

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate held on **30th May, 2020 at 11.00 a.m.** in the Golden Jubilee Hall, 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. Smt. Indu Malhotra
Director, Higher Education, Punjab
8. Principal (Dr.) Iqbal Singh Sandhu
9. Shri Jarnail Singh
10. Professor Keshav Malhotra
11. Professor Navdeep Goyal
12. Professor Rajinder Bhandari
13. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma alias Rabinder Nath
14. Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar
Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh
15. Principal (Dr.) R.S. Jhanji
16. Principal (Dr.) Sarabjit Kaur
17. Dr. Satish Kumar
18. Ms. Surinder Kaur
19. Professor Karamjeet Singh ... (Secretary)
Registrar

At the very outset, the Vice Chancellor wished good morning to each one of the esteemed members and welcomed them to the meeting. He said that the Hon'ble members of this august house are meeting amidst Covid-19 and they all pray to the Almighty to help the entire humanity in remaining safe.

Condolence Resolution

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

- i) Padma Shri Harkishan Singh, Professor Emeritus, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on 20.3.2020.
- ii) Mrs. Kuldeep Kaur wife of Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, former Fellow & Legal Retainer of Panjab University, on 21.4.2020;
- iii) Professor Rekha Jhanji, Department of Philosophy and wife of Professor B.S. Brar, Department of Political Science and former Dean of University Instruction, on 8.5.2020;
- iv) Professor Shankarji Jha, former Dean of University Instruction, on 10.5.2020;
- v) Padma Shri Balbir Singh Senior, on 25.5.2020, hockey legend, who had won 3 Olympic gold medals and upon whom the University conferred Khel Ratna Award in the year 2016.

- vi) Shri A.N. Grover father of Professor Arun Grover, former Vice-Chancellor of our University, on 26.5.2020.

Dr. Satish Sharma said that his only request to the Hon'ble members is that presently the entire country is passing through a very difficult situation, under which several workers, including Doctors, Para-Medical Staff, supporting staff of the Hospitals, Health Works, Police Personnel, etc, are providing essential services to the public. It has come to the notice through different channels (social media, newspapers, television, etc.) that many of them have lost their lives after getting infected with COVID-19. He requested that the Syndicate must pay respect to those persons, who have sacrificed their lives for them (public) and must pay their condolences to them.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they are paying respect and paying their condolences to those, who have lost their lives in fighting with COVID-19.

The Vice Chancellor requested the Hon'ble members to stand for two minutes to pay respect to departed souls.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Padma Shri Harkishan Singh, Mrs. Kuldeep Kaur, Professor Rekha Jhanji, Professor Shankarji Jha, Padma Shri Balbir Singh Senior, Shri A.N. Grover and Corona Warriors, who have sacrificed their lives for the public and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

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

- "(i) I am happy to inform that CA Vikram Nayyar, Finance & Development Officer of our University has been appointed Non-official member of the Finance Committee of The Maharaja Bhupinder Singh Punjab Sports University, Patiala.
- (ii) Dr. Rakesh Malik, Deputy Director, Sports has been appointed as a member of the Indian Olympic Association Education & Academic Committee.

The members applauded the above-said achievements of CA Vikram Nayyar, Finance & Development Officer and Dr. Rakesh Malik, Deputy Director, Sports, with thumping of desks.

RESOLVED: That felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to -

1. CA Vikram Nayyar, Finance & Development Officer of our University has been appointed Non-official member of the Finance Committee of The Maharaja Bhupinder Singh Punjab Sports University, Patiala; and
2. Dr. Rakesh Malik, Deputy Director, Sports has been appointed as a member of the Indian Olympic Association Education & Academic Committee.

At this stage, on a point of order, Professor Rajinder Bhandari stated that before taking up the regular agenda, he objects to an Item, which is being shown as an Information Item (Item I-13) and related to appointment of Professor R.K. Singla, Department of Computer Science & Applications and Professor V.R. Sinha, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, as Dean of University Instruction and Dean Research, respectively. He enquired as to how this Item has come as an Information Item. In fact, on this issue, as per Calendar they had only two options. Had there been an emergency/exigency that the meeting of the Syndicate could not be held, the Vice Chancellor could have used his power and appointed these persons in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate. Or the Item should have been brought to the Syndicate for consideration. As per Calendar, there is no third option. Moreover, when this issue was put on the WhatsApp, they (he himself and Principal R.S. Jhanji) had raised objection(s), but he is sorry to point out that no reply was given to their objection(s). He would like to bring to their kind notice that whatever provisions are available in the University Calendar, neither the Vice Chancellor, nor the Syndicate nor he (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) could go beyond those provisions and nor could the Senate. As such, the way the Item has been brought to the Syndicate, it is against the spirit of the Calendar. Hence, as on date, the appointment of these persons (Professor R.K. Singla as Dean of University Instruction and Professor V.R. Sinha as Dean Research) is illegal. He suggested that either the Vice Chancellor should pass afresh orders appointing them in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate and place the same before the Syndicate or the place the same before the Syndicate in its next meeting for consideration; otherwise the item in this form is not acceptable to them because straightaway it is illegal, illegal and illegal.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is of the view that they could discuss the issue, when this Item will come in the agenda.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that it is a point of order and that Item could not be taken up as an Information Item.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice Chancellor is right that they could discuss the Item, when it is taken up for consideration.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari reiterated that it is a point of order and Item could not come as an Information Item.

Ms. Anu Chatrath clarified that point of order is where some important information is to be given or an important/urgent issue is to be discussed. As such, it is not a point of order.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari remarked that the agenda is ill-framed, when would they discuss it. In fact, this Item is not in order.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that what they are saying is that they should bring the Item through proper channel/system. Why are they violating the Calendar again and again? In fact, there is a clear-cut provision in the Calendar and they had pointed out the discrepancy to the Registrar. Moreover, the Registrar is a part of that group (WhatsApp Group), which has been created. However, he did not know how they are treating/accepting the social site as an official group. WhatsApp, which is a social group, had never been or could never be an official group. In fact, this social group is just for giving information about the meetings and not for decision making and neither such a practice existed in the University. If there was any emergency, the Vice Chancellor could have appointed these persons in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate. They neither have any opposing to Professor R.K. Singla's appointment as Dean of University Instruction nor Professor V.R. Sinha as Dean Research. In fact, they are opposing it because the Item has not come to the Syndicate in a proper

way/through proper procedure. They are still saying that the Item should be placed before the Syndicate in a proper way. As such, it is wrong and if it is not wrong, then why the meeting of the Syndicate has been called/held today. Had it not been wrong, today also, the entire agenda could have been circulated to them through WhatsApp and got the same approved. He reiterated that they did not have any objection to the appointment of Professor R.K. Singla and Professor V.R. Sinha as they are senior-most persons, but the Item should come to the Syndicate in a proper way. He further said that when 18-20 Senate members gave him (Vice Chancellor) in writing, he never took cognizance. Now, what was the emergency that they, on the asking of a couple of members, sought consent of the Syndicate members through the WhatsApp? Had such a thing ever happened earlier?

Professor Rajinder Bhandari enquired as there any provision in the Calendar that an Item could be got approved from the Syndicate through circulation. In fact, this method is not correct. Principal R.S. Jhanji has rightly said that there were only two options – either the Vice Chancellor could have passed orders in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate or the Item should have been brought to the Syndicate for consideration. As such, the entire method should be corrected. Although they are not against the persons, if they did not question/oppose/challenge the procedure, tomorrow there would be several such wrong doings/actions, and they would not permit it because their conscience did not allow them. If it is not corrected here, they would approach anybody/authority at the highest level to get it corrected.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that this Act came into existence in 1947. Whatever situation they are facing at the moment, it is across the globe and it has never happened in their life time and not even the life time of their fathers. It might have happened during the time of their grandfathers and their forefathers. In such situations, whenever there is such a desperate time, desperate measures are always taken. It is a use of technology of making their opinion to run the system, especially the Governments (both Central Government and State Governments) could run and they could have interaction via video conference, audio conference or via any other technology. He thought that they should also transfer information sometime or at some point of time through such media. Whenever there is any exigency or need of time, they could act accordingly. So to say that it is not in accordance with Regulations/Rules, is perhaps not correct. Nowadays, even the Punjab & Haryana High Court is also functioning through video conferencing because this is such a situation that they could not say/presume anything on the first day. Their opinion about this pandemic was different and it got changed after 10 days and so on and so forth. Slowly and steadily, they have to get involved with this disease and from time to time, situation is going to change. The new method, which the University has applied, is not wrong because the purpose is only to take consent of all of them that whether agreed to it or not. Hence, they could only object to the procedure. According to him, the WhatsApp is an official group because there only official jobs should done and not informal. The meeting of the Syndicate, which was supposed to be held in the month of April 2020 and had got skipped and if the members were not able to come owing to lockdown/curfew, they could also have been held through another mode. They had the experts in the Department of Computer Science & Applications, who could have been involved to set up the requisite system. There is no need to hire the experts as everything is available in-house. According to him, the introduction of technology in the functioning/smooth functioning of the University/system and their governance is the need of the hour, especially under the present circumstance when they are facing this pandemic situation. As such, they must adopt the technology.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, first of all, he would like to congratulate the Vice Chancellor for accepting the majority view and had appointed the Dean of University Instruction and Dean Research. If they go through the composition of the Syndicate, besides Vice Chancellor, there are 17 members and out of 17, 13 members

had given their consent. Moreover, there is a tradition in the University to appoint Dean of University Instruction and Dean Research on seniority basis. If the decision has been taken by the Vice Chancellor after taking opinion of the members, they should congratulate the Vice Chancellor instead of criticizing him or raising issues relating to procedure, etc.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that whenever they do a job, they always followed the prescribed procedure. If they did not want to hurt the sentiments of anyone, they are required to follow the prescribed procedure. Had it been introduced in the WhatsApp group that these are the senior-most persons and they are seeking the opinion of the members, it would have been better, instead of writing that they are going to appoint these persons. According to her, it would have been a better practice and it would have been supported by everyone. He requested the Vice Chancellor to follow the prescribed procedure, in future and not to avoid the procedure.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari stated that to the extent of pandemic, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa is correct, but when the provision already existed in the Calendar that the Vice Chancellor could make appointment in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, where was the needs of WhatsApp or video conferencing. Moreover, how the pandemic has come in it. Had they proceeded according to that way, they would not have any objection. Had the Item been brought for consideration or for ratification, they could have understood. This Item could not come for information even in seven Yugas. Such an Item has never come for information. If the decision relating to an Item, which is to be decided by the Syndicate or the Senate, has been taken by the Vice Chancellor, the same could never come to the Syndicate for information. Information is not a right place for such an Item. When the Vice Chancellor had clear-cut power, why and owing to what reason(s) that power has not been exercised. Secondly, they had been continuously raising objection on the WhatsApp and are also challenging that platform as well as the method/procedure, why they are not heeded to. Just sometime before, the Hon'ble member has talked about the majority view. If it is so, the four persons, who are in minority, might not be invited to the meeting, and then the 11 members could decide the issues in the meeting of the Syndicate as they had the majority. Majority does not mean that they could do anything. So far as procedure or provisions laid down in the Calendar is concerned, neither the Vice Chancellor nor the Syndicate nor the Senate nor he himself (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) could violate the same. He should be told as to how he (Vice Chancellor) has approved this Item. They did not accept WhatsApp as one of the platforms of the University. Had it been done through video conferencing, wherein all would have participated in the discussion? Though they had raised the objection, the Item has been cleared by them (other members). For a second, even if they treat WhatsApp an official platform, where had they concluded that since these 11 members had given consent, it has been decided that such and such persons be appointed Dean of University Instruction and Dean Research. Where are those minutes? He should not be forced to tell that 2-3 persons, who usually visited University office, asked the University authorities to act according to their whims and fancy. Such a system should be discontinued. Already much had happened and now it is not acceptable to them. If it still allowed to continue, they would see to it. If they wanted to violate the University Calendars, the same could not happen in their presence.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he would only like to say that there is nothing like majority-minority. Whether it is a 15-member Syndicate or 17 and whether a faculty member is watching from outside or a non-teaching staff member. Even one person could give best advice. As such, they have to think and consider the issue with open mind. Everyone should respect and value the argument and opinion given by others. There is not issue of majority-minority and everyone is free to express his/her viewpoints and everybody has the right to express his/her viewpoints and the viewpoints expressed by one and all must be respected.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that senior members are present in the House and none had raised any ifs and buts on the appointments. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa has rightly said that they could have used the technology. They could have conducted the meeting of the Syndicate through video conferencing. He reiterated that none had objected the appointments. Majority of the people did not see the messages sent through WhatsApp. At times, they avoid WhatsApp and ignore the messages sent through WhatsApp. He enquired that whether WhatsApp group of the Senate, which has been created, is official. Tomorrow, they might take decision on WhatsApp group of the Senate saying that they had taken the majority view. He again stressed that majority of the people do not see the WhatsApp. In fact, the WhatsApp group is only for providing information. The Registrar and Deputy Registrar (General) are the Admins of the WhatsApp group. It is true that under the circumstances, they have to adopt different types of methods/technology and they would adopt also, but first they must prepare themselves for such methods. They must adopt the prescribed procedure. He again enquired as to where are their proceedings. If the Syndicate has approved it, where are the proceedings? They are acting on the basis of majority on the WhatsApp and published the same in the newspapers. As said by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa that it is not an issue of majority-minority, they should agree that they would always follow the Calendars and would never go beyond the Calendars. However, if they talked like this, then such things are bound to happen. Now, it is right time to put an end to such things. The 2-3 persons, who keep on roaming around the offices, should not be entertained. The Officers should be directed to be careful because at several times, the information which is not available/provided to the members of the Syndicate and Senate, is available with those persons. In the instant case also, the appointments were made later on, but before that the letter(s) was/were available outside. Before taking a final decision, the information is made available to certain persons on the WhatsApp. From where the documents are scanned and information is put on the social media (WhatsApp). How and who is doing all this? Either the Officers/officials are hobnobbed with them or the persons concerned always kept tracking the movements of the files. They scanned the information from the files at will and upload the same on the WhatsApp. The information is leaked before the relevant file is moved by the office. All this is happening. They should stop all this. Whatever issue is to be decided, first the same should be placed before the Syndicate as the Syndicate comprised of senior persons; otherwise, what is the need of the Governing Body, and they could just put the information on the WhatsApp and seek opinion from the members. He lamented that a line is incorporated that if anybody is unable to respond by this and this date, it would be treated as approved. If somebody did not see the WhatsApp for four days or so because they are also getting so many e-mails and their servers are also down owing to which they received the messages later, under the circumstances do they expect from them that they should respond immediately and they (office) have fulfilled their responsibility by incorporating the above-said line. Did they wish that all such critical issues should be approved without any discussion? In fact, new technology is not being utilized, but only is line is being inserted that if anybody failed to respond within a day or so, it would be treated as approved. If serious issues are to be approved like this, then there is no need to convene the meetings.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they have to fix some limit – either 1 day or 2 days or 3 days. If one is a member of 500 groups on the WhatsApp, he/she did not see the messages of all the groups; rather, he/she sees messages of only few groups. However, one is expected to see the messages of the groups towards which he/she has certain responsibility and such groups could only be 2, 3 or 4 or maximum 5. He/She is supposed to see the messages of such groups on regular basis. He is of the considered opinion that although they should not see the superfluous messages on the WhatsApp, they must see the messages on the WhatsApp groups towards which they had certain responsibility. If such groups had been created, they must see the see the messages either 6 or 8 hours. When Principal R.S. Jhanji pointed out that the

University had their phone numbers, they could make phone calls to them, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that this is a valid point. He informed that when the meeting of the Executive is convened, everybody is informed on phone and they are made to sit at the requisite distance for maintaining the social distance.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari pointed out that after a few days, he was asked by one of his colleagues that had he gone through such and such message. In fact, he (his Colleague) told him that such and such message has come to them on the WhatsApp. This is what, which is happening in the University.

Citing an example, Principal R.S. Jhanji said that suppose he (Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa) is in the Court and he is asked to respond within an hour or two hours, what would his reaction.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is true that the information must reached them.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the issue has been raised by Principal R.S. Jhanji and Professor Rajinder Bhandari. In fact, the circumstances are not ordinary ones. It was not a huge agenda that one could not go through it, but their opinion had been sought within a stipulated time. The post of Dean of University Instruction was supposed to fall vacant on 31st May 2020 and the same was required to be filled in. The post could have been filled by the Vice Chancellor either in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate or after taking opinion of the members. If the Vice Chancellor had taken opinion of the members and two members had given their reservation, but the other members had given their consent. If the decision has been taken after obtaining the consent, what is the harm in it? Now, if the Vice Chancellor had taken the decision on the basis of the consent given by the members, they should accept the same as they (other two members) did not have any objection to the appointed persons also. According to him, keeping in view the unusual circumstances prevalent at that time, they should accept the decision of the Vice Chancellor. At the same time, their (two members) feelings should also be accepted that wherever they could avoid obtaining opinion from the members through such a method, they should avoid. He reiterated that his two Hon'ble colleagues did not have any objection on the appointed persons as they are the senior-most and the next senior one, they should accept the decision of the University. Even if they make the appointment(s) again after following the proper procedure, then also these persons would be appointed. What purpose would be served? Moreover, these persons are already performing their duties. Their only purpose is to get the work of the University done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that perhaps, Professor Rajinder Bhandari has seen the message in question on 24th because he has responded on 24th itself. He could read out his response.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that Professor Rajinder Bhandari should not make statement in such a manner. He (Professor Bhandari) has said that he had been told after 5 days about the message.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari clarified that he had said that probably he had been told about the message after 5 days.

At this stage, a din prevailed as both Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Rajinder Bhandari started arguing with each other. Shri Ashok Goyal went through the reply given by Professor Rajinder Bhandari and said that they respect his (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) views and sentiments, but he should not make a wrong statement.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari stated that his first question is – when he (Vice Chancellor) had the power in accordance with the Calendar that he could appoint any person as Dean of University Instruction in anticipation of approval of Syndicate or the Senate, where was the need of exploring the second option. Now also, the matter has been placed before the Syndicate – whether as an Information Item. He would like a reply from the Vice Chancellor as to why this power has not been used by him. Why are they shuttling the issue on the plea of pandemic, epidemic, etc. The entire provision is available in the Calendar that the Vice Chancellor is empowered to make appointment in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate. Was the Vice Chancellor unable to take the decision as he was also entangled in the pandemic or epidemic? Had it been so, they could have understood? It should be told why the Vice Chancellor did not use his power enshrined in the Calendar. Secondly, when the matter was decided through WhatsApp, why the matter was not resolved that such and such decision-irrespective of whether it was to be recorded by the Registrar or another officer of the University. Thirdly, there is a prescribed procedure for convening a meeting. A meeting could be called a valid meeting only if the same was properly notified by giving requisite notice irrespective of whether the same was attended by majority of the members. Had they given the notice for the meeting on the WhatsApp? Had they also resolved the issue on the WhatsApp? They did not know as to who had guided/misguided the Vice Chancellor on the issue. He told that certain members are here for the last 20 or more years. They knew what is to be got done at a particular point of time and the same is quoted after about 10 years that such and such decision was taken 10 years back. He knew each and everything which has happened/is happening in the University. Earlier also, he had been a member of the Syndicate/Senate and there are persons, who are senior to him and they twist the issues intelligently. He would like to caution the Vice Chancellor and urged the members not to misguide. Since they are senior persons, they could have advised the Vice Chancellor to appoint the persons in anticipation approval of the Syndicate. Why they twisted the issue and advised him (Vice Chancellor) to get consent from the members through WhatsApp. What was the urgency? The Vice Chancellor could have taken the decision within few minutes as he had been empowered in the Calendar. As such, they are on their firm stand that this Item, in the present, form is not tenable and is illegal and thus, is not acceptable to them.

Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that everybody who supported and voted on the WhatsApp group in that situation, they must be given a chance to speak because unnecessarily allegations have been put on the entire body of the Syndicate (majority of the members).

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that this is what he wanted a point out.

Continuing, Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that instead of using the word ‘guiding’ in that situation, the word ‘misguiding’ has been used. It meant, they are not responsible persons, who have supported the University in that scenario? The Vice Chancellor had constituted a Committee comprising some of the Senate members to take decision under the circumstances prevailing at that time. They had been contributing and most of the Senate members, especially those who are staying in the University Campus, had contributed a lot. Instead of recognising their contribution, they are alleging that they are misguiding the University, which is unfortunate. 1 hour has unnecessarily been wasted. Those, who are the senior-most persons, have been appointed, which is also the practice as the persons are appointed on the basis of rotation. It was just a formality. Admittedly, they are not speaking against those persons and they are not disputing that they are not the senior-most person and instead they are talking about the procedure. WhatsApp group had been constituted and under the extraordinary circumstances, they had sort opinion through WhatsApp. Under these circumstances, they (lawyers) are also arguing the matters in the courts through video conferencing and the courts are taking the decision also. If the Vice Chancellor or the University

Administration has formed a WhatsApp group, the importance of that group should be recognised. If they disrespect a person, who contributed a lot in this group, then such a group should not be created. This is very disrespectful. Instead of using the word guiding, the word misguiding has been used, which is discourteous. As such, she would like to request Professor Rajinder Bhandari to withdraw these words that they have been misguiding. If they could see the history, senior- most person by rotation is appointed Dean of University Instruction and the next senior-most person as Dean Research either on completion of the term of the incumbents or on superannuation.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that if she (Ms. Anu Chatrath) wished, he could change his word from misguiding to ill-guiding.

