is being done in all the Colleges that the teachers are not being paid for the summer vacation. If a person is residing on rent then he has to pay the rent for a whole year and by saying that he only worked for 10 months, and his salary for 2 months would not be given, is not justified.

9. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that this issue is also in the knowledge of Professor Navdeep Goyal. A representation has been received from Dr. Maninder Kaur in which some months are left in the completion of 8 years of service to become the Chairman. If possible it can be considered as a special case or someone may be authorised to do the needful in the matter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the rule in the said case is very much clear that if no person is eligible then any one can be deputed as Chairman by rotation. This would be implemented till the time the person would be eligible for the chairmanship. The same type of case was also dealt with, in the Department of Biophysics.

10. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa requested that the case of Dr. Prem Nath relating to pension, should be considered, which had already been discussed in the item relating to Pension.

11. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that another case which he would like to bring to the notice of the Controller of Examinations is relating to the conduct of examinations of S.D. College. It should be decided whether it should be re-conducted or not but the test should be re-conducted of all the students as this College is at its top position on the basis of merit in B.Com. Course. As regard the matter of secrecy, it is informed that the secrecy had been leaked.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the decision relating to re-conduct of examinations of S.D. College should be taken after taking into account the rules and regulations.

The Vice Chancellor assured that he would decide on the same after consultation with the members of the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said the decision of the Board of Studies should also be considered in the matter.

12. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu pointed out that promotion cases of teachers of the Colleges are pending since a long time and it has become a mindset of the big institutions that promotions are not to be allowed to the teachers. These teachers will get a big jump of Rs.20000/- to Rs.25,000/- when they would be considered for promotion to the post of

Associate Professors but they are not being promoted to the post of Associate Professors. The teachers of colleges under the D.A.V. Management Committee are being deprived of their right of promotion; even when they are eligible for promotion from the last four years. This would result in a major monetary loss to the teachers. These teachers would have become the Principals if they were promoted to the post of Associate Professors and it is the major condition that one should be Associate Professor for consideration for the promotion of Principal. He requested that Dean College Development Council should make a detailed report relating to the promotion cases of the teachers and they should be promoted within 6 months after checking their seniority whether he/she would be eligible for 5<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> step, or so on and so forth.

The Vice Chancellor said “he would get it done”.

13. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the retirement benefits in various Colleges are not being allowed. It had also been requested earlier in writing to the Dean College Development Council. In these large institutions for example there are 3000 students and they are being charged Rs.60 Lacs as fees from the students. Even then the retirement benefits of the teachers are not being given.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa intervened while endorsing the view point of Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and said that Dean College Development Council should be directed to bring the list of the eligible teachers who are due for promotion to the post of Associate Professors in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

14. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu submitted a representation of 5-7 teachers that they had cleared the B.A. from the Department of Evening Studies with Police Administration as one of the paper prescribed by the University. These teachers are working in different fields and they want to pursue the Master Course in Police Administration as regular students. If it is possible the course in Police Administration should be introduced at the Master's level.
15. Ms. Surinder Kaur said that the approval of the Associate Professors is not being received from the University for last 3-4 years.
16. Ms. Surinder Kaur said that in the Colleges, teachers are given 15 days medical leave. Sometimes 3-4 teachers together proceeded on Medical Leave, owing to which, the studies of the students suffered. She therefore, suggested that a circular should be issued to the Colleges stating that only 3 days medical leave without medical certificate should be allowed.
17. Ms. Surinder Kaur requested that the course work of Ph.D. students, should be conducted during vacation period so that they could complete the work during vacation.

The Vice Chancellor asked what is the matter regarding the course work of Ph.D.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that management do not allow them leave to attend the course work of Ph.D. Students have to avail leave without pay for attending the course work of Ph.D. This course

work should be added/bifurcated into the summer vacation period so that it would be benefitted for the College teachers.

18. Principal Sarabjit Kaur submitted that the improvement chance should be allowed to the B.Sc. (Agriculture) students as being allowed to the other students.
19. Principal Sarabjit Kaur said this issue was also raised by her in the previous meeting that the late fees imposed on the Examination fees of SC students should be waived off. This late fees have not been waived off by the Vice Chancellor till date. The recruitment drive of the Punjab Government is going on whereas D.M.C.s to the passed out students of 2017 and 2019 had not been received by them. 18<sup>th</sup> March is the last date for applying them for the posts. This late fees should be waived off at the earliest so that the D.M.C.s would be issued.

The Vice Chancellor assured that it would be resolved within 2-3 days.

20. Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that there is one more issue which had also been raised by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa. The paper for the students of G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector 32, Chandigarh should be conducted on the basis of uniformity, the decision should not be taken partially on it.
21. Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that the Vice Chancellor had debarred the entry of Principals of Education Colleges in Degree Colleges. The previous appointments should be cancelled first, to implement it. If it is not possible, then this letter of debarring should be withdrawn. A clarification from the U.G.C. should be made available to them as to why they are being debarred as they are doubly eligible. The Vice Chancellor had ordered that the teachers of Education Colleges would be allowed to join in Degree Colleges as Principals.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that neither the teachers of Education Colleges go to Degree Colleges nor the teachers of Degree Colleges are allowed to join in Education Colleges.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the teachers of Education Colleges are debarred to join in Degree Colleges as the subject of Education is not being taught in the Degree Colleges. The previous appointments were wrongly done, just to benefit certain persons. Therefore, this letter should be withdrawn if the regulation permits. This is being told by him to the authorities whereas it is to be informed by the officials of the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Jarnail Singh replied that in the Degree Colleges, the regulations of U.G.C. are implemented whereas in the Education Colleges the N.C.T.E. regulations are implemented. The conditions of the both the governing bodies are different.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that Principal Sarabjit Kaur had very rightly stated if the previous appointment were wrongly made then it should be cancelled.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be looked into.

22. Shri Ashok Goyal said that the matter had been raised to create a Research Centre at the UILS. Whereas as per his knowledge it was passed from the Board of Studies as well as from the Faculty of Laws then, why the same is not brought in the meeting of the Syndicate? Where it is pending and why it is pending and on whose instance it is pending.
23. Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is another issue which had already been raised by Professor Navdeep Goyal. He believed that House should have a very serious view in the matter and it is unfortunate that they (members of the Syndicate and Senate, who had gone to the Colleges as members of the Selection Committee) refused to follow the instructions given by the Dean College Development Council, on behalf of the Vice Chancellor. They said that the decision of the Syndicate was wrong and they don't accept it, it had already been changed and they were directed to do what they were doing. He had understood that the office of the Dean College Development immediately after acting very swiftly intimated the College also that don't go ahead with this. He had been given to understand that by flouting all the instructions of the Vice Chancellor, the Dean College Development Council and the Registrar, they had alone go ahead with that. How to handle this. Simply bringing it on record and discussing it in the House is not going to solve the problem. Till now they are blaming the Colleges and other elements that they are flouting whereas the decision takers themselves are flouting this. What is to be done? It was the matter of 8<sup>th</sup> February when the Special meeting of the Syndicate was called to discuss the model code of conducted to be implemented during Elections. It was discussed on that very date and now one month had been elapsed and he brought the same to the notice of the Vice Chancellor and Dean College Development Council on 8<sup>th</sup> February, 2020 immediately. No action had been taken till one month. If it has been decided then it should be informed to them. If not, then it should be informed why it has not been done? He felt that nothing is more serious than that. He suggested that exemplary steps should be taken against the College as well as those who had intentionally and wilfully violated the instructions of the University without going to the merits and demerits of the decision. Even if I presumed that the decision is 100% wrong, nobody had got the discretion to not to follow it because decision has to be followed. They had the right to get the decision changed but nobody had the right to violate the decision. He is neither against the Degree Colleges nor the Education Colleges. But this has to be evaluated dispassionately whether it is right or not. If it is not right and it has been done in the past, then it is a justified demand. If in the past this had been wrongly done then it should be rectified by issuing show cause notice and withdrawing the approvals. The mistakes were being done at their end to benefit the certain persons and these mistakes had been made the practice.

Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to the discussion held in the morning about the resolution moved by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and he himself, said that it had been conveyed that a Committee is going to be constituted and it would be brought in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that one thing he would like to bring to the notice is that there is no provision of deputation from one affiliated college to another except from Government to Private College. But that decision had been wrongly taken by the Syndicate. What reason is

behind it, that is known to those people who had done it. They also said that it was wrongly done.

The Vice Chancellor intervened and said it was got done from him. He further asked whether it was done during this time period.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was not done during his tenure, that wrong decision was endorsed at the time of the present Vice Chancellor. It is made clear by Professor Navdeep Goyal that it was not done during the tenure of the Vice Chancellor which was agreed to by him and he would take his words back. A person of Education College is deputed in the Degree College on deputation whereas there is a discussion whether they could be appointed in degree colleges or not and on the other hand he is on deputation from the last 2.5 to 3 years. The interesting fact is that post is lying vacant in the Education College. One Principal is running the two Colleges under the patronage of the Panjab University. What the University is thinking on it, it should be discussed. The another matter which had been brought to the notice is that a man on deputation from Technical College to Degree College had decided to contest election as representative of Principal of the Degree College. They could not understand on whose rolls is that person? Either he is on the rolls of Degree College or on the rolls of the Education College. Would they wake up when the problem be would be aggravated? These things should be looked into by the Registrar and the Dean College Development Council. This case should be opened and brought in the Syndicate as directed by many times earlier. File would be gone through to find on whose recommendation it was done.