At this stage, Professor Rajinder Bhandari and Professor Keshav Malhotra indulged in one to one arguments.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that in case of emergency, the Vice Chancellor could have appointed these persons, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, first of all, he respected the sentiments expressed by Professor Rajinder Bhandari, who probably has really/seriously used these words along with the sentiments of Principal Jhanji. If at all, they felt that there are some people, who have been here in the Senate for the last 20 years as has been alleged or more than that, they are responsible for ill-guiding or misguiding. Probably, this is not acceptable at all, because as human being if their feelings are hurt, they should not forget that on the other side also the human beings are sitting. They have no business to put such kinds of allegations, that too, at official platform like Syndicate, unless and until they have the evidence to prove that what they are saying is correct. Secondly, as pointed out earlier, with due respect to Professor Bhandari, he would like to make a statement in this House that just 5 minutes back, he tried to mislead the House by saying that it is somebody, who told him on telephone after 6th day circulation of the message that he (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) should open the WhatsApp and see what is there. Let him tell that exactly after 2 Hour and 8 minutes of the message, which was put on the official group of the Syndicate by the Registrar, Professor Bhandari responded. Simply because he has the access to record, he could say; otherwise, he would have no alternative, but to believe what he has said. To give the excuse that he could have forgotten and to plead that he only remembered this. That is not acceptable.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari intervened to say that he stood corrected.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal requested Professor Rajinder Bhandari not to mind as he has full respect for him. He stated that he would like to know from him (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) as to who are the members of the Senate, who have been here for more than 20 years and who as per his (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) information, are ill-guiding or misguiding the University Administration; rather, the House would like to know. Thirdly, Principal Sarabjit Kaur has put a very valid point that had the proposal been put in the group in the proper form that such and such are the senior-most persons and the term is going to expire on this day, they would have understood. Probably, she has not gone through the message. In fact, it is exactly in the same form on the WhatsApp as they are suggesting. Fourthly, they are now vociferously and forcefully putting as if the Vice Chancellor had the power, under the Regulation of urgency, to use that. He is sorry to point out that he (Vice Chancellor) did not have that power to use in this case because the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor is not required here. It is only the recommendation of the Syndicate, on the basis of which, the Senate has to appoint. The Vice Chancellor could not do anything in anticipation of the Syndicate unless and until that power lie with the Syndicate. However, in the instant case, the power lies with the Senate, but the

recommendation authority is the Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor did not come anywhere in between. They should tell him what they are saying the two senior members of the Syndicate had sent the proposal to the Registrar not putting on the official WhatsApp group by giving the proposal. They should tell him which law provide to bar the members of the Syndicate to put any proposal whether by way of SMS or writing or telephone. Thereafter, the Vice Chancellor and the Registrar in their wisdom thought it better to put it on the official WhatsApp group. They could themselves see that it had been put by the Registrar and the SVC and not by any member of the Syndicate as is being alleged and not by those who are responsible for guiding or misguiding. The Vice Chancellor has done over and above, what they are expecting. They expected use of emergency power, which they are referring to. In fact, the Vice Chancellor used the power over and above the emergency power and thought it proper to take the opinion of other members of the Syndicate. They are right that if they think that the Vice Chancellor could have used his emergency power, what sin he had committed by taking the opinion of all the members. Simply because he (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) had responded also and now he is suggesting that had this been done through video conferencing, he/they would have no objection. They should tell him in which Calendar it is written that consent of the members could be obtained through video conferencing. They are saying that opinion through video conferencing is understandable, but not through WhatsApp. He again asked in which Calendar it is written that video conferencing is allowed. Simply because what is suitable to them, is acceptable and what is not suitable to them, is unacceptable. Still at the cost of repetition, he is telling that in case their sentiments had been hurt presuming and assuming that it has been done as a matter of design by the University Authorities or by any member of the Syndicate that probably is ill-founded. Had they spoken to the concerned person, maybe that misunderstanding could have been removed. His request is that instead of blame game, they should try to share the feelings of each other inside as well as outside the House whether through WhatsApp or video conferencing or telephonically.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari stated that he would like to respond to the plea of Shri Ashok Goyal that the Vice Chancellor do not have this power. He drew the attention of the House towards Regulation 14, which says, "Whenever there is an urgency, the Vice Chancellor may take such action as he deems necessary, and report the matter at the next meeting of the Syndicate for approval".

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that perhaps, he (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) has not heard properly. In fact, he had said that the Regulation of urgency and emergency which he (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) is quoting, is not applicable in the instant case. The Vice Chancellor does not come anywhere in the picture. According to this Regulation, the work, which is to be done by the Syndicate, could be done by the Vice Chancellor in case of emergency. Since these appointments are to be made by the Senate, the Vice Chancellor could not make recommendation in place of the Syndicate. He (Vice Chancellor) could do anything which is supposed to be done. If something is to be done on the recommendation of the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor could not do the same.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if emergency could be created in such a manner, there was no need to convene the meeting of the Syndicate today as there is no change in the situation. They could create emergent situation at will to use emergent powers.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari intervened to say Professor Keshav Malhotra should not talk hypothetically.

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

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 30th May, 2020

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired was it not known last year also that their term would expire on 30th April.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari suggested that it should be enquired from the Vice Chancellor and not from him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is asking this from the Vice Chancellor through him (Professor Rajinder Bhandari). Whatever they had done in their collective wisdom, they must endorse.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that under the pandemic situation the meeting of the Syndicate was not possible and the teachers were asking them as to why the Dean of University Instruction is not being appointed and why the meeting has not been convened. Since the meeting of the Syndicate was not possible to be convened, they thought it better to make the proposal as they had pressure of 700 teachers.

To this, Professor Rajinder Bhandari remarked that the University is not to be run according to his (Professor Keshav Malhotra) will and instead it is to be run in accordance with the Calendar.

Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that then why they had talked about the video conferencing.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari clarified that he had only referred to the statement made by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) has also said that video conferencing is acceptable to them.

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

Professor Rajinder Bhandari pointed out that even the senior-most Professor (Professor Dinesh K. Gupta), who was Dean of University Instruction at that time, was removed from the post of Dean of University Instruction.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that he completely endorsed the viewpoint Professor Rajinder Bhandari, but they should see as to who were responsible for that.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that whosoever may be, but he was removed by the Syndicate.

Shri Jarnail Singh requested the Vice Chancellor to clarify the issue.

It was informed that Hon'ble Professor Rajinder Bhandari has raised a very important point. His (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) anguish could also be understood as also as to why he is raising all these things. He is raising these things, so that a wrong precedent is not set. Responding to two-three queries, which have been raised, it was stated that an e-mail was received by the Registrar Office as to why this particular procedure has been followed. The Registrar had sent him an e-mail giving the proper justification as to what is required. Even the proofs about this could also be given to the Hon'ble members, which could be verified by them.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari clarified that he has already said that he had received an e-mail.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) had said that no reply to his mail was received from the University Office.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 30th May, 2020

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that he had said only about that no communication was received by them as to what has been resolved. The communication was received only when he put a query; otherwise, nothing had come on the WhatsApp – whether any decision has been taken or not.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the Vice Chancellor or the Registrar should have given an appropriate reply to Professor Rajinder Bhandari by giving proper justification.

It was stated that one thing has come out from the statement of Professor Rajinder Bhandari that they have no objection on the appointment of these persons and have objection only on the procedure followed by the University. He (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) is right that in accordance with the provisions of the University Calendar, Vice Chancellor is the Chairman of the Syndicate. The file was moved to the Vice Chancellor and they were contemplating to make the appointments in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, but in the meanwhile, two Hon'ble members of the Syndicate proposed that the senior-most persons should be appointed as Dean of University Instruction and Dean Research. The matter was put to the Chairman of the Committee of Syndics, who suggested that it is better to obtain opinion of the members of the Syndicate. If they did not take into consideration request/proposal of member(s), objection is received that they did not take any cognizance of the proposal made by senior member of the Syndicate. Hence, they put the message on the WhatsApp group of Syndicate member. Thirteen members gave their consent through WhatsApp itself and a note from Professor Rajinder Bhandari and Principal R.S. Jhanji also came. The office prepared a note justifying each and every aspect of the matter and the said note could be shown to them. It is open for them as the House could inspect any document. They had put all the facts clearly mentioning that these 13 members have said this and these two members have given this statement. They had mentioned exactly the same what was written by Principal R.S. Jhanji and Professor Rajinder Bhandari. The said note was put to the Chairperson of the Syndicate. Since 13 members out of 15 had given their consent. He (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) is right that the notice period, quorum, etc. is required to declare a meeting valid. In fact, it was not a meeting; rather, it was just an action taken under the position faced at that time. They had not called a formal meeting. They had to appoint the person and for appointing the person, two members had given in writing. At that time, they had only two options – (i) either to appoint the person(s) in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate or obtain opinion of the members. It was clarified that there was no intention to specifically do this. They thought that since two persons have given the proposal in writing, it would be better to have consent from the other members. He (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) has said that the decision taken through WhatsApp is not reliable. When the matter was reported to the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor they contemplated as to what should be done. Could they ignore the consent given by 13 members? When 13 members were in favour of a particular decision, they thought it appropriate to go with them. Now if the House decided that WhatsApp group is not valid, they would disband it and in future no communication would be sent to the members on the WhatsApp. So far as the procedure followed by them in the instant case is concerned, they had followed it under the special circumstances which are prevailing in the entire globe not that they were against or in favour of any particular person. The position had been clarified to them both verbally as well as in writing. Anyhow, they would be careful in future.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in case they did not do the work within the stipulated time, they would again give such proposal.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that though they have no conflict with regard to the proposal, the conflict is being created with the statement of the University.

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

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to calm down and honour the viewpoints of one another.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that when the proposal was received from two members, what they should have done is that they should have appointed the senior-most persons as Dean of University Instruction and Dean Research, in anticipation approval of the Syndicate. Had they done this, they would not have any problem? Since it was not affecting anyone, why one should have objected to it. Perhaps, they have created the controversy themselves. Why did they use the WhatsApp? They should have told them that such and such proposal received from two members of the Syndicate, which they deemed fit and they passed the necessary orders. At the most, they should have talk to the members on phone. He had also suggested a method to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are pointing out only the procedural lapse and, in future, it will be ensured that decisions will not be taken through social media like WhatsApp.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that when the proposal was made by the two members of the Syndicate, he had suggested the mechanism to the Registrar that the appointments should be made in anticipation approval of the Syndicate and they had not objected. He urged that this should be adopted.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would take care of it.

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

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that if they are going to approve this under information item, they would not agree to it.

Shri Jarnail Singh remarked that they are not getting it approved but get it noted.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari suggested that the item should be shifted to ratification and then they would have no objection and would approve the same.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that the item should be shifted to ratification, so that the matter is sorted out.

The Vice Chancellor said that the item relating to appointment of Dean of University Instruction and Dean Research be shifted to ratification from information.

This was agreed to.

- 2.** Considered the tentative Academic Calendar proposed by Dean College Development Council dated 18.05.2020 (**Appendix-I**) to be observed by the Teaching Departments/Regional Centre of the University and its affiliated Colleges (Arts, Science & Commerce) and Education having semester system of examination for the session 2020-2021.

NOTE: The meeting of the Committee constituted to finalize the Academic Calendar could not be held due to prevailing Covid-19 situation in the Country.

Initiating the discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are corrections in many things. The first is that in the academic calendar, the evaluation and declaration of results are never mentioned. This can be kept for their official use and it can never be brought for the approval of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Navdeep Goyal to explain the matter in a clear manner.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the mention of evaluation and declaration of results in the Academic Calendar is not to be placed for the approval of the Syndicate. The less time has been given for the last date of admission with the permission of the Principal. The last date of admission with the permission of the Principal should be extended up to 18th September, 2020 and the last date of admission with the permission of the Vice Chancellor should be extended up to 30th September, 2020.

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that the students should be given extension in time with the permission of the Principal as there is huge amount of difference in fees for admission with the permission of the Vice Chancellor.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that in the Academic Calendar, the constituent colleges and Regional Centres have been included; it should be intimated whether the Constituent Colleges and Regional Centres are considered as Affiliated Colleges. The Constituent Colleges cannot be incorporated with the Academic Calendar of the Departments. In this Academic Calendar, the Constituent Colleges are being treated at par with the Departments whereas there is a provision of 5-day week in the departments, can it be considered that in the constituent colleges. Would these constituent colleges be treated at par with the Departments, and then it be intimated to him from which Constituency he should contest the elections of the Senate, Departments or Affiliated Colleges. Even in the revised Academic Calendar, the constituent colleges are included with the Regional Centres and Departments. The first he would like to enquire whether these are Departments or Affiliated Colleges.

It was informed that the constituent colleges are equivalent to the Affiliated Colleges. This is the tentative Academic Calendar keeping in view the COVID-19 situation it is hoped that Colleges might open by 15th of June. In the note it has also been suggested that the Vice Chancellor may be authorised for making any amendments/addition/deletions in the said Academic Calendar according to the situation. A Committee had been constituted for dealing with the Academic Calendar and the Agenda was sent by the Dean College Development Council on mail. The suggestions put forth by them would be incorporated as this is the tentative Academic Calendar. This item was brought tentatively and they should authorise the Vice Chancellor to incorporate the changes, if desired.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that whatever changes the Vice Chancellor needs, the same can be done. Previously a committee was constituted to decide the cases of non-teaching staff of constituent colleges wherein the Principal was included in it. If the constituent colleges are considered as the Affiliated Colleges, then the

Principal should have powers equivalent to the powers of the Principal of an Affiliated College. They did not possess even the powers of Clerk. The Committee was constituted in which all the members were from the Panjab University and not even a single member of the College was included in it. The Committee was constituted, to deal with the positions of the non-teaching staff, but the decision relating to the teaching was taken that the Principal can appoint a person for 3 months in the emergent situation. Whereas the Calendar of the Affiliated Colleges says that the Principal can appoint for a period of one academic session. The Principals are not allowed to appoint a person even for a single day. The appointment made by the Principal was refused and sent back by the Clerk of the Panjab University. Whether this should be made a department, where no election would be contested by him or any of the Principal of Constituent Colleges. Department is located in the area of 200 sq. yards whereas the Constituent College is situated in 12 acres of land. Their issues are quite different. In the Departments there are only 60 seats whereas in the Colleges there are 3000 seats. Therefore, it should be treated as College. The authority treats them as the Department whereas it is not the Department. It has to be treated like an Affiliated College. The letters meant for Affiliated Colleges should be sent to the Constituent Colleges and not the letters relating to the Departments.

It has been informed that the Vice-Chancellor had constituted the Committee in which the Principals were the members. It was agreed that after January, 2020 regular monthly meetings will be held. Special rules were framed for the constituent colleges, as some exists only for the constituent colleges which do not exist in the Panjab University. As per the rules of the University the Clerk is promoted to the post of Assistant Registrar whereas this rule is not applicable to the Constituent colleges. It was also discussed there that the Principals have no power, it was decided to restore the powers of the Principal. The process was lingered on due to the lock down otherwise the whole work would have been completed.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that after that another Committee was constituted in which the University Professors were included and the recommendations of that committee were implemented, whereas the meeting of Committee relating to the Colleges have not been held for last 8 months.

It was informed that the concern of Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu is genuine and it would be taken care of.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stated that Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu had raised a very valid point in the discussion. But another thing which he would like to point out is that Constituent Colleges are getting 100% grant from the Government. This should be considered whether these colleges should be operated on the guidelines of private management or on the guidelines of the Government. The service rules of both the Private and Government Colleges are quite different. In the Academic Calendar, the schedule of examinations has been placed but at this place they cannot decide when the examinations will be conducted in the current situation. A message has been circulated to the students of the Colleges of the Punjab under the signatures of the Controller of Examinations that examinations will be held in the first week of July. When this decision was not taken in this body then how can that circular/notification is sent to the students that examinations are being conducted in the month of July, 2020.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he along with Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Professor Navdeep Goyal was the member of the Committee dealing with the issues related to the examinations. The notices/circulars are being issued from the office of Controller of Examinations in a routine manner. These decisions are not being approved by any Body i.e., neither the Syndicate nor the Senate. These decisions should come through the Vice Chancellor or the Registrar.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the Academic Calendar has been placed today itself, it has not been passed. It has to come with amendments/additions/deletions. All the said decisions relating to the Academic Calendar have been finalised and flashed on the social media groups. They even did not know how the classes will run after 15th of June.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that one interview had been telecasted on the channel, is that video fake?

It has been clarified by the Controller of Examinations that no message regarding fixing of conduct of examinations has been sent through the office of the Controller of Examinations. The message which was circulated under his signatures on 26th May in which it was written that examinations will commence on 1st July to 15th July in two shifts, was a fake. This message was circulated on social media. He informed the University has not circulated the message? The Vice Chancellor instructed till finalisation of the dates, no circular relating to it would be issued. He had regular meetings with the Vice Chancellor as well as other officers. He informed regarding this message to the Director Public Instruction to take immediate action and they wanted to find out who had circulated this message. A few days earlier another message was circulated in this context. These messages are not being sent by the personnel of the office of Controller of Examinations. The guidelines of the U.G.C. were announced on 28th of April. On 29th April, the Vice Chancellor had meeting with the Vice Chancellors of the Punjab. In the meeting instructions were given that all the Universities should have a uniform pattern/uniform dates for the conduct of examinations in the month of July for exist class students. The Vice Chancellor responded that they would not finalise the dates as every University has its own discretion in the manner. In that light from the last 15 days, they had made general guidelines to know all types of uncertainties whether examinations will be conducted or not. There is no message from the office of Controller of Examinations that students are being promoted. There is no message that examinations are being conducted from 1st of July, 2020. For all these purposes, they had filed an FIR and he had even visited to the office of S.S.P. Chandigarh to find out how these messages had been circulated. Only the group which is working with him or in the Principals groups, they were being informed from time to time to sort their queries regarding the conduct of examinations. But all these messages are on record. He further said that no date sheet has been finalised, everything is under process, and arrangements are being made. Paper setting, procurement of answer books, duties of Superintendents are still to be proposed, but they would take a final call in the first week of July.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was waiting only for the meeting of the Syndicate. If the House is authorising the decision relating to the Academic Calendar would be taken after taking inputs from the Departments/Colleges.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if the circulars/notices are being forged then this type of forgery can be done in degrees also.

The Vice Chancellor said that due to this very reason, the FIR has been lodged.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that since yesterday he had received 100s of e.mail from the students of University Institute of Engineering & Technology enquiring about whether the statement that examinations will commence in the first week of July, is true or not. He asked the Controller of Examinations to intimate whether the schedule of examinations for final year University Institute of Engineering & Technology students had been finalised or not.

The Controller of Examinations replied that no such type of information has been released from their channel.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said while taking about the Departments that one point is required to be discussed on the professional students of UBS and University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Chandigarh and Hoshiarpur where the placement has been done. Some little work of presentation is left, there they have to authorise the Departments to conduct the examinations at their own level in consultation of the students, so that it will not affect their placement.

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that whenever the University would decide on the issue relating to students, the viewpoints/inputs from the Colleges should also be included.

Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar, Director, Higher Education, U.T. said that at least 3 weeks' time should be given before the commencement of examinations. The date sheet from C.B.S.E. has been received and the examinations are being conducted from 1st July. The date sheet from Delhi University has also been released and the students have anxiety in their minds that there should be at least 3 weeks' time should be given before the commencement of examinations. It should not be such that on 15th June they would announce that the exams would commence from 1st July.

On a point of order, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that there is a difference between a College and a University. At present they must first concentrate on online classes because the moment when they would announce the date of examinations, the students would come for protest that there have been not attended classes and they have not studied then what examinations the University is taking? She endorsed the view point of Professor Navdeep Goyal that in the professional courses where syllabi of the first and second semester are interlinked with the next semester. She said that as there are no online classes, it has been observed that there are many departments who are not taking online classes, firstly it should be made mandatory and they would give a proof to that effect. In that way, the moment they announce the date sheet, there would be no protest. In Colleges, the students are immature and young; they would not raise any objection.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has proposed that a window of about 15 to 20 days be provided to various departments to overcome any shortcoming left in the process of online teaching, provide remedial classes and give opportunity for practicals. They were waiting for today's meeting.

Ms. Anu Chatrath told that the Director Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh has pointed out that the online pattern of teaching being followed by Punjab School Education Board is extraordinary and if there is something to be learnt from them, they must do so.

RESOLVED: That the Vice Chancellor be authorised to approve the revised Academic Calendars and others Academic related matters to be framed for Teaching Departments/ Regional Centres of the University and its affiliated Colleges (Arts, Science & Commerce and Education) having semester system of examination for the session 2020-2021, on behalf of the Syndicate taking into consideration guidelines and SOP issued by the UGC and Ministry of Human Resource & Development (MHRD) and other competent authority as well as situation of Union Territory.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Head of the Departments of Professional Institute/ Department of Panjab University, be authorized to conduct the examination/ presentation, of already placed students in consultation with students, so that their placement is not affected.

3. Considered the following proposal of syllabi, introduction of new courses, eligibility, condition etc. for the session 2020-2021 for Undergraduate courses/Postgraduate courses of Panjab University, in view of prevailing COVID-19 situation in the country and start of various academic activities, which are unavoidable and time bound, to authorize:

1. the Deans of various Faculties to approve, on behalf of their respective Faculties, Syllabi, introduction of the new courses, eligibility conditions, rules and Regulations, fee structure etc. duly approved by the respective BOSs falling under their Faculty for the session 2020-21 (**Appendix-II**); and
2. the Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of Academic Council, the introduction, eligibility conditions, rules and Regulations, fee structure etc. after approval of the Dean concerned.

NOTE: The 70% syllabi of various courses for the session 2020-21 have already been approved by the respective Faculties in their meetings held in the month of December 2019. The remaining syllabi were to be approved by the respective Faculties, but the meetings of the Faculties could not be held owing to COVID-19 situation.

It was stated that at present, there is a procedure for passing of syllabus. First it goes to the Board of Studies, then to the Faculty, thereafter to the Academic Council and lastly it is passed by the Syndicate. Now, there are some syllabi which have been passed by the Board of Studies but not by the Faculty and it is requested that the Vice Chancellor be authorized by the Syndicate to pass the syllabi in consultation with the respective Deans of the Faculties.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the powers of the Faculty may be assigned to the Deans and those of the Academic Council to the Vice Chancellor.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua drew the attention on page 22 of the agenda referring to the decision of the Committee of February 20 with regard to the course of B.Sc. (Hons.) Mathematics and Computing, wherein it had been said that the course may be started with the Guest Faculty in the absence of regular faculty. He further said that such decisions when taken in the case of colleges, the recruitment is made mandatory before the start of any new course. In the case of University on the other hand the Chairperson through the Registrar is proposing the introduction of the course without any permanent faculty. He further stressed that it was a full-fledged Hons. Course and not even Diploma or the Certificate Course which has been proposed to be run with the guest faculty. This leads to one set of rules for colleges and different set of rules for the University which is not acceptable. Such courses without permanent faculty should not be introduced since it harms the future of students as well as teachers in times to come.

Shri R.S. Jhanji supporting Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this was a long standing problem being faced in colleges and he proposed that the Committees from Colleges should be allowed to come and inspect the courses being introduced in University Departments.

Professor Keshav Malhotra added to the discussion saying that there are certain courses i.e. P.G. Diploma in Photography which are very beneficial for the University and are likely to generate considerable revenue and should be approved.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma was of the view that new courses are introduced only after thorough discussion in various academic bodies like Faculties and Academic Councils. He requested the Vice Chancellor to arrange virtual meetings of such bodies and take their consent prior to the introduction of new courses and not do such things in haste.

The Vice Chancellor appreciated the idea of holding discussion via video conferencing on the matter of syllabi of various course.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the course of M.Sc. (Instrumentation) was not a new course and the issue in this regard was that the fee structure was very high and that the Department has regular and permanent faculty to teach this course.

The Vice Chancellor said that the observations in this matter may be taken from various members in writing.

Since Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar, Director Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, had to go to attend another meeting with regard to Covid-19, he requested that the items on the agenda which required his views may be taken up first.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the view of Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar and Smt. Indu Malhotra may be noted and the Syndicate discussion may continue further as per agenda.

Speaking on Agenda Item No. 22, Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar gave his opinion that since both the colleges were under the same management and the person is eligible for the post. So, they may go ahead with it.

Smt. Indu Malhotra added that already the Supreme Court had decided in favour of similar decision in the late 1990 and the UGC's latest regulations do not debar such a transfer from taking place.

Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar and Smt. Indu Malhotra also said that they are in agreement with the names proposed by the Vice Chancellor for the appointment of DSW and DSW (Women).

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua addressing Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar and Smt. Indu Malhotra pointed out that when an Associate Professor was appointed as Principal in any grant-in-aid college, his or her salary was fixed at the initial level in the concerned pay band. Since the government did not protect the higher salary of the person who may be appointed as Principal, many deserving and eligible Associate Professors in colleges were not willing to become Principals. This was not in the interest of higher education in Punjab.

Principal (Dr.) Iqbal Singh Sandhu supporting the views of Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the salary of the incumbent appointed to the post of Principal must be protected by the Government.

Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar said that the Chandigarh is required to follow the Punjab pattern as far as the service conditions are concerned yet they do protect the salary of incumbent working in colleges within Chandigarh.

Smt. Indu Malhotra said that whereas placing the incumbent in the initial level of the pay scale was a general rule in Punjab Government yet once they receive representations they do consider protection of salary in every case based on the merit of the case.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa supporting Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it was a very relevant point and the situation of teachers in colleges in Punjab was very worrisome and many teachers were not receiving their salary and in certain cases some had been removed from their posts. Care should be taken that such things do not take place in such difficult time. He requested the DPIs of both Chandigarh and Punjab through the Vice Chancellor and Dean College Development Council that the lists and the salary statements of teaching as well as non-teaching staff in Colleges should be checked and verified from November 1, 2019 to May 31, 2020.

Principal R.S. Jhanji also said that there were many instances when an Associate Professor was made a Principal his/her salary was reduced and it was a very poor practice.

The Vice Chancellor thanks both the DPIs for sparing their time.

RESOLVED: That, in view of prevailing COVID-19 situation in the country and start of various academic activities, which are unavoidable and time bound:

1. the Deans of various Faculties be authorized to approve, on behalf of their respective Faculties, syllabi, introduction of the new courses, eligibility conditions, Rules and Regulations, fee structure etc., duly approved by the respective BOSs falling under their Faculty for the session 2020-21, as per **Appendix**; and
2. the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to approve, on behalf of Academic Council, the introduction, eligibility conditions, Rules and Regulations, fee structure etc. after approval of the Dean concerned.

- 4.** Considered minutes dated 20.02.2020 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss the fee structure (Tuition Fee and other University Charges) in University Teaching Department and the Regional Centre of the Panjab University, Chandigarh for the session 2020-21.

Initiating discussion, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that this item is regarding the enhancement of fee structure in the University Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres for the session 2020-21 should be deferred for the time being since it was not appropriate to talk about enhancement of fee in such difficult times.

Principal R.S. Jhanji taking her (Ms. Anu Chatrath) argument further said that since the financial health of the Colleges is not very sound and the University being the regulatory body has large amounts of unassigned grants and funds from the Colleges which are lying unutilized. In this light, the University should also consider the waiving off of routine charges and fee for the year 2020-21 that are taken from the Colleges every year.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu added to Principal R.S. Jhanji's argument saying that even the managements of several grant-in-aid colleges had ample funds to release salaries even if the grants were delayed for a certain period from the State. Therefore, the management should be urged not to delay the salaries of their staff in such difficult time.

The Vice Chancellor responding the arguments said that the points made by both the members have been duly noted.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua added that in the last five years several colleges have not been paying salaries regularly to the employees. In this regard, the University must

ensure that when affiliation is given and permission is accorded to start a course in a College, the management of the College will undertake to follow fair practices with their employees.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur also reiterated that it must be ensured by the University that salary is paid by the Management, whether the college is aided, unaided or government on a regular basis every month.

The Vice Chancellor asked to Finance & Development Officer to respond.

It was informed that there is no doubt that it is an unprecedented situation for all of us. Same situation exists for the colleges and the University. So far as the examination fee is concerned, irrespective of the fact whether the University conducts the examination or not a large number of employees working in the Examination Branch have to be paid salaries regularly. Secondly, all annual charges paid by the Colleges to the University those are specifically meant for these activities which have to be undertaken by those specialized Centres to which they can think over that they can take some even from that. Ultimately, they are going to compromise on those activities. He does not think that the University has sufficient funds even to carry on day-to-day activities, if this situation continues. It is his duty to apprise the Hon'ble Members that this session, though their final account is underway, there is substantial decrease in examination fee as compared to last year. As of now we have to see an alternative way to compensate that because the budget is very tight. The University is also facing financial challenges. This is his submission to the members.

Principal R.S. Jhanji asked whether any salary is pending as on date in the University. He said that the University has taken onetime fee from the Colleges. He further said the University is not taking classes. He pointed out that since the University has received onetime fee, it is giving salary to its employees. He said that they (College Staff) have not got salary so far. He further said that the University should release due funds to the Colleges so that the teachers as well as non-teaching staff can get salary. If the salary is not given to the teaching and the non-teaching staff, then there is no big sin than this. But the University staff is getting salary that is why they are keeping mum but the University is sending letters to the Colleges. The University is getting interest on the number of FDRs with them. He said that university should give the details of the FDRs as also of the interest accrued on it. They also require financial package. They have written letters in this regard to the UGC, MHRD University. He pointing to the Vice Chancellor said that he is the member of both the Committees. But there is not even a single clause in the guidelines which mentions about the salaries of the teachers and non-teaching staff of the colleges. He further said that all the stakeholders must be involved. They have written letters to various authorities. He said that the University should also write letters to MHRD, UGC or the State for the package. He further said that in the reports of both the Committees there is mention of IT sector, industry, health but not of financial package to Education Sector.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa added that they being the members of the Senate must give their suggestions to the MPs and MLAs and the officers sitting on higher positions and the Vice Chancellor should also send the viewpoints of the Syndicate to the government for supporting Education Sector.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members have given good suggestions and he assured that he will forward their suggestions to the higher authorities. He further told that he always forwards the suggestion of the members given from time to time.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it will be a big help.

The Vice Chancellor said that the University employees contributed Rs.76 lakhs to the Prime Minister's National Relief Fund. He also informed that the P.M.O. has sent best wishes for the staff of the University.

RESOLVED: That consideration of Item 4, be deferred in view of the problems faced by the students owing to COVID-19.

5. Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 10.01.2020 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to:

- (i) Proposal for allocation of two seats under single Girl Child Quota for BDS course;
- (ii) Proposal and recommendations of the Dean Science for creation of one seat, over and above the sanctioned strength, for awardees in field of Science and Technology, in detail and one seat over and above the sanctioned strength be allotted in all the Science Departments to the candidates having National/State Level Government Certified Academic Award.
- (iii) Increase of seats in M.A. (2 years course) in Human Rights and Duties.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Satish Kumar asked whether allocation of two seats under Single Girl Child Quota for BDS Course is over and above or within the sanctioned intake strength

It was informed that the allocation of two seats is within the sanctioned strength.

Ms. Anu Chatrath asked why there is distinction between this Department and other Departments as other Department have only one Single Girl Child seat whereas this Department is being allocated two seats.

The members were informed that the students had made a representation for creation of two seats for Single Girl Child category. The Vice Chancellor allowed single seat. Thereafter, the students approached the Court and the Hon'ble High Court passed orders that two seats may be allocated for Single Girl Child Category in BDS Course. After passing of such orders by the Hon'ble Court, the Executive Committee of the Dental Council of India decided that the request of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Chandigarh to create two additional seats under 'Single Girl Child' category in BDS courses cannot be acceded to by the Council. However, the applicant Institute/University is not prevented from implementing the directions passed by the Hon'ble High Court vide judgment dated 10.08.2018 by giving reservation as envisaged under Rule 3(b)(1) of the University Rules within the sanctioned intake capacity as is being done by other Universities/State Governments.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she would like to study the Court order since normally the Court order may dispose of just with consideration. The court order can never issue a direction. By doing so, they are playing with the merit of the General Category candidates. She asked how the University can give two decisions for two departments. The University has to go uniformly. She said that in future some other department will demand similar reservation. She further said on the basis of this court order the other day some freedom fighters or ex-servicemen will approach the court for enhancement of their seats. To how many categories they will give admissions at the cost of General Category candidates.

The Registrar said that is why this item has been brought here.

Dr. Satish Kumar asked whether the University has contested this case in the High Court.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that since these seats are not over and above and have to be given out of the sanctioned intake strength, hence, by doing so, the University will be reducing the seats.

Shri Ashok Goyal said the issue is not first of all of the students of Dental College. It is the case of UIIS who had gone to the Court and the Court had disposed of the by saying that her case be considered if otherwise eligible. So, it is a law course. He does not know how the Dental College has picked up the judgment of the law department. On the basis of that order they represented to the Dental Council of India and asked for additional seats in view of the High Court order. The High Court has not given any direction to Apex Body because it cannot do so. If the total number of seats sanctioned by the Dental Council of India or any other Apex Body are given the High Court cannot order them to increase the number of seats for all times to come. He further added that if the University were to go by the Court order it would mean giving five additional seats (One for cancer patient + one for Aids patient + one seat for Thalassaemia patient + two for single girl child) not just two. But in the Handbook of Information it is given that the above order is not applicable to courses that are governed by regulatory bodies such DCI and MCI. In addition, if one goes through the table detailing the bifurcation of the seats it emerges that the total number of seats that are reserved is 51 and as per the law of the land reservation cannot be more than 50%. He requested the Vice Chancellor to only bring the matter to the Syndicate which had been thoroughly examined for their legal as well as technical soundness.

RESOLVED: That in the light of the discussion held, consideration of Item 5, be deferred.

- 6.** Considered if, the guidelines for admission to the Reserved Category of Sports is same for the academic session 2020-21, for admission in various courses of Panjab University under 5% reserved category of sports and the same be incorporated in the Handbook of Information 2020. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-III**) was also taken into consideration.

It was pointed out that there is a minor change in the admission guidelines under 5% reserved category of sports, which has been specified at page 106 of the **Appendix**, viz., "Self Attested photocopies of sports certificate with photograph duly attested by the respective issuing authority (**by National/State Sports Federation/ Association/Head of the Institution last attended /Self Attested**)".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are being informed about something else, whereas the item says something else. In fact, the item says as if the guidelines for admission to various courses offered by Panjab University under the Reserved Category of Sports for the academic session 2020-21, be the same as was for the academic session 2019-20. The item has been wrongly worded and the same should have been that the guidelines for admission to various courses offered by Panjab University under the Reserved Category of Sports for the academic session 2020-21, be the same as was for the academic session 2019-20, with the stipulation that the format of certificate be changed as suggested by the Committee (**Appendix-III**). He suggested that the correct wording should be mentioned in the decision.

RESOLVED: That the guidelines for admission to various courses offered by Panjab University under 5% Reserved Category of Sports for the academic session

2020-21, be the same as were for the academic session 2019-20 except certain minor changes, i.e., “Self Attested photocopies of sports certificate with photograph duly attested by the respective issuing authority **(by National/State Sports Federation/Association/Head of the Institution last attended /Self Attested**” and the same be incorporated in the Handbook of Information 2020.

Item 7 on the agenda was withdrawn.

8.

Considered if, additional donation of Rs.1,00,000 + Rs.1,00,000 made by Shri Radha Krishan Sethi S/o Shri Kanshi Ram, H.No. 362, Sector-9, Panchkula, be accepted for purchase of books and payment of Scholarship etc. to the poor & needy students out of “Students Aid Fund Account” and Income Tax Exemption Certificate duly signed by the Registrar, P.U. Chandigarh be provided to the donor to avail income tax benefits for the session 2019-20.

- NOTE:**
1. The Senate in its meeting dated 26.05.2019 (Para XXXIV (I-30)) **(Appendix-IV)** had accepted the donation of Rs.1,00,000/- donated by Shri Radha Krishan Sethi S/o Shri Kanshi Ram, H.No. 362, Sector-9, Panchkula.
 2. The amount of one lac has been deposited in Students Aid Fund Account vide receipt No.4253 dated 06.02.2020 and credit of the same has been received in the account No. 10444984461 on 10.02.2020.
 3. The amount of one lac has been deposited in Students Aid Fund Account vide receipt No.4274 dated 19.02.2020 and credit of the same has been received in the account No. 10444984461 on 26.02.2020.
 4. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-IV)**.

RESOLVED: That the additional donation of 2 lacs (Rs.1,00,000 + Rs.1,00,000) made by Shri Radha Krishan Sethi S/o Shri Kanshi Ram, H.No. 362, Sector-9, Panchkula, be accepted for purchase of books and payment of Scholarship, etc. to the poor & needy students out of “Students Aid Fund Account” and Income Tax Exemption Certificate duly signed by the Registrar, P.U., Chandigarh, be provided to the donor to avail income tax benefits for the session 2019-20.

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

9.

Considered the minutes dated 18.02.2020 **(Appendix-V)** of the Student Aid Fund Administrative Committee, constituted by the Vice Chancellor, with regard to the applications of eligible students of Teaching Departments/VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur and USOL, for financial assistance out of Student Aid Fund for the session 2019-2020.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Student Aid Fund Administrative Committee dated 18.02.2020, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

10.

Considered the recommendations at serial No. 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 of the minutes dated 04.12.2019 **(Appendix-VI)** of Youth Welfare Committee.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations (at serial No. 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5) of Youth Welfare Committee dated 04.12.2019, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

- 11.** Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 28.01.2020 (**Appendix-VII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the whole issue of migration, relating to the Department of Laws and University Institute of Legal Studies and make recommendations in consistent with existing regulations/rules in Panjab University Calendar. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-VII**) was also taken into consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the agenda item had not been worded correctly and the wording should be reframed and then passed.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma requested that the students belonging to Chandigarh and they are studying at Hoshiarpur or at any Regional Centre may be allowed to sit in the examination at an examination centre in Chandigarh.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that not only of the Law Courses student, the change of examination Centres of all the students, who wish to appear in the nearest examination centre, should be allowed.

The Vice Chancellor said that a good decision would be taken in this regard and they would feel happy.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 28.01.2020, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Item 12 on the agenda was withdrawn.

- 13.** Considered the minutes dated 26.02.2020 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding transfer of funds lying in the Saving "Bank Account No. 10883087506" of Panjab University Extension Library, Ludhiana, to the Development Fund of Panjab University. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the recommendation of the Committee regarding transfer of funds lying in the Saving "Bank Account No.10883087506" of Panjab University Extension Library, Ludhiana, to the Development Fund of Panjab University is contrary to the statutory provision. At page No. 36, there is a provision regarding University Extension Library, Ludhiana. As per Director of the Extension Library, there has to be one Advisory Committee and under the heading powers and functions, it says, the Advisory Committee shall regulate the acquisition policy and the allocation of funds available for purchase of books and everything. So whatever the amount the Committee is to spent, first that amount they are transferring to Panjab University Head then University Regional Centre will pray for release of these funds to the University for spending on that. As per this, it is only the competent authority, the Advisory Committee. She asked as to why the University has been coming into between, contrary to the provisions.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said for the last so many there had been an Advisory Committee.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that if they go into the details of this, it is that the fund is to be utilized for PU Extension Library and the Regional Centres. That is not to be used in the Panjab University. It has been written here. He said that they have wrongly written as development fund of Panjab University. This should not have been written as. This is a special fund account, probably the PU Extension Library and Regional Centre Ludhiana Development Fund Account.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that they have no need to transfer the funds here. It should be at the Regional Centre.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the Development Fund account will occur to open. Only then, that amount would be utilized for the development of the Extension Library and PURC Ludhiana. He said that secondly, if the competent authority is Advisory Committee, that can be looked into

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that this is not a PURC Committee. He said that there has been sitting a lot of members, who are although not members of that Committee, but he had constantly been the member of that Committee. It is passed in the Advisory Committee. Even a structure of that Advisory Committee at Ludhiana is locally formed there. The things are passed in that Advisory Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it seems to him that this is the money of the University.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the things are no so.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Extension Library is an iconic thing. In the past they have committed a blunder that the Regional Centre was sanctioned in the Extension Library, at that time, it was told that there is a need of a Law College. The very day the college started emerging, the library started ceasing. The surrounding colleges, Government College, Arya College and Khalsa College, and evening College. All the students of these colleges utilize the library services. He said that what happened in 2003, when the Librarian retired, and Deputy Librarian retired, what has been happening and why this item has come here. All the colleges surrounding to it, contribute money for Extension Library. The money of Extension Library cannot be spent for Regional Centre. This has been made a via media that the money which has been accumulated over the years, by putting it into this fund, it could be utilized for Regional Centre. He further said that they could take the example of AC Joshi Library, if the Librarian of AC Joshi Library is removed and the UILS Director is deputed there, shall it run? He further said that for the reasons for which it stood existed, have gone to an end. The irony of the situation is that on query, nobody can tell about the exact location of the Extension Library. The nature of response would be that it could be on the left or on the right. That scenario has completely been demolished. He said that Librarian be appointed there. Do not put to an end to the Library. It is a matter of uncertainty as to whether the Regional Centre would gain its existence in future or not, the library would extinct. He further said that in case the money in reference is to be utilized, and they know that there are so many set parameters to run a Library, the Chairman of a Department cannot run the Library, he may be of ABC, of external or internal. He said that in no way, this money of the Library should not be shifted towards this Account. This money is specifically meant for the development of the Extension Library and not for the Regional Centre.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that he has to add something to it. He said that the Committees which were constituted, there was no member from the Ludhiana neither a Principal nor a Fellow who have to see the facility. He said that the item have been brought in a different manner and the recommendation of the Committee are otherwise. The Committee recommendation is that the funds may be transferred to centralized Development Fund Account for utilization towards infrastructural & Developmental needs/improvement of facilities at Extension Library as well as Regional Centre of Ludhiana.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that if the funds are to be spent by them at Ludhiana, and we are bringing the money here and creating a via media so that situation is turned such, that you are dependent on the University.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the money of Regional Centre cannot be transferred to University.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that there are two points in the matter. One of which is that instead of keeping the fund there, it be transferred to Chandigarh. There will be our dominance and they will become dependent upon us and on the University administration.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the money related to colleges and that has been generated for the colleges. It cannot be brought here.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the simple way is that about our students, they become the members in two ways. The students become the members of the PU Extension Library as well as they take membership at Panjab University library. There are two different set ups. One student can get two membership cards. He put a query as to why the money would come here.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that the item should be withdrawn.

The Vice Chancellor said that let them see what could be done. They should listen to the Finance and Development Officer.

The Finance and Development Officer clarified that there is no doubt that this amount can be spent only for the extension library. It has categorically been mentioned in the minutes of the Committee. He said that the issue is that how to see that money at separate place, then there are issues of legal sanctity to those transactions after making a separate entry. Now the financial regulation in terms of Income Tax and GST laws, these are very stringent act. Earlier universities they were not covered under these laws very strictly but now its compliance with respect to various taxes is very stringent. We have never sought any type of exemption of Income Tax just speaking seven eight years back. But from the seven eight years, they have to seek specific exemptions because the government universities are not blanketly exempted from the Income tax. Even for students' fund which are maintained by departments, they are having separate entity, now you cannot keep money without having an umbrella of legal entity. It is okay you are treating them as separate entity for them, separate bank, separate GST number, everything has to be created for that fund. He said that they thought that okay, that is to be either we have to take all these paraphernalia to utilize this money at Ludhiana or but they have thought with the consent of all members present in that Committee that they will keep the money under the umbrella of this, but it will be earmarked but it cannot be utilized for any other purpose. He said that if the honourable members feel that no, it is to be kept there (Ludhiana), they have to create a separate entity for that.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it can be created.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath asked as to what is the statutory provision.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari enquired as to what will be the name of the Fund.

The Finance and Development Officer responded that it would be known as Development Fund.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the name of the Development fund needs to be specified.

Principal Jarnail Singh said the development fund of the University is of larger size.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he has a query as to who could utilize this money at present.

The Finance & Development Officer explained that at present and in future too, it will be utilized and it will be utilized only for Ludhiana, for nothing else. He further said that let him just clarify and he told something about financial powers to sanction a certain expenditure.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that Mr. Vikram Nayyar was making a wrong statement. The original agenda is at page 124. There it has specifically been mentioned that for improvement of facilities at extension Library as well as at Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

The Finance & Development Officer said that it was included on the advice of the Director because he said that the facilities are so intermingled. He further explained that why this line was added.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the Finance & Development Officer should not give wrong statement to the Syndicate as he was making an official statement. She further said that the FDO may reply to on an enquiry that will it be spent exclusively on Extension Library whereas their minutes say that Extension Library as well as Regional Centre at Ludhiana.

The Finance & Development Officer said that he would tell her as to why it was so. Let him explain.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that via media they are diverting one amount to another.

The Finance & Development Officer explained that this line was added on the advice of the Director, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana. He said that it is not binding and all depends on the consent of the honorable members.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the regulation is clear, without amending the regulation, it cannot be done. The Senate is the competent authority to amend the regulation and then with the approval of the Central Government, they can amend the regulation and the regulations are very clear that the Advisory Committee comprised by Vice Chancellor in the absence of local Senator, Principals of Degree colleges, they are the competent authority. Without amending the regulation, they cannot change it.

The Finance & Development Officer again explained that the sanction of any expenditure, manage the money how to make payments, both are the separate things. Now the Chair, PIO head of the Department have the financial power to make expenditure. But here the money has been lying centrally. It has two different connotation. Why, he would clarify. Why this line was added because there are certain facilities which are intermingled. Now because in that sense there are common facilities. In order to avoid any objection at a later stage, to create some facility which is in common area but that is primarily or substantially going to aid to Extension Library.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that her question is that as to if without amending the regulation, can they do it?

The Finance & Development Officer again reiterated that they are not amending the regulation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is unable to understand whatever the Finance & Development Officer says. The operation of the Account and parking of funds are two different things. He said that the funds can be parked anywhere but as and when they are utilized, those would be spent by those to whom the regulation allows. But the FDO says that yes of course, that has wrongly been added, Extension Library/Regional Centre because indirectly utilizing fund of extension library for Regional Centre also and in handwritten it is Director P.U. Extension Library. He asked as to if there was any Director in Panjab University Extension Library. But on page 124 it has been written that Director PU Extension Library and that too by deleting the Regional Centre Ludhiana. He asked that if there was any Director. He said that he thought that it should have been Librarian. So ex-officio Librarian he is not. On his own he has created the nomenclature of Director of PU Extension Library. Anyway, the Director of the Regional Centre who is also the in charge of the Library. He further said that secondly, it should have been, he has rightly proposed on page 125, out of this need based budget allocation will be made for the development of the PU Extension Library. This is what has been proposed. So if he has the right to transfer the amount, then it is not so easy to say that you create separate entity, a separate PAN. That is not possible. Because the money belongs to Panjab University and Professor Bhandari has rightly said that if they write Development Fund, then they should make a sub head to say, PU Extension Library. That would have been good enough. Now whatever money they need, they will send the proposal here and money would go there and will be operated by those who are authorized.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that they it was unnecessary to create confusions. She raised that query that the authorities at Ludhiana are not spending money but how they will spend it after taking it from the University. She further said that she has a personal information also. She suggested that there is a sufficient staff PURC and the library affairs could efficiently be managed by deputing requisite workforce in PU Extension Library at local level. She said that they are in need of recruitment.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that on page 125, as per the report so and so, it has come office note of the Director PU Extension Library that development fund has not been utilized at all and accumulated balance of development fund has been lying in the Saving Bank Account. It is pertinent to mention that all the developmental needs of PU Extension Library, Ludhiana, is being met out of the University budget earmarked funds.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that they have been writing in respect of that they want to use that amount for Regional Centre.

The Finance and Development Officer explained that even they were not aware of this. He said the money has been lying there. The University had been releasing the amount as per their general budgetary needs.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the point which he wants to emphasize is that the money, which has been lying there, belongs to Extension Library, the money has been demanded by the PU Extension Library or by the Director of the Regional Centre.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the money has been sought by the Extension Library.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this statement has been there for the last three four years.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the money of the Extension Library has not been demanded, they have been demanding the money of the Regional Centre.

The Finance & Development Officer explained that as per these statements, they have sanctioned many development needs.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, asked as to if they may allow the transfer out of the PU need based budget allocation for the development needs of the PU Extension Library. The money would start coming into the pool every year.