24. Professor Keshav Malhotra asked that the letters relating to the Career Advancement Scheme which were discussed on 16<sup>th</sup>March, had not been received till date.

The Vice Chancellor replied that due to the CORONA Virus no experts are available.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they would intimate the names of the experts to him.

The Vice Chancellor replied that why they would provide the names when it is his jurisdiction to do so.

Shri Ashok Goyal said the CORONA Virus had been continuing since long. If these persons were available on 2<sup>nd</sup> March then why they could not be available on 16<sup>th</sup> March. It is on the peak on 2<sup>nd</sup> March. It is a very serious matter which would create unrest at a later stage.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be got examined. He was kept on trying to get all these things settled.

Ms. Anu Chatrath intervened while saying that the cultural events and evenings are banned due to CORONA Virus but not the interviews.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would consult the local experts as suggested by the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is to be informed by the Vice Chancellor that whether any Professor declined to visit as an Expert due to CORONA Virus. Therefore, this reason is not acceptable.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that all the members of Syndicate are visiting in Inspection/Selection Committees and it is his request with folded hands to do the needful at the earliest.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would not be disappointed on this point.

25. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he had brought all the agendas of the previous one year to remind them all the issues relating to the Colleges which were placed in the meeting. In the meeting held on 27.01.2019 a case of Chawarianwali College had been placed, on 18.02.2019 the case relating to permanent affiliation of Bhag Singh College had come, on 16.03.2019 the deferred cases of both the colleges had come, on 10.04.2019, the deferred case of Chawarianwali College was placed. On 11.05.2019, the NCT College of Ludhiana had been brought, on 28.05.2019, the reports of Atma Vallabh and Devki Devi Jain College were placed, on 30.07.2019, the case relating to the approval of Arya College, Ludhiana plus the case relating to the Principals of Degree Colleges were placed. On 16.10.2019, the case relating to the extension of the Principals and on 13.12.2019, the case relating to the Seonk College was placed in the meeting of the Syndicate. He said with a pain that in all these 10 cases no action had been taken on so far. These 10 cases were placed in the meetings of the Syndicate during the last year. The case of Chawarianwali College was brought by the Vice Chancellor in the meeting of the Syndicate in which it had been decided to reinstate the teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members would sit for one hour after this meeting to discuss these issues.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that these should be responded at least. As it was earlier said when the post of the Ganga Giri was not vacant then how the panel was sent.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that these teachers were re-instated but no letter had been sent from Panjab University from the last one year. The management had obtained the stay by saying that they had not been communicated. All the efforts made for the same had went in vain. In the case of S.D.P. College, the guidelines had been received that University had taken a right step. He had brought with him the copy of the judgement. The step for the reinstatement of the teachers had rightly been taken and it was decided that students would be admitted as per their risk and responsibility and to co-operate in the enquiry. This had discussed in the 8<sup>th</sup> month of the year 2019 and now till the third month of year 2020, no Committee has been constituted. Nine months had been elapsed and no committee has been constituted. Six teachers had left the job, enquiry committee was not constituted and everything was found settled. Now the current Officiating Principals (the senior most persons) had written a letter to the D.P.I. that their services are no longer required.

The Vice Chancellor asked Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua to come tomorrow to discuss these issues.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he wanted to discuss the same only in the presence of the Syndicate. The case relating to the College of Devki Devi Jain College is that Regulation 11.1 was imposed and they were saying at that time no meeting would be conducted. No letter from Panjab University was sent whether the meeting was required to be convened or not. The teams were sent to Atam Vallabh Colleges but reports were not received till date. No action was taken by the authorities on any matter of the College. When the officer of the office of the Vice Chancellor visit these colleges on function then what is the credibility of the said Inspection teams? The affiliation of Sri Aurbindo College had not been granted from the last 2.5 years, then how this college is functioning when it is disaffiliated. Even the college did not apply for the affiliation. In Arya College, Ludhiana the powers of the Principal had been withdrawn, could after that the papers with his signatures would be accepted. These papers are being accepted by the Controller of Examinations and the Registrar. There is another College where they pay only for 4 months in a year. In the year 2018 the salaries for only 5 months had been paid and that was only for the period when the Inspection teams were sent. In the year 2019 only salary for the months of March to June were paid. The Inspection teams were being sent but even no Ph.D increment was sanctioned to them. Where the system is going? Is there a huge workload with them? There are only 125 colleges if a person handles two colleges then the whole work would be completed in 2 months. The team should be sent to Kottanwala College. It had been got approved from the last 3 months that the increments to the Associate Professors were sanctioned. Three months had been elapsed even a letter had not been issued to seek the record whether they are granting the increments or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be examined.