The Vice Chancellor said that now the matter be concluded.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that as per his opinion that the purpose of their is that the funds are in abundance and the funds are not utilized by the PU Extension Library as per the corpus of the funds and the facilities of the Regional Centre are fed from it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that should they make it sure that the money whether kept here has to be used only for the purpose for which it will be kept here.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that as has already been said by Mrs. Anu Chatrath that the rules are very clear. The funds are to be used for the PU Extension Library. But may it be PU Extension Library or the Regional Centre, both belongs to us. It is also not a good practice that the money be allowed to be lying idle there. So some mid-way solution should be find out. If the House considers it right, it appears to him that the funds can be used on the campus of the Panjab University extension library and other facilities. The campus facilities of the Regional Centre shall also be approved in addition to utilization of the funds by the PU Extension Library. He said that on the straightaway, the salaries etc. of the Regional Centre may be met out of this fund.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that his submission is that if the money would come here and when the need of the development of the Extension Library would emerge, the release of the money would be restricted from here.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the money has been going there very much right now. He said that the money which has been lying aside, let it be left. They are not touching that money and they are siphoning money from here.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the information be sought for the last two years of the use of the money.

The Finance & Development Officer said that the information would be supplied.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that let the information be brought in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the money which has been talked of to be transferred here needs to be kept in a separate Development Fund Account. He further said that may he suggest that another Development Fund in the name of PU Extension Library Ludhiana Development Fund so that under no circumstances, the money could not be used for other purposes. By doing so, the things would settle at its own.

The Finance & Development Officer said that his submission is that if a separate Account would be opened, then a separate Cash Book will be required and all the paraphernalia would be different. From where the manpower would come for this.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he could remind them that a meeting was conducted there and an amount of rupees one crore was transferred. Why it was not done at that time.

The Finance and Development Officer said that the amount was not transferred from that account. He said that he is making an official statement.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that when Principal Gosal was the Director of Regional Centre, and when the Air Conditions were installed, why not then the issue was raised.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the spending was not from the Extension Library funds.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the separate Fund Account would be created.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is unable to understand and Professor Bhandari who is the man of Accounts, could understand the feasibility of a separate account.

The Vice Chancellor said that they will see the matter by forming a Committee.

RESOLVED: That a Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to look into the whole issue in the light of the discussion held and make recommendations, on behalf of the Syndicate.

14. Considered the minutes of the Academic/Administrative Committees of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Centre dated 20.02.2020 for approval of the following:

1. A new Board of Studies to discharge the function of BoS in Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Centre and
2. Composition of the same as suggested by the Coordinator be also approved.

Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: As per Regulation 6 appearing at page 57 of P.U. Calendar, Volume 1, 2007 which states that "Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in these regulations; where, in the opinion of the Syndicate, it is not possible to form a 'Board of Studies in the case of subjects listed in Regulations 1.1, 1.2, 2.3 and 2.5, **in accordance with these Regulations the Syndicate may nominate a committee to discharge the functions of the Board of Studies**".

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua asked why they were allowing the Academic Committee to discharge the functions of the Board of Studies of B.R. Ambedkar. He said that why the Board itself is not formed. He asked as to if the Board is to be constituted by the Syndicate. He urged that the Board be got constituted.

The Registrar said that the very Board has been approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let it be seen that their Administrative & Academic Committee have sent the suggestion of the Board and rightly query has been raised as to as per rule who is to constitute the Board. He asked the Registrar as to whether the query on page No. 133 was the query of the Registrar.

The Registrar explained that it was said that the Syndicate appoints the Board.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per rule, who is to constitute the Committee.

The Registrar said that he had written that as per rule, who is to constitute the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they say that notwithstanding with anything, where in the opinion of the Syndicate when it is not to form a Board of Studies in the subject so and so, in accordance with rules and regulations, the Syndicate may nominate a Committee to discharge the functions of the Board of Studies. So this nomination is to be done by the Syndicate to a Committee which is already in existence and there are so many subjects where the Board of Studies are not there. They are nominating the Board of Studies, and also the Committee to act as Board of Studies. So that should have been referred back to that Committee. They can approve this only.

The Vice Chancellor said that by putting a condition, the item be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the matter be referred to the Committee which is already there, that Committee would do it.

The Vice Chancellor asked if there was any need to bring this here in the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said No

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee of Syndics, which already exists.

- 15.** Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 17.06.2019 (**Appendix-VIII**) regarding reviewing the existing policy framed for fetching rent on leasing space for indoor or outdoor shooting of films in Panjab University and also minutes of the Committee dated 25.03.2019 (**Appendix-VIII**) regarding consideration on fetching rentals on leasing of space for canopies, posters/hoardings, stalls for Holi/Diwali etc. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-VIII**) was also taken into consideration.

Dr. Harpeet Singh Dua said that whenever the space is provided by the University for film shoot, etc. there had come a picture, and let him quote the name, what has been done is that our Panjab University and CU Gharuan has been mixed. On the front page, an advertisement has been given that they are giving such type of education. The student of the Panjab University comes from all the regions. Already there is a confusion about the nomenclature of Panjab University and Chandigarh University and the name of the Panjab University is misused.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that the issue has already been raised so many times. He said that their's is the Panjab University and that is Chandigarh University, Gharuan. They should not use our campus or our name.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members should tell about the content of the item.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that on page No. 136, the figures of the amounts has been mentioned. He said that their purpose is not about the amount of five lacs. They are commercially using the University sites for their benefits. Our students are our iconic identity. He said that the film producers have been utilizing the name of the

University in an inappropriate way. He said that purpose of his saying is only that to whosoever the University given its site for shooting, the University should take the affidavit from the name of the University would not be misused.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the shoots in the Panjab University should be floated only with the name of the Panjab University.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that if the Chandigarh University has been utilizing the name of the Panjab University, then they should be given a legal notice. He further said that if any shooting have been done by them by using our name, action need to be taken

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committees dated 25.03.2019 and 17.06.2019, as per appendix, be approved; however, an affidavit be obtained from the agency concerned that they would not misuse the name of Panjab University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal abstained, when the following Item 16 was taken up for consideration.

- 16.** Considered the minutes of the committee dated 27.02.2020 (**Appendix-IX**) 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. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-IX**) was also taken into consideration.

It was pointed out that at page 146, there is a leave case of Mr. Tarun Kumar Vashisth, Assistant Professor (UBS) and in this case, the Committee has unanimously recommended that “the leave case of Mr. Tarun Kumar Vashisth be referred to the Syndicate for consideration”.

Ms. Anu Chatrath enquired as to what is the reason for referring this matter to the Syndicate for consideration instead of recommending grant of leave to Mr. Tarun Kumar Vashisth.

Shri Ashok Goyal also enquired as to why only in his (Mr. Tarun Kumar Vashisth) case, the Committee has said that the matter be referred to the Syndicate for consideration.

It was informed that three cases were place before the Committee out of which one has been recommended for grant of leave, one rejected and the other referred to the Syndicate for consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that, in fact, all the leave cases come to the Syndicate for consideration. It should be told to the office that all the leave cases should come to the Syndicate for consideration.

Ms. Anu Chatrath pointed out that the leave is being sought for the period 25.05.2020 to 24.05.2021, whereas under the present circumstances he could not go abroad. Ultimately, it would again come for one year leave with salary.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that Mr. Tarun Kumar Vashisth, who has sought leave from 25.05.2020 to 24.05.2021, has already gone and he is now seeking extension in leave.

Ms. Anu Chatrath enquired as to what is his previous leave period.

Professor Keshav Malhotra informed that Mr. Tarun Kumar Vashisth is doing Ph.D. research work.

Shri Ashok Goyal informed that Mr. Tarun Kumar Vashisth had been sanctioned leave for a period of two year and now he is seeking extension in leave for one year. This case has been referred to the Syndicate for consideration, whereas the other cases have been approved by the Committee itself. In fact, all the leave cases are to be considered by the Syndicate.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that since the person has been granted leave for a period of two years and he would not be in a position to come back, the leave sought by him should be granted.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to how much maximum leave could be granted.

It was informed that, as per Regulations/Rules, maximum of three years leave could be granted.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that then the leave sought by Mr. Tarun Kumar Vashisth should be granted.

The Vice Chancellor said that should they bring the rejected case (case of Dr. Pradip Singh, Assistant Professor) again after relooking into the same.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that, in fact, the Committee has not rejected the leave case of Dr. Pradip Singh. It has been written in the minutes of the Committee that "Dr. Pradip Singh may be advised to submit his updated progress report through proper channel of the work done during Study Leave within 10 days from the receipt of this advisory letter".

Attention of the members were drawn to the recommendation of the Committee, which says, "The Committee unanimously recommended that Dr. Pradip Singh may be advised to submit his updated progress report through proper channel of the work done during Study Leave within 10 days from the receipt of this advisory letter".

Ms. Anu Chatrath pointed out that in this case, the leave has been sought for one year, i.e., w.e.f. 05.05.2019 to 04.05.2020, and the period has already expired. As such, *post facto* the permission is being sought. The request for grant of leave should have come to the competent authority prior to start of leave.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since in the third case, the Committee has sought updated information from the candidate, the item should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting after getting the updated progress report from the candidate.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the leave has been sought up to 4th May 2020, but what is the status after 4th May 2020. In fact, the said issue has neither been placed before the Committee nor the Syndicate.

When it was proposed that both the cases (the case of Mr. Tarun Kumar Vashisth and Dr. Pradip Singh) should be referred back to the Committee, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the case of Mr. Tarun Kumar Vashisth is clear as Mr. Tarun has submitted the Progress Report(s).

Ms. Anu Chatrath suggested that the matter should have been or should be placed before the Syndicate along with the provisions available in the Calendar.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari pointed out that 2nd case has been referred to the Syndicate, whereas all the cases, including 1st case, are for consideration of the Syndicate. Even the first case could also not be decided by the Committee itself without the approval of the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is no provision in the Calendar for constitution of Leave Cases Committee. In fact, it is the Vice Chancellors, who had constituting this Committee. The cases used to come to the Vice Chancellors and they thought it proper to constitute a Leave Cases Committee.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari remarked that the Committee has referred the 2nd case to the Syndicate without any recommendation. If the case is to be considered by the Syndicate without recommendation, then what for the Committee has been constituted.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the Committee should have given its recommendation(s).

The Vice Chancellor suggested that 1st case should be approved and the other cases (2nd and 3rd) should be referred back to the Committee for reconsideration.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Mr. Tarun Kumar Vashisth would not be in a position to return. Hence, the leave in his case should be extended.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that in case something needed to be seen, the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to examine these two cases and take decision on behalf of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Rajinder Bhandari and Professor Keshav Malhotra be requested to examine these two cases and make recommendation to him.

RESOLVED: That –

1. Dr. Navdeep Goyal, Professor, Department of Physics, be granted sabbatical leave w.e.f. 01.08.2020 to 31.07.2021, under Regulation 11(J) at pages 143-144 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, for undertaking Study and Research Programme and to interact with people from Industries in India and abroad; and
2. so far as leave cases of Mr. Tarun Kumar Vashisth, Assistant Professor (UBS), P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana and Dr. Pradip Singh, Assistant Professor at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital are concerned, Professor Rajinder Bhandari and Professor Keshav Malhotra be requested to examine these cases and make recommendation(s) to the Vice Chancellor, who be authorized to take decision on the recommendation(s), on behalf of the Syndicate.

17.

Considered the case of Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional CMO (Retd.).

- NOTE:**
1. Dr. B.S. Lal was working as Additional CMO (Retd., on contract), pursuant the decision of the Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.07.2015 (Para 15) (**Appendix-X**).
 2. He has attained the age of 70 years in April, 2020.
 3. The CMO recommended to appoint Dr. B.S. Lal, as Visiting Consultant after attaining the age 70 years with fixed pay of Rs.34,854 p.m. four hours duty daily i.e. 8.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. (Monday to Friday) against the vacant post of visiting consultant created due to Dr. Mrs. Shiela Arora (Ex-CMO) who left for U.S.A. in October 2018.

4. The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has allowed Dr. B.S. Lal, as Visiting Consultant with fixed pay of Rs.34,854, vide office order No. 51/HC dated 29.4.2020 (**Appendix-X**).
5. In response to the order of the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. B.S. Lal has submitted his representation dated 30.4.2020 (**Appendix-X**).

Initiating discussion, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma stated that he has also written a letter to him (Vice Chancellor) relating to the decision taken with regard to Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional Chief Medical Officer (Retd.) and had also talked to the Registrar. According to him, perhaps, this decision has been taken in haste because it was very difficult to go through all the relevant files during the lockdown. As such, it is also an untimely decision. So far as his case (Dr. Lal) is concerned, it is covered under the decision of the Syndicate dated 19th July 2015, wherein it has been clearly mentioned that "Dr. B.S. Lal the appointment of Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, as such on contractual basis beyond the age of 65 years, on the pattern of Dr. Sheila Arora and Dr. Harish Khanna, be approved and the salary of Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, be regularized from March 2015 to June 2015, which has been released by the Audit under objection for want of approval of the Syndicate". The second decision (regarding salary) had been taken to take care of the Audit objection. As such, the service of Dr. Lal is connected with the decision referred to above. The decision, which has been taken now, has been taken after completely ignoring the said decision. Moreover, the decision in the case of Dr. Lal was taken keeping in view the decision taken in the case of Dr. Sheila Arora and Dr. Harish Khanna as also the age factor. Owing to age the item had been placed before the Syndicate and the decision was also taken keeping in view the age. Now, attaining the age of 70 years by Dr. Lal does not matter at all because his terms and conditions are in accordance with that decision. This is the only Doctor in Bhai Ghanaiya ji Health Centre, who is an MD (Medicines) and Heart Specialist. If he is not wrong, in the history of the University, he (Dr. Lal) is the only MD (Medicines) who has joined Bhai Ghanaiya ji Health Centre in the year 1994 and everybody in the University knew him. He is the only capable Doctor in the Health Centre. He remembered that another MD Lady Doctor had joined the Health Centre in the year 2012, but she left the job after 1 month. If he is willing to provide his services to the University fraternity and he is doing so also, it is wrong to say that he should work on much less/fixed emoluments on the plea that his working hours would be reduced. All this does not seem to be in good taste. In fact, Dr. Lal is an asset for the University. If they lose such a specialist, it would be a great lost to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that he got the point made by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari enquired as to what is the policy of the University in this regard.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that according to the proceedings of the Syndicate, to which Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma has referred to, he (Dr. Lal) has already been allowed to continue till he is in good health. As such, what he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) says appeared to be relevant and they should not disturb him by reducing his salary and working hours; rather, the same would be unfair.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it should not be done at this critical moment.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is true that now they are passing through a critical moment. Allowing him to continue on the previous terms and conditions seems to be proper at the moment, but if they continued like this, people would be allowed to continue till death, and the coming new generations would be forced to roam first on the roads and when they would stand before them with arms, they would call them terrorist. Such a situation would be created by them themselves. Had they no faith in the new generation that they would be able to take the place of their predecessors. If they advertise the post, numerous applications would be received, especially when the station is Chandigarh nobody is going to leave.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he completely agreed with Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa. First extension was granted from 63 to 65 years and at that time, it was pleaded that he should be allowed till 65 years. After the age of the 65 years, even the teachers are not allowed to evaluate the answer-books. As such, there is a bar on the teachers, who are otherwise more healthy and mentally fit than any other body. Here the person has been allowed to continue up to the age of 70 years.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that copies of the advertisements made during the last five years for filling up of posts as well as the list of candidates, who had applied, should be provided to him.

Principal R.S. Jhanji enquired that as to whether any Professor has been allowed to continue after the age of 65 years. Even the decision of the Court has also come. They should not talk about compassion. Are competent persons not available? On the one hand, they were talking about making the courses online as well as recruiting persons having knowledge of latest technology and on the other hand they are allowing the persons to continue after superannuation. If one person could do MD, could others not? It is a wrong policy and he strongly opposes it. If they allowed people to continue like this, when would the new persons get opportunity?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they talk about the Health Centre, an acute shortage of Doctors is there. A few months before they had made certain appointments of Doctors on contract basis, but the person, who has been appointed was already beyond 70 years age. As such, problem of Doctors is being faced in the Health Centre. Hence, they needed sufficient number of Doctors. So far as Dr. Lal is concerned, he has already been giving his services as Visiting Consultant in a best possible manner and now also they are suggesting that he should be allowed to continue on the terms and conditions on which he was working before the issuance of office orders dated 29.04.2020. So far as Additional CMO is concerned, he should not be allowed to continue as such. If they think that they would be able to get work from a Doctor at a monthly emoluments of Rs.34,854/-, that too, a doctor who is MD (Medicines), probably, they would be mistaken as it is completely wrong and unfounded. Regarding emoluments, they should have clear cut policy, but unless and until the policy is framed, they should allow him to continue on the same terms and conditions and salary on which he was working before the issuance of office orders dated 29.04.2020. So far as the orders dated 29.04.2020 regarding change of his service conditions and payment of less salary is concerned, it is completely wrong. He, therefore, suggested that he (Dr. Lal) should be allowed to continue on the same terms and conditions and salary on which he was working before the issuance of office orders dated 29.04.2020. However, for future, they should frame a policy and go ahead accordingly.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what should they do right now.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that he (Dr. Lal) should be allowed to continue on the same terms and conditions and salary on which he was working before the issuance of office orders dated 29.04.2020, as the same is the Syndicate decision.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the status, which was prevalent before the issuance of office orders dated 29.04.2020, should be maintained. He further said that presently, there are only 4 Doctors in the Health Centre, who are working on regular basis.

The Vice Chancellor said that since they did not have enough time, he was also thinking of allowing him (Dr. Lal) to continue.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu suggested that the term should be made time bound and in the meantime efforts should be made to fill up the vacant post of Doctors on regular basis. However, till Dr. Lal is allowed to continue, he should be paid the salary, which he was getting before the issuance of office orders dated 29.04.2020.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that the entire information as to how many times the post of Doctors had been advertised, how many applied, appeared in the interview, selected, etc., should be provided before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

At this stage, a pandemonium prevailed as both Professor Keshav Malhotra and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa started arguing with each other.

Continuing, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he has just now sent two messages to the Registrar on his mobile – one related to a complaint made by an employee and another about a news published that the patients are not treated properly in the Health Centre. First of all, the University should tell as to in which specialization the Doctors are required. Thereafter, an expert Committee should be constituted, which should prescribe the qualifications for the post of the Doctors to be advertised and the appointed Doctors should be paid full salary.

To this, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that although the University always paid salary in accordance with the latest pay-scales, qualified and capable Doctors do not join the service in the University.

Continuing, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that along with the full salary, the appointed Doctors should be given accommodation in the University campus on a priority. He is sure that hundreds of Doctors would be interested to join the University.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari remarked that the health of the Health Centre is not good. They would imagine the plight of the Doctors, who had been appointed on temporary basis and their services are not being regularised and those, who had attained the age of superannuation, are not being retired by the University. The system does not function like this. According to him, the persons, who are waiting for the job, could prove better as they are well-versed with the latest technology. Hence, they should take the decision cautiously. They should find new ways and means instead of allowing the old people to continue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since the problem related to the Campus, they are allowing the Campus people to continue, who are serving the University people in a very good manner. In fact, they had improved the health of the University employees.

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

Professor Keshav Malhotra, citing an example, said that only five years ago they had recruited two persons – one at Chandigarh and another at Hoshiarpur, but both of them are MBBS.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the Health Centre only meant for those, whosoever is associated with Panjab University irrespective of whether he /she is teacher, non-teacher or the student. One should be prepared to serve the society in honorary capacity on humanitarian ground. He urged the Vice Chancellor to provide the data from January 2010 onwards as to how many times the post of Doctors, paramedical staff, etc., had been advertised, how many applied, appeared in the interview, selected, etc. Information should also be provided as to what infrastructure is required to do all such things, what is the feedback and how many specialists are required.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that only one regular Doctor would be left in the Health Centre and the entire system would collapse.

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

When a couple of members remarked that COVID-19 patients are not treated at the University Health Centre, Ms. Anu Chatrath clarified that owing to COVID-19, every patient could not go to PGIMER or Government Hospital, Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that, what has been said by Principal R.S. Jhanji, he was also saying the same thing that the health of Health Centre is not good. Professor A.K. Grover, former Vice Chancellor, used to saying that he was feeling more than them that though much pressure of students, teachers and non-teachers was there on the Health Centre, what could they do as the Government is not allowing them to recruit the Doctors and they are in the dilemma as to what should be done under the circumstances.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that then they should find ways to make the recruitments on regular basis.

It was pointed out that the problem is that the designation of Additional CMO (Retd.) could not be given after the age of 70 years. Earlier, he (Dr. Lal) was allowed to continue on the pattern of Dr. Sheila Arora and Dr. Harish Khanna, who were Visiting Consultants. Right now, if his (Dr. Lal) services are available, his designation should be changed and salary could be given whatever they decide.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there is no problem in changing the designation, but the terms & conditions and salary should not be changed.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is a fact that after the retirement of present Chief Medical Officer (Dr. Devinder Dhawan) tomorrow, there would be only one regular Doctor, who would be left in the University Health Centre. Now, they themselves are realizing that they are not in a position to recruit the Doctors immediately for whatever reasons it could be. Professor Rajinder Bhandari is right that they should try to expedite the recruitment of Doctors and as and when the shortage of Doctors is over, these people could be relieved. However, to run the Health Centre without Doctors is not possible. Referring to remarks made by Principal R.S. Jhanji that certain persons are allowed to continue till death, he said that it is true because people are not interested to join the Health Centre despite the fact that the persons working in the Health Centre are allotted accommodation at the Campus to the level of F-Type and G-Type, being health an essential service. People might be seeing their career prospects. Hence, Dr. B.S. Lal should be allowed to continue on the same terms and

conditions and salary on which he was working before the issuance of office orders dated 29.04.2020.

When certain members asked as to what has been done in this Item, the Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Lal) is allowed to continue.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that their concern in this is that efforts would be made to advertise the vacant posts of Doctors and others within a stipulated time.

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. B.S. Lal is being allowed to continue on the terms and conditions, which are being suggested by the members. At the same time, the other things are being made time bound, which would be got executed by Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and Principal R.S. Jhanji.

When Principal R.S. Jhanji said that it is not possible to hold the meeting owing to COVID-19, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that the issue is such an important that it could be discussed by sending messages on WhatsApp. He further said that they have demand information since 2010 from the University as to how many times the post of Doctors, paramedical staff, etc., had been advertise, how many applied, appeared in the interview, selected, etc.

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that instead they should give advertisement for filling up of vacant posts lying in the University Health Centre within a week and the same should be shown to the members of the above-said Committee.

RESOLVED: That after attaining the age of 70 years, Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional CMO (Retired), be appointed as Visiting Consultant. However, his salary be the same, which was drawn by him before the issuance of office orders dated 29.04.2020.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Committee comprising Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and Principal R.S. Jhanji, be constituted to execute the work relating to advertisement of vacant posts of Doctors and other paramedical staff at University Health Centre in a time bound manner.

- 18.** Considered report of the fact finding Committee (**Appendix-XI**) of the State Election Commission, U.T., along with replies (**Appendix-XI**) of the officials of the University, who were deputed in the General Election to Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh held on 18.12.2016. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XI**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.10.2019 (Para 26) (**Appendix-XI**) considered letter No.6/1/MCCE/SEC/CHD/17/107 dated 02.07.2019 received from State Election Commission, U.T. Chandigarh, with regard to disciplinary action against the delinquent officials of the Panjab University, who were deputed in the General Election to Municipal Corporation of Chandigarh held on 18.12.2016 and resolved that a regular Inquiry be conducted against the delinquent officials of Panjab University, who were deputed in the General Election to Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh, held on 18.12.2016.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the University is taking the steps, which are required to be taken, but the same are yet to be informed to Chandigarh Administration.

RESOLVED: That intimation with regard to action taken by the University be sent to State Election Commission, U.T., Chandigarh.