26. Shri Ashok Goyal said that these issues are much more important than the agenda items as these things are never brought on the agenda.

The Vice Chancellor urged the members not to raise all such issues in the formal meetings only, but try to sort out the same in the informal meetings itself.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had told him certain things informally also that the members on the Inspection/Selection Committees are appointed keeping in view the fact whether affiliation/appointment is to be given/ appointment is to be allowed to be made or denied. A finger had been raised on a Committee and the decision of the Committee had been challenged in the Court. Now, they had changed the Committee, which meant that they are accepting that their integrity in doubtful.

The Vice Chancellor said that 3-4 members should sit together after the meeting.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that he had made request not once but 2-3 times that the same Committee should be sent again; otherwise, they would be endorsing the viewpoints those, who are levelling the allegations, but his request were not paid any heed.



Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he would like to tell them as to how the officials of the University implement the orders of the Governing Body. An order passed by the Vice Chancellor that accommodation in the Guest House should not be allotted to anyone, but on his arrival it came to his knowledge that 6 rooms and 2 suites were allotted on that day. However, no accommodation was given to the Syndics. When he made phone calls to 4 officials, he was informed that he/she was not a booking manager. Only 6 rooms were allotted, whereas there are 15 rooms in the University Guest House and the 9 were vacant. Similarly, out of 7 suites, 2 had been allotted and 5 were vacant. Whenever the meetings of the Selection Committees are fixed, provision for allotment of accommodation should be made in the University Guest House, but they issued orders contrary to it and also followed the said orders. Although the Colleges are running shops, they are not issuing the necessary orders. What to talk of the orders, even letters are not being issued to the concerned Colleges. They went to the extent that even if the Syndicate took certain decisions against the College(s), the same are not notified for 5-6 months.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if his appointment with him (Vice Chancellor) is fixed for tomorrow, he would not put forth his viewpoints.

When the members requested the Vice Chancellor to give him time, the Vice Chancellor said that the time would be given by his Secretary, i.e., Secretary to Vice Chancellor.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu remarked that why the need has arisen to bring the matter to the Syndicate, because in the University the job is not accomplished for months together.

27. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he is having a lot of pain in pointing out that though he had raised the issue in the meeting of the Senate held in the month of December 2019 and also raised the issue personally to him (Vice Chancellor) about the Construction Committee Report made on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2018.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee has been constituted about 10 days before. However, he would like to tell him that a technical person is required because the issue is cropping up again and again.

To this, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma pointed out that about one and a half years had already elapsed.

The Vice Chancellor said that first of all, somebody has to give his consent for the job and at the same time, they also needed the requisite funds.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as to how much funds are required.

The Vice Chancellor said that since they would take consultancy, who would be ready to serve on the Committee without the honorarium.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that, anyhow, it is never too late, but he had been repeatedly saying, still nothing has been done. If now the Committee has been formed, it is good.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee has been formed and they would definitely get the report within a stipulated period.

28. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as the issues of the Colleges are being discussed, a letter has come to him and the same has also been given to the Vice Chancellor and has also been sent to him. There was a teacher in Guru Nanak College, Abohar, who might have also officiated as Principal. In this regard, Shri Dharma Pal ji has also written to him (Vice Chancellor). The retiral benefits to the teacher concerned had so far not been released. The teacher is really in great hardship as he had yet not been given the retiral benefits despite is repeatedly writing to different quarters, including Vice Chancellor, Registrar, Dean, College Development Council. One of the senior teachers (Associate Professor) working in that College is saying that the College is not paying him more salary than the Superintendent working in the College. This needed to be examined as to how it is happening and it could also be asked from the College as to how it could be possible that Associate Professor get less salary than the Office Superintendent. It itself is giving a wrong message.
29. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the faculty house of the University is in a very bad shape. It has come to his notice that, last year, a sum of Rs.65 lacs had been allocated for renovation of the faculty house but nothing has been done so far, owing to which it remained unoccupied. Resultantly, there is loss of revenue to the University as well as inconvenience to the teachers. He requested the Vice Chancellor to take care of this issue.
30. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as pointed out by other members, the persons, who are working in the Hostels for the last so many years, should be accommodated.
31. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he would again like to reiterate that the meetings of the Syndicate should be held at regular intervals. Skipping of any meeting is neither good nor appreciable.

The Vice Chancellor said that, in this regard, he would like to make a request to the members that they should also informally meet as much time as possible.

Karamjeet Singh  
Registrar

Confirmed

RAJ KUMAR  
VICE-CHANCELLOR