19. Considered –

- A.** the request of Election Cell, PU, Chandigarh dated 13.02.2020 for use of own car/taxi with bill for the staff deputed on Election duty and also for providing accommodation to the staff as per entitlement in the Senate Election 2020.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting held in the month of Nov. 2016 vide paragraph 47 R (xlix) (**Appendix-XII**) had approved that the polling parties deputed for Senate Elections 2016 be allowed to use their own car for one polling party (consisting of Presiding officer if from the University + Polling officer + supporting staff) if their starting station is common. The owner of car is allowed to get the reimbursement as per approved rates of Panjab University for use of own car with the condition that whole polling party will travel together and no TA/Local Conveyance/Carriage charges will be paid to any member of the polling party.

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

- B.** minutes of the Committee dated 25.02.2020 (**Appendix-XII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to consider the payment of honorarium, etc. to the staff members to be deputed on duty for the conduct of Senate Election 2020.

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

Initiating the discussion, Dr. Rabindra Nath Sharma proposed that keeping in view the current situation, the last date for enrolment for Registered Constituency should be extended for 15 days.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the date of election has already been announced, which could not be changed but the schedule for the conduct of examinations could be changed. The House authorised the Registrar, being the Returning Officer, to make changes in the schedule for the conduct of Senate Elections. The last date for enrolment of Registered Graduates for Registered Graduate Constituency was allowed to be extended up to 16th June, 2020.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that if the dates of enrolment for Registered Graduate Constituency are being changed, then the last date for College teachers/Principals should also be changed/extended.

RESOLVED: That –

1. Polling Parties (comprising Presenting Officer + Polling Officer + Supporting Staff) deputed for Senate Election 2020, as per schedule, be allowed to use own car or taxi with bill as their station is common. The owner of the car be allowed to get reimbursement as per approved rates of Panjab University meant for own car or Taxi with proper bill with the condition that whole polling party will travel together and no TA/Local Conveyance/Carriage Charges will be paid to any member of the polling party;
2. Polling Staff deputed for Senate Election 2020 outside Chandigarh be allowed to stay in Hotel/Tourist Bungalow, if they are not provided accommodation by the College/Institute and the reimbursement of actual accommodation charges be made to the polling staff on production of receipt/bill against their name(s) as per entitlement mentioned in TA rules at par with the States other than Punjab and Chandigarh; and
3. The recommendations of the Committee dated 25.02 2020 relating to honorarium, refreshment charges/charges of meal to staff, local conveyance, preparation of brass seal by the Presiding Officer, etc., as per **Appendix**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That, being the Returning Officer, the Registrar, be authorised to make changes in the schedule for Senate Election, especially for enrolment of Registered Graduates for Registered Graduate Constituency

- 20.** Considered the recommendation of the condemnation/write off Committee dated 05.2.2020 (**Appendix-XIII**) that the following vehicles, completed 15 years of their life span, be written off:

Sr. No.	Vehicle Name	Number	Chassis No.	Engine No.	Model	Date of Purchase	Purchase Value
1.	Ashok Leyland Bus (52 seater)	CH01-G1-1255	VME494835	KVH221968	2003	27.12.2003	Rs.10,79,724 /-
2.	Mini Bus	CH-01-G-1429	357251DV Z 81066	497SPTC36 DVZ 885066	2004	31.08.2004	Rs.7,74,980/-
3.	Ambassador Car	CH01-G1-1616	ADD876273	3ELCD-080229	2004	05.04.2004	Rs.4,21,018/-

NOTE: As per P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 appearing at page 450-51, the competent authority to write off losses is as under:

1.	Vice-Chancellor	Up to Rs.1 lac per item
2.	Syndicate	Up to Rs.5 Lac per item
3.	Senate	Without any limit for any item

RESOLVED: That the following vehicle, which has completed 15 years of their life span, be written off:

Sr. No.	Vehicle Name	Number	Chassis No.	Engine No.	Model	Date of Purchase	Purchase Value
1.	Ambassador Car	CH01-G1-1616	ADD876273	3ELCD-080229	2004	05.04.2004	Rs.4,21,018/-

RESOLVED FURTHER: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following vehicle, which has completed 15 years of their life span, be written off:

Sr. No.	Vehicle Name	Number	Chassis No.	Engine No.	Model	Date of Purchase	Purchase Value
1.	Ashok Leyland Bus (52 seater)	CH01-G1-1255	VME494835	KVH221968	2003	27.12.2003	Rs.10,79,724 /-
2.	Mini Bus	CH-01-G-1429	357251DV Z 81066	497SPTC36 DVZ 885066	2004	31.08.2004	Rs.7,74,980/-

21. Considered the request dated 20.01.2020 (**Appendix-XIV**) of Ms. Veena Aggarwal, P.A. (transferred to USOL, but yet to join due to long leave), P.U., that she be granted extension in Extra Ordinary Leave without pay, w.e.f. 03.01.2020 to 26.06.2020 (176 days) as her 80 year old mother has been suffering from chronic health problems and patient of Alzheimers's, cannot be left alone at home.

- NOTE:**
1. Ms. Veena Aggarwal, P.A. was proceeded on leave w.e.f. 20.02.2019 to 02.01.2020 and applied for extension in leave from time to time. As per record she has availed Leave without pay for 1 year 6 months and 02 days i.e. 547 days.
 2. Under Regulation 11.1(i) at page 119, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the Syndicate is the competent authority to grant of leave more than six months to Class 'A' employee in the University.
 3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**)

RESOLVED: That Ms. Veena Aggarwal, P.A., be granted extension in Extra Ordinary Leave without pay, w.e.f. 03.01.2020 to 26.06.2020 (176 days).

22. Considered if Dr. S.S. Sangha, Principal, Dashmesh Girls College of Education, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib, be transferred to the post Principal Dashmesh Girls College, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib, as request dated 1.5.2020 of the Chairman, Dashmesh Girls College, Local Managing Committee.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.05.2018 (Para 43) has allowed that the deputation period of Dr. S.S. Sangha, Principal, Dashmesh Girls College of Education, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib be extended further for a term of another two year w.e.f. 04.05.2018.
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.10.2019 (Para 35) considered the eligibility for appointment of Principals, in Degree and Education Colleges, in view of the UGC Regulations and NCTE norms and resolve that the matter be got examined and until a final call is taken on the issue, no Principal of the College of Education be allowed to be appointed in the Degree Colleges in future.
 3. Regulation 24.2 at Page 176 of P.U. Calendar Volume-1, 2007 is reproduced below:

“Unless in any case it be expressly provided for, the whole time of a teacher shall be at the disposal of the College and he shall serve the college in such capacity and at such places as he may, from time to time, be directed by the Principal/Governing Body of his college, subject to such conditions as may be laid down by the University”.

4. An agenda item (**for Ratification R-3**) for transfer of Dr. S.S. Sangha from the post of Principal, at Dashmesh Girls College of Education, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib to the post of Principal Dashmesh Girls College, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib has been included in the Agenda of Syndicate dated 30.5.2020.
5. A copy of office order No. Misc./A4/DR (Colleges) 3 dated 5.5.2020 issued by D.R. College enclosed.
6. An office note enclosed.

Initiating discussion, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she would like to point out that there are provisions in the Panjab University Calendar regarding posting of male Principal in Girls College. And as per Regulation 5 of P.U. Calendar, Vol-III, there is a bar for transferring and posting/absorbing a male Principal in the Girls College. An issue relating to it had come in the Punjab and Haryana High Court wherein Regulation 5 was challenged. The Bench of five High Court judges was constituted and this matter was placed for hearing. It was decided in the ratio of 3:2 wherein the provision of this regulation was quashed. One of the lady Principal, who was posted in a College, challenged in the Supreme Court. This case was registered in the name of Vijay Lakshmi, it has been in her notice as this case was first heard by the Punjab and Haryana High Court. The constituted bench of Punjab and Haryana High Court comprised of Dr. M.C. Sharma and others. The case related to CWP 11694 of 1994. The decision was taken on 19th January, 1995 in which the provision of the University was quashed. However, she challenged the decision of the Punjab and Haryana High Court in the Supreme Court. The case was reported as Dr. Vijay Lakshmi versus Panjab University which was reported as 2003, Volume-VIII Supreme Court Cases 440, in this, the provision of the Panjab University was upheld. What would she like to enquire is that as arbitrarily all these regulations are existed in the Panjab University according to which, no male teacher can be posted as Principal in the Girls College. Whether the consideration of that agenda item is the violation of the decision/order of the Supreme Court. As per her view if this agenda will be considered then it would be considered as contempt of court as the Supreme Court had already approved the existed provisions of the Panjab University. Firstly the matter relating to the consideration of the item should be examined. Secondly, is there any provision regarding absorption exists in the Regulations of the Panjab University Calendars? These are the two queries which she wanted to be answered. Could it be possible to consider that agenda item, keeping in view the judgement of the Supreme Court. If required, she could send the copy of the judgement on Whatsapp number of the Vice-Chancellor.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that as pointed out that there is no provision in the Panjab University Calendar is not correct as in the meeting of the Syndicate in the year 2017 and 2018, he (Dr. S.S. Sangha) was allowed deputation for two years along with the interim order. Whereas it had been mentioned in Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2019 that the “Principal of the Women College shall be a lady who shall possess Master’s degree with 1st or 2nd Class or its equivalent, the rule shall not apply

to women Colleges whose men and women”, which had already been approved in the Syndicate. This deputation had already been approved in the Syndicate. The latest decision of the Supreme Court reads as under:-

“For a very long time, the University has allowed transfer of the staff working under the same Management/Committee. The fact that the two Colleges are under the same management/Committee is not under dispute, it is established that eligibility conditions laid down by the U.G.C. are mandatory. This was established by Supreme Court of India in early 1990s in the case of Raj Singh versus Delhi. University. If they go by the Regulations of 2010, one can emphasise on the word ‘concerned subject’;

In the first part the matter regarding Women Colleges was discussed in the second part it would go from Education to Degree College. He should be Ph.D. in the concerned subject. In this case the College is already teaching the subject of Education. This condition of finding the Lady Principal had already been explored by them twice. The advertisement was published twice but no Lady Principal was found for the College. Due to this very reason, the deputation was allowed. The advertisement was published twice, the latest judgement of the Supreme Court had also been issued and Syndicate had already allowed his deputation in its previous meetings. If there was such type of law, why the Syndicate did not stop his deputation at that time? It was passed in the meeting of the Syndicate that no Principal can be transferred from Degree to Education College and from Education to Degree College. He could provide the list of minimum of 15 Principals of Degree Colleges whom were allowed to be appointed on Education Colleges and vice versa. In such cases the Director Public Instruction who is the funding agency, had accorded the approval. It is understood that they follow the rules/regulations and other matters relating to appointments of the State Government. Both of the DPIs of Punjab and U.T. Chandigarh had recorded their opinion in favour of his viewpoint. The Regulatory body, i.e., funding agency is in favour of this decision. University Grants Commission did not mention anywhere that no transfer is allowed from Degree College to Education College and vice versa. If this is to be done after following the rules and regulations as stated by Ms. Anu Chatrath, then it should be allowed as it is according to the rules and regulations of the University. Why it was approved twice by the Syndicate?

Ms. Anu Chatrath pointed out that only the deputation was allowed, and not absorption Permanent absorption means he would become the member of the cadre of that College.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that he (Dr. S.S. Sangha) is the approved Principal of the same Management, under which transfers are allowed. This decision was passed in the year 2017. The decision of the Syndicate did not apply in the case of Principal Sangha as it was the case of 2017, how could they deal it in 2020. It was decided in the Syndicate that a Committee would consider the transfer from Education College to Degree College, till it is decided by the Committee, this could not be implemented. If it is applied before that, then the decisions relating to Principals, who had been appointed between 2017 to 2020 from Education College and Degree Colleges, are required to be taken back. If these decisions would be reverted back, then it is okay. This reversed decision should be implemented on all the Principals irrespective of whether they reached in the Senate after winning the elections. Two decisions could not be taken simultaneously. The guidelines of the University Grants Commission relating to it should be intimated. It had been intimated that in the same management, transfers were being made; there is need of reversion/cancellation of all these decisions.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Principal R.S. Jhanji has given very important information that he (Dr. S.S. Sangha) had been sent on deputation after advertisement

of post of Principal twice. Though the post of Principal was advertised twice, no lady Principal was found suitable. He requested the Vice Chancellor to seek information from the Dean, College Development Council whether this post has been advertised twice. So let the Dean, College Development Council reply that the post was advertised twice and thereafter, he (Dr. S.S. Sangha) was sent on deputation. Secondly, he (Principal R.S. Jhanji) has rightly pointed out that when in 2017 the Syndicate had sent him (Dr. S.S. Sangha) on deputation and the rule, which has been quoted by Ms. Anu Chatrath was already there. Under what circumstances, he (Dr. S.S. Sangha) was sent on deputation. So far as his knowledge goes, though he was not the member of the Syndicate in 2017, the office had clearly mentioned in its note that he (Dr. S.S. Sangha) could not be sent on deputation to that College since that is a Girls College and a male could not be a Principal of a girls College. And to his surprise, the then Vice Chancellor instead of getting the matter considered by the Syndicate, sent him on deputation from one college to another. The letter is on record that the Vice Chancellor had sent him on deputation. Let them see whether Syndicate did it or without any background papers presented before the Syndicate, just an item had come for ratification of action taken by the Vice Chancellor of sending this man on deputation from one College to another. The Syndicate in its wisdom might have thought that the Vice Chancellor maybe having the right to send a man on deputation to a Girls College. Again in 2018, the case came and the case came along with a complaint sent by a senior advocate to the Hon'ble Chancellor that this is how the law of the land is being thrown to winds in Panjab University, and one person, who is not eligible to become the Principal of a Girls College, had been sent on deputation. Then again his extension of deputation for another two years was brought. As is the practice here that the important agenda should be taken up for consideration and the rest should be left for the next meeting and in that way that extension of deputation for two years was also granted. Now, when the matter of absorption came, the relevant questions, which are not here in the note, but are very well within the knowledge of Principal R.S. Jhanji, they could proceed further, in accordance with the rule quoted by Ms. Anu Chatrath, which had been duly upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, wherein earlier, this was not the provision he was keeping the Calendar starting from 1975 in which the provision was that there could not be male Principal in Girls College and the rule was upheld in 2003. Subsequently, an addition was made in the rule that "However, if after repeated advertisements female Principal is not available, a male Principal could be appointed for one academic year". As such, he had already been sent as an interim measure for three years, subject to the confirmation by the Dean, College Development Council that whether the post had been advertised twice as shared by Principal R.S. Jhanji. They would proceed further only after the same is confirmed by the Dean, College Development Council. Secondly, when the rule was made, it was incorporated that those, who are already approved, would not be covered under this rule. Meaning thereby, at the time of framing the rule, it was mentioned that it could not be effective retrospectively; rather, it would be effective prospectively. Not that as they were discussing in the forenoon that first they create an emergency, and then they could use regulation(s) of emergency, in anticipation of approval of Syndicate and Senate. It is not that at anytime they get it approved by hook and crook and thereafter, say that the rule did not apply. And if there is fear of contempt, in spite of the fact that he is willing, if the rule permitted, they should approve it, but at the same time if they are to be penalized for taking any illegal decision, and that too, against the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, then probably not he himself (Shri Ashok Goyal) he would request all the members of the Syndicate not to become party to any legal decision. They are his (Dr. Sangha) friends and well-wishers, they wanted him to become Principal of this College, but not at the cost of law of the land. He pointed out that it has not been mentioned anywhere in the note of the Dean, College Development Council that the post had been advertised twice.

It was informed by the Dean, College Development Council that so far as he remembered, the post had not been advertised, but he could check the file again because this has now become the fundamental question.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could tell them for their knowledge that the post had not been advertised. Secondly, whatever he (Dean, College Development Council) has seen so far, that meant the post has not been advertised. He asked Principal R.S. Jhanji as to how he has said that the post had been advertised twice.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he is requesting them to ensure/verify that the post had been advertised because the person could not be mistaken.

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

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that according to his information, the post had been advertised, but the same could be verified.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that in accordance with the amendment in the rule, which has been brought to their notice just now, even if the post had been advertised, a male Principal could only be appointed in a Girls College only for one academic year and not permanently.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to where is the note of 2017.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that Shri Ashok Goyal is right that when the Syndicate had allowed deputation of Dr. S.S. Sangha to a Girls College, on what basis the Syndicate had allowed deputation at that time, and on what basis the deputation period was extended for two years thereafter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should be provided the note of 2017, so that they could see the same.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that Panjab University was a party as the petition was filed against the University and the Supreme Court had upheld the provisions of the University. She remarked that perhaps Principal R.S. Jhanji has not done the complete homework. She added that Principal R.S. Jhanji was a member of the Syndicate in the year 2017.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he would not say that this is relevant but both the things had been recorded by D.R. (Colleges) in the agreement obtained from the management at the time of appointment that transfer could be made from one institution to other under the same management, which has also been mentioned in the service and conduct rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that this issue should not be discussed as it is not required to be discussed, because they want to help him (Dr. S.S. Sangha) but should help him in a legal way.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that then they should suggest "What to do to help him".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be intimated whether the post had been advertised or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that, at present, the Dean College Development Council is not in a position to give all the input.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No, he would not accept it".

The Vice Chancellor said that Shri Ashok Goyal could go through the file.

Shri Ashok Goyal, after going through the file, said that nothing is available in the file relating to advertisement.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that after reading the rule, it has been observed that after advertisement, he could be sent on deputation only for one year.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he was deputation for 2 years.

Ms. Anu Chatrath replied that it was the interim arrangement.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that this may also be allowed as per interim arrangement.

Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that there are many things which are required to be examined in the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the interim arrangement, there would be no benefit to him (Dr. S.S. Sangha) whereas they want to benefit him.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it should be examined thoroughly keeping in view the legalities involved to avoid any type of embarrassing position of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal, while addressing to Principal R.S. Jhanji, stated that his memory is not too short. In 2017, the said item was brought to the Syndicate for ratification. In the year 2017 itself, the Vice Chancellor had approved deputation of Principal S.S. Sangha from Education College to Degree College, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate. This is the actual position of (i). It was clearly mentioned in the minutes of the meeting held in 2017 that "it is pointed out in bold letters that Rule (as quoted by Ms. Anu Chatrath) at page 171 in respect of "appointment of Principal in Women College provided that on their retirement a qualified lady Principal shall be appointed, in case a lady Principal is not available after repeated advertisements, a male Principal may be considered for appointment for a limited period i.e., for one year". This is the office note put up to the Vice Chancellor and thereafter, the then Dean College Development Council wrote without anything 'forwarded to Registrar for further perusal'. The then Registrar, while completely overruling the rule which had been quoted, wrote that since both the institutions are of the same management and the Chairman of the Managing Committee has requested for deputation of Principal S.S. Sangha, this may be approved, in the anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate. Then he (Vice Chancellor) approved in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate.

Principal R.S. Jhanji asked who were the members of the Syndicate at that time?

Shri Ashok Goyal while continuing on (ii) said that in spite of the fact that the office had clearly mentioned that this is the provision, but overruling the rule, even without referring to it, it was done in a half hearted manner,. It was never brought before the Syndicate. It was simply done under ratification that Vice Chancellor has approved deputation of Dr. S.S. Sangha. Then in 2018, the matter was again brought for extension of deputation. There again it was written that Syndicate had approved the deputation in 2017 and asked that the Chairman had again requested for extension in deputation for two years, which may be approved.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that in 2018, item for extension in deputation was brought under consideration and not for ratification.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was alright that the same was brought under consideration but it was without any office note.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that this item was placed in the Agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal replied that the agenda has also come in 2020 but it without office note. Where it was written that advertisement was published twice, which is known to Principal R.S. Jhanji. He said that he would like to intimate for the information of Principal R.S. Jhanji that no advertisement was published even for a single time. He said that they should not argue rather try to help him. The second issue which Principal R.S. Jhanji had raised that the judgement of the Supreme Court was received that the same management can allow the transfer from one College to other. In the case if there is one management in both the Nursing and Degree College, in that way the Principal of the Nursing College can be transferred to the Degree College.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that Education is a subject in that College.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that education subject is not the subject of teaching. It should be understood by him. In Education, there is requirement of M.A. whereas in teaching of education it has to be M.Ed. Let them not to be confused with this. There is lot of difference between M.A. (Education) and M.Ed.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that one is the Professional College and the other is Degree College. There is no difference in it. Panjab University issue the certificate both for M.A.(Education) and M.Ed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is it possible to consider the eligible candidate of M.A.(Education) for Education College.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said "Yes".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not correct, in Education College, M.Ed. is required. Shri Ashok Goyal further said that he want information only on two points, while addressing Dean College Development Council, if he felt after discussion that the Vice Chancellor is ready to confirm that as per the existing norms, he is eligible to be transferred, the Syndicate has no problem in it.

Shri Rajinder Bhandari said that the statement made by Shri Ashok Goyal is correct that while keeping in mind all the discussion, the Vice Chancellor may decide at his level.

Principal R.S. Jhanji, Ms. Anu Chatrath and Shri Ashok Goyal stated that "NO" it is not right, they are not saying so.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to inform one more thing to the Vice Chancellor is that it is not only the matter of respect of the House, but it is the respect of the Vice Chancellor being the Chairman of the House. Whatever items are brought in the Syndicate, are nothing but only the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor. He knew that it is not the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor, it is the office note which they are considering, let the Vice Chancellor come with his comments that "he had gone through the file in detail". In view of the existing rules here and the orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, he is eligible to be transferred permanently and there is no doubt. At least, they will be saved in the eye of public.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that at least they could say that they have addressed this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Dean, College Development Council is not in a position to confirm whether advertisement has been done or not. He said that Principal R.S. Jhanji has also not confirmed about the advertisement.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that had he got information, he would have shared it.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to where is the information. He further said that so much so, the information from that college has not come.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that now he is confirmed that of the other college, have also not come. It should be checked as to whether of the other colleges, the advertisements have come or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have written that now they want to give advertisement. It has been written here. The advertisement has not been issued earlier.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that both the things should be checked. It should be checked that an advertisement of that college had come or not.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that first of all they should firstly examine as to whether they could do it as per laid down provision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even if they had given advertisement, they could do for only one year and not for three years.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that if they could do as per the provisions of the Supreme Court, it should be examined.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that they have earlier done such things, this should also be done.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that the matter is related to an appointment of a teacher from the Education College in a degree college. There has been a proceedings of the Syndicate of 16.10.2019. She said that at the page No. 175 para four, the language used by the worthy learned person, she said that she thinks that this language should not have been used. She said that they should not term it as praiseworthy language. She said that the members could go through the page No. 175. She read out the portion of the statement that even if the Principal of College of Education goes in a small Degree college, he/she is not able to teach there, what to talk of big colleges because from time to time the NCTE had relaxed the norms. She said that she would like to read out the last line which has been quoted Dr. Navdeep Goyal and Dr. K.K. Sharma. She said that she has strong objection for such kind of language that has been used for the Faculty of Education. The people from the Education College are highly qualified, highly competent. They joined us with the general degree rather they possess extra professional degree that is BA and M.A.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that first point is that he has only talked about the norms of the NCTE. They have frequently changed, sometimes they made it necessary that the NET is compulsory, and sometime negated it. The overall influence was coming to fore that all that has been happening there, sometimes appointments took place with NET and sometime without NET and sometimes happened this or that. He said that he was stating that after taking all this in mind. He said that it is a fact

that whenever it is talked of the appointment and then it comes to bear on the eligibility. In Degree College, it is of 15 years and in Education College it is of eight or 10 years. There are lot of differences.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that she had no problem with all that. Her concern just is that in an Education Faculty there are a lot of good people. She said that in her view it is wrong to generalize them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they were talking about of having the NET necessary for University and college teachers.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that if they see the UGC guidelines of 2010, they have mentioned Ph.D. education. If they see of 2018, it has been written as only Ph.D. and nothing has been mentioned.

The Vice Chancellor said that let it be made known what is to be done.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said she had to say that the letter which has been issued by the Panjab University of 9.12.2019, it has been written that the people of Education cannot go to the Degree College. She requested the Vice Chancellor to allow them as applicants. She is not saying that their selection should be made. She wanted to say that let them be the applicants and if they are competent, they are sending the Selection Committees. Let them be selected, if they are not competent, they may be rejected.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said if they see the resolved part, it would seem that the points raised by her are appropriate. He is not aware if Dean College Development Council has added something to it.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that it has been written that the clarification from the UGC would be taken, but that information is not there. A lot of Education persons have been harassed. She is not talking about making a favour to someone specific. She further said that she thinks that they are having equal right to equal opportunity.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that after the receipt of the clarification on the issue, it should be examined.

The Vice Chancellor said that what was being talked of about re-examining by Mrs. Anu Chatrath, it would not be appropriate. He further enquired as to if some interviews have been conducted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue raised by Principal Sarbjit Kaur is of different nature.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that she had spoken to address on the issues.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that there is a case of his (Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa) mother-in-law in Hon'ble Supreme Court. If by being a son-in-law (Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa), they have not mentioned, it is their will. It is his (Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa) mother in law who has gone up to the Supreme Court.

The Dean College Development College said that the Deputy Registrar (College) informed him that the facts were not there in the file. DR Colleges has been asked to check other record/file.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to about which other file the DCDC was talking about. He said that it means that in this file, this fact is not there. If this would have

been so, then it would have been there in that file. He urged Principal R.S. Jhanji to try to get copy of the advertisement published.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the matter is that they can allow this as it was done once, then twice.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that no one stop them from becoming wiser any day. If he has committed mistake, it does not mean he would continue to do the same again and again.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that it should be brought after legal opinion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they have committed foolishness once, it should not be repeated again. He suggested that the Vice Chancellor should constitute a Committee.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that let they authorize the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Anu Chatrath said that until and unless the thorough satisfaction is not there, it should not be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue should be clinched. It has already been delayed. There has been an issuance of interim order of deputation.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the matter has reached the level of optimum deliberation. It should be stopped now.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that a lot of time was also exhausted in the start of the session of this meeting. It could be done in a relaxed way.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the seriousness of the issue should be seen. He said that in spite of the best efforts of the office, they have not been able to find the copy of the advertisement, if that is not the case, then how they have prepared the note. How have tried to play with the wisdom of the Syndicate. Is not it befooling the Syndicate? And that is what they have done in 2017 and then what it could have done in 2018 and that is what they have done it here also and they are very keen to help. He further said that so recklessly the issues are being handled. Pointing toward Principal R.S. Jhanji he said that here is the case that Principal R.S. Jhanji saying hundred percent true. He said that he should be shown as to where are those cases.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that this was not the alone of the issue. Let the other issues be taken up.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there might be so many cases.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the previous practice be seen and the matter be clinched.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what previous practice be seen.

Principal Jhanji said that in was done in 2017 and then in 2018 and let it be done now too.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the deputation which was done was not valid. That deputation shall have to be tendered. How it would be done. He said that yet he has not asked the questions. He said that can be DCDC tell about as to whether there is any provision of transfer in our Calendar, Is there any provision of deputation in our

calendar. Is there any permission of absorption in our Calendar. He said that till now he was not asking any questions. He said that the President of Management is someone else and the Vice Chancellor is sending on deputation to the college.

A din prevailed.

Shri Ashok Goyal while pointing towards Principal R.S. Jhanji said that it cannot be such, that there happens to be no advertisement. He asked, can Principal Jhanji wanted to get it done.

In reply, Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he very much was asking them to do it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that should it be done in the absence of advertisement and it has very rightly been stated by Principal Jhanji the advertisement had happened twice.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he had said that if the advertisement had been given, then it could be seen from the office record.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not the case that if the advertisement was there, this if should be there. He further asked to Principal Jhanji that in case there is no advertisement, then what could possibly be done.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that either the Vice Chancellor or Principal R.S. Jhanji give statement of advertisement.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then they would say that this has been done by Principal R.S. Jhanji.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that whatever the issues and objections has been raised, the Dean College Development Council has not been able to understand as to if the advertisement was given or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is very much understandable that the advertisement was not given. He further said that on what other file, the record of advertisement would be there.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that it not clear in actual the advertisement was given or not. He further said that Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no grey area. They should fully examine it at their level.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that this would be violation of Supreme Court with regard to rules and regulations. She said that it looks not good that Professor Bhandari shall be saying such things.

Shri Rajinder Bhandari said that he had said that there are a lot of grey area. Even their office is not clear on various issues. Probably they might not be able to see the clear picture. The issue should once be examined thoroughly and then brought it to the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Syndicate is not sitting here to examine the office. They are also not here to conduct the viva-voce of the office.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that let it be examined legally.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the questions or objections or whatever things has been told by the members, the matter should be studied in the light of that.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that before them there are regulations and there are amendments of the regulations also, according to it, the matter could be seen.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that let once the office exercise be done, why they are in a so much of hurry.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the office has to do the exercise, this would be done today. He said that what was the guarantee that the tomorrow the advertisement will not be manufactured.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that they would provide it at their own.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there happened to be advertisements from Ludhiana. An advertisement was given and after that it came into the newspaper that this was the advertisement of the shop of the Barber. After putting the Board, the advertisement of the college was given.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that there is no answer to these conversations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why there is no answer to these things, he could name also Baba Kundan College. He further said that let the office come with whatever information.

Mrs Anu Chatrath said that the question of the advertisement comes only when that if advertisement was very much there, then too only for one academic year, they could retain the Principal. Now it has happened three years.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that even if the advertisement was given, in that case too, the position could have been retained only for one year.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that let it be postponed to till the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that If transfer is not possible, then deputation could be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has already been said that the deputation was already done wrongly. Now another wrong could not be done.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that complete exercise should be done and the matter should come in the next meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal objected to the proposal and further said that the Vice Chancellor could make an exercise with Professor Rajinder Bhandari. They are not against it.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari it is no matter only exercise is being done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he too have been saying that this is the exercise and he is not saying that the decision was being done. Whatever decision is to be done, let this be done with Professor Rajinder Bhandari.

The Vice Chancellor said that the item be brought back in the Syndicate after having exercise with Professor Rajinder Bhandari and Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this would not come in the Syndicate. They could do whatever they want after consulting with Professor Rajinder Bhandari.

Shri Rajinder Bhandari said that this would come to the Syndicate, without Syndicate it would carry no meaning.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no question, let the Vice Chancellor confirm right now.

The Vice Chancellor said how he would not confirm it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then who will do it, the Dean College Development Council is not doing, the Registrar is not doing, the office is not doing, he himself is not doing, Principal R.S. Jhanji has backed out. He could tell something more that there is a Supreme Court judgment. Then there were not a clause of advertisement. This is the latest judgment. This is not of 1990 or 2003.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said this judgement is not on the issue of women. Our regulations have been dealt with into it. How can they ignore their own judgment. The judgement which has now been cited by her and which has been dealt with by the constitutional bench and has been decree in their favour. With regard to our regulations, the Supreme Court has upheld our provision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that is why for the information of Principal R.S. Jhanji that till date, in none of the Girls College of Chandigarh, no male Principal has been posted. It is for their information. He said that the rule in the Punjab Government has been the same.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that at outstation, the candidates for Principals are not available, it could be that they are available here in Chandigarh.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the advertisement is not given, then from where the Principal could be found.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they have not enough time. They have been sitting here since long and they do not want to say anything. Everyone know all the things, it is up to him (the Vice chancellor) let he do whatever he wants to. He further said that there is no scope for extending the issue, let it be closed just by now.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever the Syndicate would decide, he would go by that. He further said that it is upto the Syndics as to if the matter be resolved by forming a Committee or so.

Principal I.S. Sandhu denoting towards Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the matter is to be decided by this very day.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he did want to ask the Vice Chancellor that as to from where the idea of forming of a Committee has jumped here. He further said that they were thinking as to if something is traced on the basis of which a positive decision could be taken. But no positive thing is there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that everything is clear to everyone. The opinion of all should be taken.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that Principal R.S. Jhanji should be asked if they favour the appointment as the Principal of Dashmesh B.Ed. College of Education.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that if any mistake has been committed later on, it does not mean that it will continue. Once the judgement of Supreme Court has come.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that already they have very clearly conveyed that those who have been saying that do it, it should be asked from them as to how to do it. It could very much possible that there exists any specific idea in their mind.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the matter will linger on to the next month.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the matter would be resolve by this very day. He further said that in the morning Professor Rajinder Bhandari was talking loudly about the Calendar.

Principal Rajinder Bhandari said that they have been trying to disclose the secrets of all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he Vice Chancellor should insist the Dean College Development Council to tell about what is the position, whether it could be done as per rules or not. If this is not possible, then ask your office. Here the previous Deputy Registrar of Colleges is also sitting here, he may be asked. The new Deputy Registrar Colleges, which has been seen over here, let he also be consulted. The matter should not be handled in the way it is being done.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that he had a request before the Vice Chancellor that it should also be asked from the officers as to which problems they are made to face in such matters. If there has been coming a lot of problem on account of taking just one issue, then what about the problem of various issues. To her view, they should once be consulted.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the matter is that all the discussion has taken place, all the points have come, now it is for them to decide as to whether it is to be passed or not.

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

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the Vice Chancellor at its own, should examine as to if as per the provision of the Supreme Court it could be done or not. In case, they do, want to do it, can we do it?

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the legal opinion should be taken.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Senior Advocate has very much been sitting here.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the person was sent on deputation. There has come a legal notice of the Senior Advocate from Supreme Court. If they would talk of the absorption, it would mean that he would be effecting the seniority of the other colleges also. She further stated that the litigation would surely come.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that it is a straight thing that in 2005 that was B.Ed. college. In the year 2005, it had become the Girls College. Now in the Girls College, if there is any issue that he cannot be posted in Girls College, he was saying on that basis that he might have been appointed twice. His appointment might have taken place as in the B.Ed. Girls College.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that yes, that may be the possibility.

Principal R.S. Jhanji continued saying that now as he has come to the Girls College and has been there for the last fourteen years in the B.Ed. college. Three years ago, the same Management had transferred him from the Girls College to Girls College. His approval was very much done by the office of Dean College Development Council. Now if they now say that the period of one or one and a half year is a lenient period. He has completed fourteen years as Principal in that B.Ed. college. He said that this has been happening, it is nothing new, he has been coming from the Girls College to the Girls college.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if this has been so, then the case of 2005 from the office of Dean College Development Council, be also brought.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that if the new dimensions are added, then the issue could take another turn.

Shri Ashok Goyal reiterated that the case of 2005 should be placed before the House just now as to how all this happened. He said that Professor Rajinder Bhandari might have the knowledge of it and Principal Jarnail Singh also might be aware of it.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that if they say this or that was the decision of the Court. He said that he has already been an approved Principal in Degree College and the University has very much given approval to it for B.Ed. College. Now the same Management has been transferring him to their Girls College. They have been transferring him from the Girls College to the Girls College. He is approved in B.Ed. Girls College. He further said that the Panjab University Calendar speaks itself that in case in Man or Women College, if once is approved, then there is no need of afresh approval.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that although he did not want to interfere but let he be told about the case in the last five year that once approved always approved Principal would have gone to another college. The ruling of the Supreme Court which have been read here says that the new condition should be fulfilled. He said that no person of DAV college under Panjab University has been transferred. If any case has happened, it was a case of new appointment and not by way of transfer. He further said that in Panjab University, no person has been transferred from the DAV. The case which has come from Abohar is a case of new appointment.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that both the Mahajans from GNDU have come after transfer.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the both are the new appointments.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Panjab University does not admit the transfers.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that both are the new appointments. He said that those who go from here, the GNDU has been approving them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is a outflow from our side.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that the issue should be brought in the next meeting.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said the details of the members be forwarded to the concerned quarters to get the e-passes for the members for their journey to their home after the meeting.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the Vice Chncancellor should get this issue examined. He said that it was not so simple. He further stated that he is the regular Principal in girls degree college. He has been having the regular approval and he is going from one girls college to another girls college. He said that all the facts should be legally examined.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that legal opinion should be sought.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have even narrating the decision at their own. It means that they are so fool that we are not aware of what is the legal position? Do we not know?

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it cannot be done in the present manner. She said the Professor Rajinder Bhandari was aware that the admittedly the senior most, admittedly the placement was to be done by rotation. From the very beginning of the morning, he talked about procedure of regulations. She expressed that she could not come out of the situation created.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it has been spent enough time and they have to leave for home and the resolve part be told to them.

Principal Jarnail Singh said that the Vice Chancellor should give his ruling.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have reached the decision and there is no need of ruling.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that eleven members are in clear cut about taking the decision. There are fourteen members and out of them eleven have indicated about the decision to be taken in the light of the Supreme Court provisions.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that they have done this at their own. Let he be asked firstly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have not taken the name of Principal Jhanji.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they wanted that the decision is taken collectively.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that whatever decision the authority wants that could be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the action of the vice Chancellor standing the deputation can be ratified for request of absorption

Prof. R.S, Jhanji asked whether the item stands ratified.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been done indirectly till now.

Principal R.S. Jhanji asked whether it was resolved or not.

Shri Rajinder Bhandari said that Where it has been resolved?

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that out of 14 members, 11 members showed their dissent on the transfer of Dr. S.S. Sangha, Principal, Dashmesh Girls College of Education, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib to Dashmesh Girls College, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked the Vice Chancellor to comment on it.

The Vice Chancellor replied that the House would take a decision on this.

Shri Rajinder Bhandari said that the matter may be discussed in the next month after obtaining full details.

Shri Ashok Goyal replied that all the files and record have been placed before the House and it is not right to say that it would be discussed next month with complete details.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that voting should not be done, the matter should not be made political, and it is in the interest of the University.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said major thing why they did not want to create such type of impression is that initially they wanted to help him but now in view of the factual position, it is not in his favour.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it is not clear to him regarding his statement (Principal R.S. Jhanji) that the advertisement had been published two times and now he is saying that he did not have information relating to it. He should be asked on phone.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that keeping in view the factual, legal and statutory provisions, it is not acceptable.

It was informed, if the House wished he could check the entire file again.

Shri Ashok Goyal replied to this, if file is required to be checked, it would be checked at this place only. They could get the file immediately at this House only. When file is available in the House then what is the need for checking the same again.

It was replied that as per Principal R.S. Jhanji, the advertisement was published whereas as per the office record, the information relating to the advertisement is not in the file.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked Dean College Development Council to make a call (Dr. S.S. Sangha) and ask him to provide the copy of the advertisement.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that whether the advertisement is there or not, if it can be done while keeping in view the statutory provisions and the judgement of the Supreme Court, then it may be done. If advertisement was there, it was only for one academic year whereas in this case it had been allowed for three academic sessions. It is to be considered whether it may be allowed on the basis of statutory regulations and the judgement of the Supreme Court. The amendment of the Regulation defines that at the most if the advertisement was published two times (or repeated), but none is available; the appointment could be made only for one academic year. This could not be allowed even if the advertisement was there.

Shri Jarnail Singh said it should not be done in such a manner as it would give the impression that he is not known to anybody. He should not be in an embarrassing situation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this would not be done like that, let them take the decision and proceed further.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the decision proposed by Shri Ashok Goyal and Ms. Anu Chatrath is passed.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that his dissent on the decision may be recorded.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the interview was conducted by Shri Prakash Singh Badal Ji in the Guest House. Later on, when the discrepancy was brought to his knowledge, he immediately cancelled the appointment. He is such a genuine man if there is some problem in it, they can contact him to resolve but not to linger on in such a way.

Shri Ashok Goyal while recording the decision said that after detailed discussion and looking into the case in the light of the Regulation 5 mentioned at Page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Vol-III duly upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and in the absence of any advertisement, no transfers has ever been issued by Dashmesh Girls College after the retirement of the earlier Principal, it is not possible, so Dr. Sangha may be sent back to his parent College where he has been allowed to retain by the College management/Vice Chancellor. This decision is to be quoted under the Ratification item 3.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated, while recording his statement on the resolve part on Item 22, that in view of the fact and in the absence of any provisions in the P.U. Calendars, the request of the management to transfer Dr. Sangha cannot be acceded to, under Rule 5 mentioned at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that his point-wise opinion may please be noted.

1. Dr.S.S.Sangha was given first deputation vide Para 36(i) of the meeting of the Syndicate dated 16.12.2017 for a period of one year.
2. Dr. S.S. Sangha was given further extension of two year vide Para 43 of the meeting the Syndicate dated 26.05.2018.
3. As per Regulations/ Rules of the University under Chapter VIII "Conditions of Service & Conduct of teachers in Non-government Affiliated Colleges at Pages 171-176 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
4. In this regard under Rule 5 given at page 208 of the Chapter VII, 'Conditions for Grant of Affiliation to Colleges', P.U. Calendar, Volume -III, 2019 provided as under:-

"The Principal of a Women's College shall be a Lady who shall possess at least Master's degree in 1st or 2nd class or an equivalent degree with experience of teaching in a college. This rule shall not apply to women's colleges whose men or women Principals have already been approved. Provided that on their retirement, a qualified lady Principal shall be appointed. In case a lady Principal is not available after repeated advertisement, a male Principal may be considered for appointment for a limited period, i.e., for one academic session only".

5. Then there is further one office note indicating therein that it has been observed as per Agreement Form for Teachers in Non-Government Affiliated Colleges (qs quoted under Regulation 2.1 at page 171 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007), as provided at Page

248 (clause 3) of P.U. Calendar Vo;.-IV, 2016. There is a clear cut provision in it that one can be transferred from one institution to other institution with same management.

6. Further the latest judgement of the Supreme Court in the case of Raj Singh Vs Delhi University in which there is a clear cut provision in support of it.
7. Under the above mentioned points/issues, so many issues had come up which needs to be examined further, the office is also not sure about all these many things to their opinion. The office be given a chance to examine the issue in the light of the above discussion which happened today.

He further said the above statement be recorded under his name, Shri Rajinder Bhandari and Principal Sarabjit Kaur. Their dissent opinion under the resolve part should be recorded. It was also stated that both the DPIs had given their opinion in favour of the Dr. Sangha.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the opinion of both the DPIs would be recorded and noted.

RESOLVED: That after detailed discussion and looking into the case in the light of the Regulation 5 mentioned at Page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, which has duly be upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India as also in the absence of any advertisement made by the College concerned, after retirement of earlier Principal, it is not possible to extend deputation any further and in view of the facts and in the absence of any provision in the P.U. Calendar, the request of the Management to transfer Dr. Sangha, not be acceded to.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That so far as Sub-Item R-3 relating to request of Sardar Prakash Singh Badal, Chairman, Dashmesh Girls College, Local Management Committee, that extension of deputation of Principal S.S. Sangha be allowed w.e.f. 04.05.2020 to 30.5.2020 as an interim period, is concerned, the request of Management for further extension of deputation w.e.f. 31.05.2020 has not been acceded to. So, Dr. S.S. Sangha be sent back to the previous College where he was allowed to retain lien by the College Management.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari, Principal R.S. Jhanji and Principal Sarabjit Kaur recorded their dissent with the point wise opinion of Principal R.S. Jhanji:-

1. Dr. S.S. Sangha was given first deputation vide Para 36(i) of the meeting of the Syndicate dated 16.12.2017 for a period of one year.
2. Dr. S.S. Sangha was given further extension of two year vide Para 43 of the meeting the Syndicate dated 26.05.2018.
3. As per Regulations/ Rules of the University under Chapter VIII "Conditions of Service & Conduct of teachers in Non-government Affiliated Colleges at Pages 171-176 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
4. In this regard under Rule 5 given at page 208 of the Chapter VII, 'Conditions for Grant of Affiliation to Colleges', P.U. Calendar, Volume -III, 2019 provided as under:-

“The Principal of a Women’s College shall be a Lady who shall possess at least Master’s degree in 1st or 2nd class or an equivalent degree with experience of teaching in a college. This rule shall not apply to women’s colleges whose men or women Principals have already been approved. Provided that on their retirement, a qualified lady Principal shall be appointed. In case a lady Principal is not available after repeated advertisement, a male Principal may be considered for appointment for a limited period, i.e., for one academic session only”.

5. Then there is further one office note indicating therein that it has been observed as per Agreement Form for Teachers in Non-Government Affiliated Colleges (qs quoted under Regulation 2.1 at page 171 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007), as provided at Page 248 (clause 3) of P.U. Calendar Vo;.-IV, 2016. There is a clear cut provision in it that one can be transferred from one institution to other institution with same management.
6. Further the latest judgement of the Supreme Court in the case of Raj Singh Vs Delhi University in which there is a clear cut provision in support of it.
7. Under the above mentioned points/issues, so many issues had come up which needs to be examined further, the office is also not sure about all these many things to their opinion. The office be given a chance to examine the issue in the light of the above discussion which happened today.

23.

Considered the report of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of the decision of the Syndicate dated 09.11.2019 (Para 7), who visited National College for Women, Machhiwara, District Ludhiana, on 20.01.2020 to ascertain/evaluate as to whether discontinuation of courses of M.Sc. (IT) and M.A. Punjabi being run in the College, with effect from the academic session 2020-21 is justified.

Initiating the discussion, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stated that the Committee sent by the Syndicate/Senate in its report submitted did not mention that if these courses would be discontinued.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu stated that this should not be done that new courses starts and later after 5 years, after taking financial benefits, the courses used to closed and teachers were being sent back. A Committee should be sent to know the position of the teachers due to closing of the courses.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this College is already in the lime light as there were major issues also relating to non-payment of salaries. In this College there was also the case of embezzlement of Rs.2 crores by Head Clerk and Clerk. This issue is also pending with the University and no decision has been taken on it so far.

Shri Rajinder Bhandari asked who had recommended the case relating to the Item.

It was informed that a Committee visited the College and had recommended the same.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the case is submitted in the House to examine in detail as what are the repercussions of closing the above said course in the Colleges. Whether it involves any financial loss to the teachers or not. What is the status of endowment fund in the College.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the report of the Committee recommended that they should try to run these courses. It can also be verified whether this course was included in the Handbook of India of last two years. Students did not come for admission whereas no information for starting the new courses was given to the students. How can the students join without the information?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stated that they sent back the students in the case of non-appointment of teachers and asked the authorities to close the courses due to lack of students.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that a certificate to the effect that no teachers are being affected due to the closure of courses be obtained from the College.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Committee did not give any recommendation relating to the fact whether teachers are being affected or not. The Committee visited the College so far just to ask them to try to continue the said courses

RESOLVED: That the same Committee, which visited the College earlier, be asked to prepare its report in view of the discussion held in the Syndicate and submit the same.

24.

Considered –

- (i) request dated 01.05.2020 (**Appendix-XV**) of Dr. Rakesh Khullar for relieving him from his services due to unavoidable personal circumstances.
- (ii) request dated 15.02.2020 (**Appendix-XV**) of Dr. Devinder Dhawan (presently working as CMO) for extension in term of appointment as CMO beyond 62 years up to 65 years, OR he be considered for re-employment as was done in the case of Dr. B.S. Lal & Dr. Rakesh Khullar.
- (iii) assigning the charge of CMO, Health Centre, P.U., Chandigarh.

NOTE: A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-XV**).

Initiating the discussion, Shri Jarnail Singh asked whom the University would give the charge of Chief Medical Officer.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if there is any permanent Doctor then it would be his legitimate claim to be considered for the post of Chief Medical Officer. The Health Centre is a full-fledged Centre with 24 hours of work with a dealing of medical reimbursement bills of all the employees of the University. Therefore, in the Health Centre, the services of a person who is resident of Chandigarh is required. At present there is only one permanent Doctor and he/she is the legitimate claimant for the post of Chief Medical Officer.

Shri Jarnail Singh asked as to how much experience the incumbent has?

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma stated that the incumbent had the total experience of 21 years consisting of 7 years in Panjab University and 14 years in Punjab Engineering College.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it could not be done like this as the cadre of both the Regional Centre and the Panjab University is common. It is not acceptable that a senior person reports to junior. It would create problem whenever the University have to re-designate whenever the person of Regional Centre would achieve the seniority, he/she could represent his/her case, the situation of reversion should be avoided. The person deputed at Regional Centre should be appointed as Visiting Doctor in the Health Centre, he/she should be shifted there so that the charge would only be given to the senior most person. He pointed out that earlier it was also decided in the meeting of the Syndicate that the charge would be given to the senior most person.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated a person will take over the charge at the place where he has been posted.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the appointment of Medical Officer of the Hoshiarpur Health Centre is only for the Hoshiarpur region. It has been clearly mentioned in her appointment letter that she cannot be transferred to Chandigarh.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma is misguiding the Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor. He read out her appointment letter as under:-

“At present your posting will be in the above said Centre (Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur), however, you could also be transferred to be posted outside Chandigarh at Department/Institutions maintained by the Panjab University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma pointed out that it is mentioned that he can be transferred outside except Chandigarh.

The Vice Chancellor advised to listen carefully the provisions mentioned in the Calendar relating to it.

It was informed that after the name of Dr. Devinder Dhawan, there are two senior most regular Doctors. The provision is that a Medical Officer after attaining 9 years experience would become the Senior Medical Officer. After 5 years of service, the Senior Medical Officer will be allowed to give the charge of Additional Chief Medical Officer. The senior most Additional Chief Medical Officer is to be designated as Chief Medical Officer. Whereas in this case, she is not eligible because right now she is not Additional Chief Medical Officer. The current position is that none of these two Medical Officers is eligible. They are not appointing, they are only giving the charge. Right now it is a charge only. In Regional Centre, Ludhiana there is only Medical Officer and the remaining persons are on contractual basis. If anybody is allowed to be shifted from Ludhiana, in that case there would be no regular person. This case is only for the charge. This is the factual position of the eligibility of the persons.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the charge may be allowed to be given till the post is filled after publication of advertisement.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that post of Chief Medical Officer should be advertised.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in the case of the post of the Registrar, the charge has been given to him, the post is not filled on regular basis. He further pointed out the

Medical Officer and Senior Medical Officer is posted in both the Regional Centres, their name should also be considered for the same.

It was informed by the members that both the persons deputed at the Regional Centres are not eligible for the post of Chief Medical Officer.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that both the Medical Officers be directed to report to Dean of University Instruction.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that in that case, it would not be possible to run the Health Centre.

Shri Jarnail Singh asked how can the charge be given to a junior person?

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma replied that she is not the junior, she is only permanent Doctor. If anybody visits a foreign place, in that case also the charge is also being given to the next senior person.

The Vice Chancellor said "What to do?"

The Vice Chancellor stated that the rules are very much clear, none is eligible there as explained by the Registrar. It is a matter of charge and they have to go by the rules only.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he may be permitted to explain one thing that one has 13 years experience; she would be eligible after two years.

The Vice Chancellor stated that how can he tag this case with the case of Hoshiarpur?

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that in the interest of Health Centre, the charge of Chief Medical Officer (CMO) should be given to senior most Doctor of the Health Centre (local person).

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay". Now, they should move forward.

Ms. Anu Chatrath and Shri Jarnail Singh said that the cadre of all the Doctors is the same.

It was clarified that when the post of Doctor occupied by the Senior Medical Officer at Panjab University Regional Centre (Hoshiarpur) was advertised, it was advertised exclusively for Hoshiarpur.

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that charge should be given to senior-most Doctor at Panjab University Health Centre and they would have no objection to it.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if the charge is given to senior-most Doctor of Panjab University Health Centre, his following dissenting note should be recorded:

"This has been done arbitrarily and the charge has been given to a Medical Officer ignoring the senior-most person (Senior Medical Officer)."

Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to Item 24(i), i.e., request dated 01.05.2020 of Dr. Rakesh Khullar for relieving him from his service due to unavoidable personal circumstances, apprised that Dr. Khullar be requested to reconsider his decision and if he agreed to continue to provide his services, his period of absence, i.e., intervening

period from the date he has not come to see the patients in the Health Centre to re-joining, be treated as leave of the kind due.

Under mentioned discussion shifted from Item 29:

It has been asked by the Registrar regarding the case of re-employment of Dr. Devinder Dhawan from 62 to 65 years as the said part had been missed in the discussion of the previous item.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not from 62 years to 65 years, it is to be considered on the previous pattern.

RESOLVED: That –

1. Dr. Rakesh Khullar, be requested to reconsider his request (dated 01.05.2020) and if he agreed to continue to provide his services, his period of absence, i.e., intervening period from the date he has not come to see the patients in the Health Centre to re-joining, be treated as leave of the kind due;
2. Dr. Devinder Dhawan (presently working as CMO) be re-employed (with one day break on 1.6.2020) on similar terms and conditions as was done in the case of Dr. B.S. Lal & Dr. Rakesh Khullar; and
3. Dr. Rupinder Kaur, Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Health Centre, be assigned the interim charge of Chief Medical Officer (CMO) of Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Health Centre.

Shri Jarnail Singh recorded his dissent on the decision for assigning the interim charge of CMO of Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Health Centre to Dr. Rupinder Kaur.

25. Item 25 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

25. (i) To appoint –

- (i) Dean of Student Welfare w.e.f. 1.6.2020, under Regulation 1 at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007;

NOTE: The term of appointment of the present Dean of Student Welfare, Professor Emanuel Nahar, USOL, is going to complete on **31.5.2020**.

- (ii) Dean of Student Welfare (Women), w.e.f. 1.6.2020, under Regulation 2.2 at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: The term of appointment of the present Dean of Student Welfare (Women), Professor Neena Capalash, Department of Biotechnology, is going to complete on **31.5.2020**.

NOTE: The relevant Regulations read as under:

1. Regulations 1 and 2.2 appearing at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

1. “The Senate may, on the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate, appoint a Dean of Student Welfare for such a period and on such terms and conditions as may be determined by them”.

2.2 “The Senate may also, on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate, appoint a Dean of Student Welfare (Women) for such period and on the same term and conditions as for the Dean of Student Welfare out of the Amalgamated Fund Account. The Dean of Student Welfare (Women) would also be Chairperson of Grievance Committee for the code of conduct and discipline for avoidance of Sexual harassment.”

2. An office note enclosed.

3. The Recommendation of the Vice Chancellor for the under mentioned appointment are as under:

1. Dean of Student Welfare – Professor Devinder Singh, Department of Laws
2. Dean of Student Welfare (Women) – Professor Sukhbir Kaur, Department of Zoology

(iii) To appoint the Associate Dean, Student Welfare w.e.f. 01.06.2020.

NOTE: 1. The term of appointment of the present Associate Dean of Student Welfare, Professor Ranjan Kumar, Department of Physics, is going to complete on **31.5.2020**.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 1/15/28 and 29 May 2016 has resolved as under:

“That a position of Associate Dean of Student Welfare, be created and further resolved that a person belonging to the reserve categories be given the charge of Associate Dean of Student Welfare”

3. The recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor for the post of Associate Dean of Student Welfare – Professor Ashok Kumar, Department of Hindi.

While referring to Item No.25, it was informed that there is a case of appointment of Dean Student Welfare, Dean Student Welfare (Women) and Associate Dean. At Page No.2 at point No.(2) of the Supplementary Agenda, it has been mentioned that the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor for the post of Dean Student Welfare is of Professor Devinder Singh, Department of Laws, for the post of Dean of Student Welfare (Women) is of Professor Sukhbir Kaur, Department of Zoology and Professor Ashok Kumar, Department of Hindi for the post of Associate Dean of Student Welfare

Initiating the discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the Panjab University, every Dean of Student Welfare remained on the post of Warden. One should have a good deal of administrative experience for the post of D.S.W. But this requirement is not being met in the case of recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor for the post of Dean of Student Welfare. Therefore, he had a reservation on this point. Whereas in the case of Dean of Student Welfare (Women), the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor is fully justified as she had a good deal of administrative experience as she remained as Head of the Department. Moreover, she remained on the post of Warden also. The position of the Dean of Student Welfare is such that he/she has to deal with the students and he/she should have a vast experience in dealing with administrative matters. To deal with these things is not easy for a person with least experience in dealing with administrative matters.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he completely agreed with Professor Navdeep Goyal. As far as the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor for appointing Professor Devinder Singh, Department of Laws as Dean of Student Welfare and Professor Sukhbir Kaur as Dean of Student Welfare (Women) is concerned, he welcomed and appreciated the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor. As far as the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor for the post of Associate Dean Student Welfare as Professor Ranjan Kumar is due to complete his term, Professor Ranjan Kumar should be allowed to complete his term and he should be given extension for one year. He requested the Vice-Chancellor that in place of Professor Devinder Singh, he may give some other names/ recommendations for the appointment of Dean of Student Welfare. He endorsed and agreed with the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor as far as Dr. Sukhbir Kaur for the post of Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal had very rightly pointed out.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that Vice-Chancellor should bring new names for the post of Dean of Student Welfare and in the meantime the Vice-Chancellor should be authorised to give charge accordingly.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said one thing she would like to add while keeping in view the current situation of the country is that students, teaching faculty and non-teaching staff have to face lot of difficulties in the present scenario. The meeting for the month of April could not be held, by any means or method that meeting should be conducted as a part of the regular routine. She said that the next meeting of the Syndicate should be fixed in this month according to the convenience of the members of the House. As per her viewpoint on the matter of the Dean of Student Welfare, two or three recommendations should be placed by the Vice-Chancellor along with the Bio-data/Experience of the recommending persons so that this should be examined in

detail. She agreed on the viewpoint expressed by Professor Navdeep Goyal that a person, who had not worked on the post of Warden, should not be considered for the post of Dean of Student Welfare

Dr. Dayal Pratap Singh Randhawa said that with regard to the case for appointment of Dean of Student Welfare (Women), she remained on the post of Warden in the past, therefore, she is competent for the post of Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice-Chancellor should invite the names of the persons for the consideration to the post of Dean of Student Welfare

The Vice-Chancellor replied that they should follow as per the regulations of the Calendar.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu, Principal R.S. Jhanji and Shri Jarnail Singh said that the case for appointment of Dean of Student Welfare (Women) has been cleared by the House.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor should be considered by the members of the House gracefully and their consensus be made on the same as the said person has to work with the Vice-Chancellor and there should be co-ordination between the concerned person and the Vice-Chancellor. He said that the members of the House should make their consensus on the name of Professor Devinder Singh.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that with regard to the matter of co-ordination they fully agreed with the Vice-Chancellor to give interim charge to the said incumbent till he brings the new name.

Principal R.S. Jhanji and Shri Rajinder Bhandari said that the Vice-Chancellor should pass the interim order relating to it.

Ms. Anu Chatrath pointed out that the Vice-Chancellor is only empowered to give charge to the person but he is not authorised to appoint.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what everybody wants to say and what he would like to propose is that one has to be very-very clear that unfortunately the House is not agreed on the name of Professor Devinder Singh. But since the House had requested the Vice-Chancellor to bring new recommendation, he may take whatever interim arrangement what he deems fit till the next meeting of the Syndicate which should be fixed today only as latest 27th June which is a Saturday and till 27th of June whatever arrangements the Vice-Chancellor decide, that would be welcomed. But he thinks that they should meet on 27th of June at 11:00 a.m. But because of some unavoidable circumstances and due to some exigencies, the meeting would not be held then from 28th of June itself, the charge of Dean of Student Welfare should go to the Dean University Instruction Till 27th June, i.e., the next meeting of the Syndicate, the Vice-Chancellor should give the charge to Professor Devinder Singh. If due to some reason they failed to meet on 27th June due to the current situation, then on 28th of June, the charge of Dean of Student Welfare should be handed over to the Dean University Instruction.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that in this manner the University would not function. This is the University and not the departmental store. He said that on the one hand they are saying that the recommendation should be brought by the Vice-Chancellor and on the other hand it is being decided that the person recommended by the Vice-Chancellor would be given the charge till 27th of June. This should not be done

as this is not the way to make the University functional. This Syndicate is not a permanent body, it is only up to 31st December. The members should own and take the responsibility in a right manner as it is not acceptable to allow the Vice-Chancellor to give the charge till 27th June and not after 27th June. He felt ashamed while sitting in such type of Syndicate where these types of subjective decisions are being taken. It is his emotion which can be expressed by him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor should object to Professor Rajinder Bhandari for the use of such type of language on the public platform.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari staging walk out of the House said that he would not be party to this of these decision. Let they take the decisions in their own whims and fancies.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Professor Rajinder Bhandari to sit and be present in the House.

Principal R.S. Jhanji also showed his resentment and walked out of the House.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the Dean, College Development Council and the Registrar to persuade Professor Rajinder Bhandari and Principal R.S. Jhanji to join the meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Registrar (Secretary of the Syndicate) will go to bring them back then all the members of the House will stage walk out of the House. The Vice-Chancellor should send the DCDC for the same. Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that it is the duty of the Vice-Chancellor to control him (Professor Rajinder Bhandari) as he is not saying on the self-respect of any person, he is only giving his opinion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is pointing out the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor is saying that it is his feelings but it has not been observed that what type of words has been used by him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is the feelings of Principal R.S. Jhanji and he is free to express the same.

Under mentioned discussion shifted from Item 30:

The Vice-Chancellor again discussed the issue of appointment of Dean of Student Welfare, Panjab University and appreciated the members for taking the panel which he had submitted and thanked the members for giving the wider scope for the Vice-Chancellor to work. He said the members have apprehension on the first name and consider other person. The Vice Chancellor once again appealed to Syndicate to consider all names proposed by him. The Syndicate members agreed that the Vice-Chancellor can give charge of DSW for the time being to any person at his own. The final decision regarding appointment of DSW will be taken in the next meeting to be held in last week of June, 2020.

Secondly, the syndicate members agreed to the name of DSW (Women).

Thirdly, the Vice-Chancellor asked the members regarding the clarification with regard to category for the Associate Dean post. Shri Ashok Goyal told that it is regarding reserved categories i.e. Scheduled Caste, Backward Class, Scheduled Tribe, Physically disabled, Freedom Fighter. The Vice-Chancellor expressed his willingness that Dr. Ashok Kumar could be given the chance to serve as Associate Dean but the

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 30th May, 2020

members did not agree to it. It was decided that as Dr. Ranjan Kumar is in abroad so Dr. Ranjan Kumar be allowed to continue as Associate Dean.

The Vice Chancellor appealed not to fix the date of Syndicate meeting as it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor to fix the date. In spite of that, the Syndicate members have fixed the date of holding the next meeting of the Syndicate, which is uncalled for and against the tradition of Panjab University. He expressed his reservation on such a dictate.

RESOLVED: That -

1. It be unanimously recommended to the Senate that the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor for appointment of Professor Sukhbir Kaur, Department of Zoology, as Dean of Student Welfare (Women) for period of one year, i.e., from 1st June 2020 to 31st May 2021, under Regulation 1 at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007., be accepted and the letter of appointment be issued to her, in anticipation of approval of the Senate; and
2. Professor Ranjan Kumar, Department of Physics, be allowed to continue as Associate Dean of Student Welfare for another year, i.e., from 1st June 2020 to 31st May 2021; and
3. the Vice Chancellor should bring another name for the post of Dean Student Welfare in the next meeting of the Syndicate. The name of Professor Devinder Singh is not acceptable as Dean of Student Welfare; and
4. Meanwhile, the Vice Chancellor is authorized to assign the charge of Dean of Student Welfare for the interim period, i.e., from 1st June 2020 to 27th June 2020 (the date of the next meeting of the Syndicate). However, in case meeting of the Syndicate is not held on 27th June 2020 owing to any exigency, the charge of Dean of Student Welfare be given to Dean of University Instruction w.e.f. 28th June 2020.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the services rendered by Professor Emanuel Nahar as Dean of Students Welfare and Professor Neena Capalash, Department of Biotechnology, Dean of Students Welfare (Women), be appreciated and letter of appreciation for the services rendered by them be issued; and

- 26.** Considered recommendation at Serial Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 5 of minutes dated 18.02.2020 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Committee constituted by the Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor regarding the issues, discussed in the Syndicate meeting held on 13.12.2019 & 18.01.2020, with regard to issue related with Registered Graduate Constituency for Senate Election, 2020.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee at Serial Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 5 dated 18.02.2020 with regard to issue related to Registered Graduate Constituency for Senate Election, 2020, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

- 27.** Considered minutes dated 20.01.2020 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to frame guidelines for empanelment of contractor's up to Rs.5.00 lacs.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 20.01.2020, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to frame guidelines for empanelment of contractor's up to Rs.5.00 lacs, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

28. Considered if Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Professor in Orthodontics, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Sector 25, Chandigarh, be confirmed in his post w.e.f. 14.03.2014.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.07.2019, Para 13 (**Appendix-XVIII**) had resolved that in view of the orders of Punjab & Haryana High Court passed by the Hon'ble Single Bench in CWP No. 13560 of 2014, Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta be considered on regular basis.
 2. The Senate in its meeting dated 14.12.2019 (Para XX) (R-2) (**Appendix-XVIII**) had ratified the recommendation of the Syndicate dated 30.07.2019.
 3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Professor in Orthodontics, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Sector 25, Chandigarh, be confirmed in his post w.e.f. 14.3.2014.

Items 29 and Item 30 were taken up for discussion together.

29. Considered proposal dated 27.05.2020 regarding affiliation/ extension of affiliation to Colleges, in view of the crucial circumstances emerged with the outbreak of Corona Virus in the Country and advisory for social distancing.

NOTE: Regulations 4.1, 4.2 and 7 at Pages 158-160 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-1, 2007 are reproduced below:

- “4.1** on receipt of an application for grant of affiliation to a new college the Registrar shall, after all the papers in regard to the requirements of Regulation 2 and 3 are complete, place the matter before the Syndicate, which shall appoint an Inspection Committee”.
- “4.2** The inspection committee shall visit the college in accordance with such instructions as may be given by the Syndicate and submit their report to their Registrar within ten days of the Inspection. The report of the Inspection Committees shall be placed before the Syndicate”.
- “7.** The procedure for consideration of the application for grant of extension of affiliation shall be the same as laid down in Regulation 4 for grant of affiliation”.

30. Considered proposal dated 27.05.2020 regarding the issue of panel for recruitment of teachers in different subjects at affiliated colleges of the University, in view of the crucial circumstances emerged with the outbreak of Corona Virus in the Country and advisory for social distancing.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are two things related to affiliation which is that it would be difficult to send inspection teams in the current situation. They should prepare a clear template after taking input from the Colleges. Ultimately, the authority lies with the Syndicate, in the current situation, it would not be possible to look into the records of nearly 200 Colleges. Even it would be very difficult for the Committee. The Syndicate could check the same after some spadework is done by the Committee. The Inspection teams would not be sent in the present scenario, but it should be got checked whether they are giving salaries or not. Numerous problems are being faced relating to salaries, etc. If extension of affiliations are granted to such types of Colleges, it would create problem for them. Last time, the salaries were paid after the intervention of the Affiliation Committee. All these things should be incorporated in the template and documents relating to compliance should be checked.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he also proposed which has rightly been said by Professor Navdeep Goyal and they should take a decision in principle which had already been discussed in the forenoon also. Any fresh course in any College should not be considered. All the information relating to salary statements and position of teachers should be submitted by the Colleges to the Syndicate. As per his view this is the only solution for the time being. As far as the next item relating to issue of panel for recruitment of teachers is concerned, the selection panels were given to Colleges before the lockdown but the Selection could not take place some of the panels are still in pipelines which are being asked by different Colleges. There is an impression as if the panel once given expires after six months, which is not correct. It is misunderstood as if they started thinking that its life is six months then the Colleges will not use that panel for six months which is not suitable to them. Thereafter they will ask for fresh panel. The idea behind making this norm was that if the panel is not suitable to the College/management, re-advertise the post and then ask for fresh panel. It was written that panel will not be changed before six months but it is not that it will not work till one year. It cannot be changed before six months. In both the cases it is only to avoid misuse by the management. But in some of cases it was done as better known to Dr. Rabindra Nath Sharma. This should be taken care of whether the Colleges can implement it or not. It is also possible that those who had applied cannot reach due to containment zone or lack of transport facility. If such type of difficulty is expressed by anyone then his/her interview schedule can be changed in consultation with the Dean College Development Council so that no applicant is deprived under such conditions. These things should be taken care of. He further said that at the cost of apprehension is that the Dean College Development Council should send the detailed instructions to all the panels (V.C. nominee and all the members) regarding the criteria of selection along with the list of applicants which have been received by the Dean College Development Council. As far as the guidelines are concerned, in spite of the fact that they have been told number of times, no way, anybody was informed that no candidate from C.M.J. University is to be entertained. He had come to understand even two months earlier, a candidate had been selected from C.M.J University. Every selection panel should have a circular to this effect.

It was informed that during this period, the cases relating to Colleges, affiliations and selections/interview, a Committee consisting of the 4-5 members of the Syndicate may be constituted.

Dr. Dayal Pratap Singh Randhawa said that this work should be divided into district wise and four Committees should be constituted for the purpose.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the House had already authorised Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal to constitute the Committee of members of the Syndicate.

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

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the gist of whatever has been said by Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Ashok Goyal on the Item so far is that a certificate be obtained from the Colleges that they are paying full salary to teacher. The Dean College Development Council should ask from the certificate to this effect from the Colleges during the time of COVID-19 as also that they had not reduced the salaries of the staff as well as that they are deducting the Provident Funds as per University rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that all the colleges should be asked to get the Form 16 filled from all the teachers.

Principal Surinder Kaur said that in previous meetings also she raised the issue of the teachers of the DAV college that in spite of having complete documents as per the requirement of the Panjab University their names were not approved for the last three years and asked that why they are debarred from getting approval.

Principal (Dr.) Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that earlier there was not a practice of taking panels by the DPI and colleges from University. He said that his and Dr. Sarabjit Kaur appointment was also made as per previous practice. He appreciated the efforts of the syndicate members because of which DPI and DAV Management had started accepting panels from the last one and half year. He further said that teachers are suffering from the last 3-4 years as they are not getting approval. He said that the posts of these teachers are from grant-in-aid and the college is giving them salaries but they are not getting full salaries for the last 3-4 years and suffering loss for want of approval. He requested that the approval of the teachers should be considered as per practice followed earlier.

Prof. Keshav Malhotra requested the Vice-Chancellor to look into the matter regarding the persons who were supposed to vacate the Panjab University accommodation in March or April 2020 could not do so because of COVID 19 Lockdown should be given time up to 30th June, 2020 as is given by the U.T. Administration to their employees.

Principal Surinder Kaur said that there are ten colleges of DAV in Punjab and praised the DAV Management for giving salaries by four of its colleges to their employees. But six colleges did not give salaries to the employees for the last 3-4 months and requested the Vice-Chancellor to look into the matter so that the employees of those colleges also get pending salaries.

Discussion regarding Dean of Student Welfare shifted to Item-25.

Principal (Dr.) Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that there is no provision in the PU Calendar to give panel for the contractual post. The panel were given by the Panjab University, but in spite of that the approval to the teachers are not given for the last 3-4 years. The appointments are made under grant-in-aid and they are given fix Pay of Rs.21,600/-. For the last 3-4 years they are not confirmed by DPI and due to this, they are suffering financial loss by getting Rs.21,600/- instead of Rs.62,000/-. He requested that the approval of the teachers under grant-in-aid, who have completed minimum three years of service, should be given approval on the humanitarian grounds at the earliest.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that the *Pro-forma* of Education Colleges need rectification because there were some issues regarding salary and relieving and suggested that some columns should be added and the affidavit should be attested from the Notary not from the Principal of the College, because the Principal is not responsible for disbursing the salary of the staff. She further suggested that the affidavit should be

taken from the management and not from the Principal so that it is legal and the teaching and non-teaching staff are safe. Secondly, the Part B of the Performa in which sanction is given for starting new course, additional seats. She suggested that this should also be rectified because this was meant only for extension of the course which were already running. The college cannot take new intake because that was required to be taken from the new session. She further said that requested the panels Lecturers and Principals, which are lying pending, be released at the earliest so that selections are done.

RESOLVED: That

1. need-wise Affiliation Committees be constituted by the Committee already constituted by the Syndicate dated 18th January 2020 (Para 4) to take care of all the affiliations;
 2. the Colleges, which have requested for any panels at any point of time, be issued the same with an advisory that the College Management should ensure that the eligible candidates, including those belonging to containment zone(s), who have applied must get a chance to appear in the interview;
 3. due to lockdown, physical inspection is not possible. The whole information as per the prescribed *pro forma* from the College for inspection may be sought online or by any other mode by the Dean, College Development Council along with the supporting documents and put before the Affiliation Committee for approval;
 4. the panels for selection, which have already been given to the Colleges be utilized by the Colleges;
 5. inspection for starting new course(s) not allowed. However, in those new Colleges, where process of affiliation has already been undertaken by the University or Government and in case of any other requirement of already affiliated Colleges, panel be given for inspection; and
 6. the teachers appointed under the DAV College Management, prior to their accepting University nominee and where approval is pending, be given approval as per the previous practice after confirming the qualifications, eligibility and veracity of certificates/degrees.
- 31.** Considered if, physical presence of the candidate/s be not necessitated at the time of Viva-Voce during Covid-19 Pandemic restrictions.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 08.03.2020 Agenda Item No. 2 had resolved 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 the Vice-Chancellor.
 2. Office order No. 10156/Secy./Thesis dated 21.05.2020 enclosed.
 3. An office note enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the item requires deliberation.

RESOLVED: That consideration of Item No. 31 on the agenda be deferred.

32. Information contained in **Items R-1 to R-6** was read out, viz. –

Professor Emanuel Nahar abstained when the following item was taken up for consideration:

R-1. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate & Senate, has allowed Dr. Emanuel Nahar, Professor of Political Science, USOL, to take over the assignment as Chairperson on the Punjab State Commission for Minorities till his superannuation on 31.05.2020, under Rule 4 & 5 at page 63 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019.

R-2. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Lakhveer Kaur, Assistant Professor in the subject of Physical Education (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, w.e.f. 25.02.2020 (A.N.) with the condition that she has to deposit one month salary and her salary for the period 13.02.2020 to 25.02.2020 (13 days) be adjusted in lieu of one month notice period, under rule 16.2 appearing at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

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

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

R-3. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the request of S. Parkash Singh Badal, Chairman, Dashmesh Girls College, Local Managing Committee and extended the deputation of services of Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha, as Principal, Dashmesh Girls College, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib, Punjab in the interim period w.e.f. 4.5.2020 in continuation of his deputation period w.e.f. 4.5.2017 to 3.5.2020, during interim period Dr. S.S. Sangha will hold his lien to his substantive post.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.05.2018 (Para 43) has allowed that the deputation period of Dr. S.S. Sangha, Principal, Dashmesh Girls College of Education, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib be extended further for a term of another two year w.e.f. 04.05.2018.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.10.2019 (Para 35) considered the

eligibility for appointment of Principals, in Degree and Education Colleges, in view of the UGC Regulations and NCTE norms and resolve that the matter be got examined and until a final call is taken on the issue, no Principal of the College of Education be allowed to be appointed in the Degree Colleges in future.

3. Regulation 24.2 at Page 176 of P.U. Calendar Volume-1, 2007 is reproduced below:

“Unless in any case it be expressly provided for, the whole time of a teacher shall be at the disposal of the College and he shall serve the college in such capacity and at such places as he may, from time to time, be directed by the Principal/ Governing Body of his college, subject to such conditions as may be laid down by the University”.

4. An agenda item for transfer of Dr. S.S. Sangha from the post of Principal, at Dashmesh Girls College of Education, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib to the post of Principal Dashmesh Girls College, Badal, Sri Muktsar Sahib, has been placed for before the Syndicate for consideration.

5. An office note enclosed.

R-4. The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the request of Shri Shashi Shekhar, Superintendent, Publication Bureau (now transferred to Establishment Branch-Non-teaching) Panjab University for voluntary retirement w.e.f. 31.03.2020 (A.N.) from the University service and has accordingly sanctioned the following retirement benefits:

1. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 17.3 at page 98 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

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

R-5. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following Board of Control, for the University Business School, P.U. for the year 2020:

Sr. No.	Designation	University Business School
1	Professor	Dinesh Kumar Gupta

2	Professor	A.K. Vashisht	
3	Professor	S.K. Chadha	
4	Professor	B.B. Goyal	
5	Professor	Karamjeet Singh	
6	Professor	Parmjit Kaur	
7	Professor	Meena Sharma	
8	Professor	Sanjay Kaushik	
9	Professor	Suveera Gill	
10	Associate Professor	Dr. Monica Bedi	
11	Associate Professor	Dr. Rupinder Bir Kaur	
12	Assistant Professor	Dr. Tilak Raj	
13	Assistant Professor	Dr. Neha Gulati	

Board of Control for GD/PI process for admission to MBA program (s) at UBS/Panjab University, Chandigarh for the academic session 2020-21

Sr. No.	Panel- I	Panel- II
1	Professor A.K. Vashisht	Professor Dinesh K. Gupta
2	Professor B.B. Goyal	Professor S.K. Chadha
3	Professor Karamjeet Singh	Professor Sanjay Kaushik
4	Professor Parmjit Kaur	Professor Suveera Gill
5	Professor Meena Sharma	Professor Monica Bedi
6	Dr. Rupinder Bir Kaur	Dr. Neha Gulati
7	Dr. Tilak Raj	

Shifted from Information in view of the discussion held in the beginning (after Vice Chancellor's Statement)

R-6. The Vice-Chancellor, after taking online approval from Syndicate, approved the following in anticipation of the approval of the Senate:

1. Prof. R.K. Singla, Department of Computer Science & Applications, has been appointed as Dean of University Instruction w.e.f. 01.05.2020 for the period of one year or till the age of superannuation (i.e. 60 years) whichever is earlier.
2. Further, Professor V.R. Sinha, UIPS has been appointed as Dean Research in place of Professor R.K. Singla till further orders.

NOTE: 1. Late Prof. Shankarji Jha, Deptt. of Sanskrit was appointed as Dean of University Instruction for a period of one year w.e.f. the date he joins, vide Syndicate/Senate decision dated 30.03.2018 (para 35) and 27.05.2018 (Para IV), respectively. The Syndicate in its meeting vide Paragraph 3 dated 10.04.2019 recommended to Senate that Late Prof. Shankar Ji Jha, Dean of University Instruction be allowed to continue as such for **one more year w.e.f. 01.05.2019 under**

Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

2. Copy of office orders conveyed vide email dated 27.04.2020 is enclosed **(Appendix-XX)**.
3. An office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XX)**.

Referring to Sub-Item R-1, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that permission has been given to Professor Emanuel Nahar, Professor of Political Science, USOL, to take over the assignment as Chairperson of Punjab State Commission for Minorities till his superannuation, i.e., 31.05.2020, under Rule 4 & 5 at page 63 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019. However, Professor Emanuel Nahar has also got stay from the Hon'ble High Court. He requested that permission be accorded to Professor Emanuel Nahar to act as Chairperson on the Punjab State Commission for Minorities till his continuation in University service.

Discussion on the **Sub-Item R-3** has taken place under Item 22 as well as decision taken thereunder.

Referring to Sub-Item R-5, Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that since Registrar and Dean, College Development Council are having busy schedule, so Board of Control and the panel of UBS be reconstituted and Dean Faculty of Business Management & Commerce in association with Chairperson of UBS and Senior-most faculty of UBS are authorised to reconstitute Board of Control for UBS.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) So far as Sub Item 32-R-1 is concerned, Dr. Emanuel Nahar, Professor of Political Science, USOL, who has taken over the assignment as Chairperson on the Punjab State Commission for Minorities, be allowed to act as such till his continuation in the University services, under Rule 4 & 5 at page 63 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019;
- (ii) the information contained in Item 32-R-2, R-4, R-5 and R-6 on the agenda, be ratified;
- (iii) So far as Sub-Item 32-R-5 is concerned, the Dean Faculty of Business Management and Commerce is authorised to reconstitute Board of Control for UBS in consultation with Chairperson, UBS, and senior-most faculty of UBS by excluding the name of Registrar and Dean, College Development Council from the panel; and
- (iv) So far as Sub Item 32-R-3 is concerned, decision has already been taken under Item 22.

33. Information contained in **Items I-1 to I-16** was read out, viz. –

- I-1.** The Vice-Chancellor vide office order No. 41-45/Estt.-I dated 03.01.2020 has allowed to release annual increment to Dr. Rajesh Kumar Jaiswal, due in July 2014 in view of LPC No. PGGC-

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 30th May, 2020

11/2014/AI/6292 dated 29.10.2014 issued by the Principal Postgraduate Govt. College, Sector-11, Chandigarh.

NOTE: An office note is enclosed.

- I-2.** In partial supersession to the office order No.14518-31/Estt.I dated 02.11.2011, the Vice Chancellor on the recommendation of the Pre-Screening Committee dated 06.01.2020 has allowed the promotion of Dr. Ashish Virk, as Assistant Professor (Stage-I) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), PURC, Ludhiana, w.e.f. 01.07.2009, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.7000/- under UGC Career Advancement Scheme (as per Regulation 2010) at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

NOTE: A copy of revised office order No.1262-66/Estt. I dated 06.02.2020 is enclosed.

- I-3.** In pursuance of orders dated 24.02.2020 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 4888 of 2020 (Dr. Ramanjit Kaur Johal & anothers. Vs. Panjab University and others), wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case:-

The LPA no.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is pending, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Ramanjit Kaur Johal, Professor, Department of Public Administration, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.03.2020, as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No.4888 of 2020 & other similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing on the date of attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filled by him. The payment to her will be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per *per forma*.
- (ii) the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

- I-4.** In pursuance of orders dated 18.03.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 6956 of 2020 (Dr. Ronki Ram Vs Panjab University & Ors.), wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is pending, the Vice Chancellor has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Ronki Ram, Professor, Department of Political Science, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.05.2020 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No. 6956 of 2020 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing on attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per *pro forma*.
- (ii) the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

I-5. The Vice-Chancellor has:

- (i) sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Shamsher Kaur Wd/o Late Sh. Amarjit Singh, Head Mali, Construction Office, Panjab University, Chandigarh who expired on 15.01.2020, 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.
- (ii) allowed the retiral benefit of Sh. Amarjit Singh, Head Mali, P.U. Construction office already sanctioned vide office order No. 21750/Estt. dated 20.12.2019 be treated as cancelled.

I-6. The authority in partial modification to office order no. 21628-36/Estt., dated 18/12/2019 and no. 1773-78/Estt. dated 31.01.2020, has ordered that the word '**Electrical Division**' mentioned in the above office order **be read as 'Work Department'** as per budget provision vide No. 3417-24/Estt. dated 03/03/2020. The remaining part of the above office orders will remain the same

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

I-7. In pursuance of orders dated 24.02.2020 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 4888 of 2020 (titled Dr. Ramanjit Kaur Johal & anrs. Vs. Panjab University and others) vide which the following faculty member has been granted same relief as in LPA 1505 of 2016 to continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases:-

Sr.	Name of faculty	Department	Date	of	W.e.f.	The	date
-----	-----------------	------------	------	----	--------	-----	------

No.	members		superannuation	they continue in service as per interim orders
1.	Dr. Harsukhjrit Kaur	DES-MDRC	31.03.2020	01.04.2020

In this regard, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that:

- (i) the above faculty member be considered to continue in service w.e.f. the date mentioned against her name, as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing on the date of attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by her. The payment to her will be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per Performa.
- (ii) the teacher residing in the University campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court on the next date of hearing.

I-8. The Vice-Chancellor, has re-appointed afresh Dr. Harsimran Kaur Boparai as Assistant Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 04.04.2020 for 11 months i.e. upto 03.03.2021 with one day break on 03.04.2020 or till the post is 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 she was working earlier.

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

I-9. To note order dated 23.03.2020 vide No. F.-2071/F-II(6)-2020/5023 (**Appendix-XXIII**) issued by U.T. Chandigarh, during the period of Lockdown/Curfew the temporary/causal/contractual/Daily wage/ Outsourcing workers be allowed to be treated as 'On duty'.

I-10. The Vice-Chancellor in continuation to office order No. 8246-92/Estt.-1 dated 13.09.2019, in terms of Senate decision dated 14.12.2019 (Para 4), has approved the promotion of Dr. Prashant Jindal from Academic Level 11 to Academic Level 12, in UIET, w.e.f. 22.09.2018, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100/- + AGP of Rs. 8,000/-, 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 vide office order No. 2664-73/Estt-1 dated 14/05/2020. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

NOTE: An office note is enclosed.

I-11. The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendations of the Administrative & Academic Committee dated 18.12.2019 (**Appendix-XXIV**) has sanctioned an amount of Rs.61,110/- as tuition fee for refund to Mr. Nikhil Namreta, student of B.E. (Bio-Tech 4th Semester), UIET, belonging to EWS category, for the session 2019-20.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 29.06.2010 (Para 28) has authorized the Vice-Chancellor for taking decision in such cases in future on the basis of merit and circumstances of each individual cases, on behalf of the Syndicate.

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

I-12. To note the following recommendation of Committee dated 29.03.2020 (**Appendix-XXV**) with regard to suggest measures to cope with COVID-19 that the bills for Guest Faculty be prepared on the following basis:

1. From 1.3.2020 to 14.3.2020 on actual lecture delivered basis.
2. From 15.3.2020 onwards, i.e. since when teaching stand suspended, lectures be counted as per the timetable.

I-13. Shifted to Ratification in view of the discussion held in the beginning (after Vice Chancellor's Statement)

I-14. The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following retirement benefits to Shri Shiv Kumar Verma, Deputy Librarian, VVBIS& IS, Hoshiarpur, up to the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years on 31.03.2018 as he is continuing upto the age of 62 years as per interim orders of the Hon'ble Court dated 15.03.2018 and will be completing 62 years on 31.03.2020:-

1. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007; and
2. Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due to not exceeding 300 days, as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

I-15. The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Dr. Ronki Ram Professor Department of Political Science,	12.06.1995	30.04.2020	(i) Pension/Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 & 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 30th May, 2020

	P.U.			Cal. Vol.-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.
2.	Dr. Emanuel Nahar Professor University School of Open Learning, P.U.	22.12.1999	31.05.2020	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 & 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-2007; (ii) In terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 08.10.2013 and the judgment of Hon'ble High Court dated 23.01.2020 in CWP No.1196 of 2020, the payment of leave encashment will be made only for the number of days Earned leave as due to him but not exceeding 300 days.

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

I-16. The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Sanjeev Kumar Assistant Registrar Accounts Branch, P.U.	12.10.1978	31.03.2020	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Shri Vivek Kumar ASO (Stenography) Department of Economics, P.U.	18.06.1980	31.03.2020	

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 30th May, 2020

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits	
3.	Shri Sankaran Kutty Nair Assistant Registrar Examination Branch-II/ O/o the Registrar, P.U.	27.05.1986	31.03.2020	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.	
4.	Shri Sukhdev Sharma Assistant Registrar General Branch (Syndicate Section), P.U.	21.01.1985	31.03.2020		
5.	Shri Mahinder Pal Assistant Registrar DUI's Office, P.U.	28.01.1982	31.03.2020		
6.	Shri Arun Kumar Mahajan Superintendent Examination Branch-I P.U.	22.11.1982	31.03.2020		
7.	Ms. Maya Devi Superintendent P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana	27.04.1985	31.03.2020		
8.	Ms. Satwant Kaur Superintendent Examination Branch-IV, P.U.	06.06.1990	30.04.2020		
9.	Shri Amarjeet Singh Superintendent R&S Branch, P.U.	06.02.1986	30.04.2020		
10.	Shri Subhash Chand Saini Senior Scientific Officer (G-I) Department of Physics, P.U.	21.07.1993	31.03.2020		
11.	Shri Vivek Kumar Senior Technical Officer (G-I) Department of Microbiology, P.U.	27.03.1984	30.04.2020		Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
12.	Shri Gurdev Singh Senior Technician (G-II) Department of Botany, P.U.	03.09.1982	30.04.2020		
13.	Shri Tilak Raj Senior Assistant Re-evaluation Branch, P.U.	02.04.1993	31.03.2020		

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
14.	Shri Amar Chand Library Restorer Department of Gandhian Studies and Peace Studies, P.U.	29.12.1988	31.03.2020	
15.	Shri Amarjit Singh Mali Department of Botany, P.U.	25.11.1999	30.04.2020	
16.	Shri Raj Singh Cleaner Department of Publication Bureau, P.U.	01.04.1978	30.04.2020	

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

Referring to Sub-Item I-3, Shri Ashok Goyal said that one thing, which he would like to point, is that in March 2019, it was specifically raised that there should not be one day's break in the cases of re-employment but somehow with the oversight still the letter was issued by giving one day's break. Wherever such things have been done, this should be rectified.

It was further pointed out that despite the decision having been taken earlier in 2019, the letter of re-employment to the teachers are being issued with one-day break.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the information contained in Item 33-I-1 to I-16 be noted; and
2. while giving re-employment to teachers, no break should be given. In case one-day break is given earlier that should be rectified and fresh letter of appointment without break be issued.

When the discussion on the agenda items was over, the members started general discussion.

1. Ms. Anu Chatrath said that in the previous meeting of Syndicate held on 8th March, 2020 it was decided to extend the date for submission of Ph.D thesis by 30th June but due to unfortunate condition because of COVID-19 neither the guides nor the supervisors are available and requested that it should be further extended up to 31st December, 2020.

The Vice Chancellor informed that since he is a member of National Committee constituted by the UGC, due cognizance shall be taken of guidelines issued by the UGC from time to time.

2. Ms. Anu Chatrath further raised the issue regarding one of the official in Non-Teaching Staff, Mr. Ravinder Mohan Trikha who received letter from the Panjab University on 26th November, 2018 and 5th September, 2019 in which orders were passed to review his pay scales. On this basis some persons went to the court and the decision went against them in which Mr. Ravinder Mohan Trikha was not the party. Mr Ravinder Trikha gave representation to the Vice-Chancellor and Registrar but no decision was taken. Then the petitioners went

to the Supreme Court to challenge the decision of the High Court for reviewing of their pay scales on the basis of Mr. Ravinder Mohan Trikha. Supreme Court gave in favour of the petitioners. She further requested that, as the retirement of Mr. Trikha is due in January 2021 and his annual increments of 2019 and 2020 are still pending because of the review of the decision in the Supreme Court, a committee should be formed so that decision is taken and the employee who has served for long time in Panjab University does not suffer at the end of his service. She further requested that a Committee be constituted and expressed her willingness to contribute in the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor requested F.D.O. to put the case.

3. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that due to COVID-19 pandemic and requested to start process of screening for the affiliation of colleges. He further said that in some cases persons has applied for research centre for doing Ph.D and requested to start the work a committee of 1-2 members are formed.
4. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua told that letters are sent by some colleges to Panjab University like Guru Nanak Girls College, Ludhiana regarding discontinuation of subjects on 30-8-2019 which are lying in the Registrar Office or in DCDC Office and no committee has been constituted till date. The session is going to start in colleges and they do not know whether to continue or discontinue the teachers who are below the age of 25. He said that there are 2-3 colleges who sent letters but till date no committee has been constituted. He requested the DCDC to attend to these type of serious issues.
5. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua further said that in the meeting of Syndicate held on 8th March, 2020, he raised the issue regarding sending committees to the SGPC colleges to check their working. The pandemic situation as arisen two months back but for the last 3-4 years, two or three colleges of SGPC are not checked. He requested that committees should be formed and sent to these colleges.
6. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua further requested that colleges should be well informed about the framework of the exams whether these are to be reconsidered or rethink so that there is no confusion amongst the colleges while giving statements.
7. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma told the Vice-Chancellor that earlier also he has raised an issue regarding the construction quality for which a committee was constituted and the report of the committee is still awaited. He further emphasized that a mechanism to monitor and facilitate construction works for quality assurance and unfair payments should be made.

The Vice-Chancellor informed that the report has come, it will be conveyed. He assured that the Committee will monitor the entire construction process starting from tendering to completion.

8. Dr. Rabindra Nath Sharma further said that there is Research and Development Department in the Panjab University which needs to be strengthened for the better performance of the Panjab University in Research. The Dean Research should be merged with the Research & Development Department.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa strongly endorsed to the viewpoint raised by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma regarding strengthening of Research and

Development Department of Panjab University with effective infrastructure for improving the ranking and fame of the Panjab University in the world.

The Vice-Chancellor apprised the members that there is one Director, R & D in innovation department in foreign country and they invite research proposals and said that a Committee will be constituted to look into the matter. The Dean Research be merged with Research and Development Department (R&D), to consolidate the R&D Directorate.

9. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma requested the Vice-Chancellor that to tell the status of the decision taken in earlier meeting of the Syndicate regarding taking the legal opinion for the cases related to Pension.

10. Ms. Anu Chatrath said that as informed by Registrar that classes will start from 15th June, 2020 for 15 days. She said that in semester system only classes for one month were taken and it is difficult to complete the syllabi of three months in 15 days which will put pressure on the students.

11. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that in GGN College, Ludhiana the retirement benefits of 10% share of the management contribution has not been implemented. He said that a decision in this regard was taken in 2006 and there are about 20-25 retirees and requested the Vice-Chancellor for the implementation of the same so that the retired persons could get their dues.

12. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said regarding the Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur Cantt. that in Punjab Assembly a demand was raised by two MLAs that the functioning of the college may be probed. He praised the Vice-Chancellor for acting promptly and writing to Deputy Commissioner, Ferozepur to intervene and requested the Vice-Chancellor to look into the matter so that it could reach to a logical conclusion.

13. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa requested that the Computer Department of Panjab University should be fully strengthened and well equipped in the terms of technical and electronic functioning because a need can arise for the training of all the officers of the Panjab University for 1-3 months.

The Vice-Chancellor informed the members that they would be happy to know that the Panjab University was going to conduct webinar and video conferencing at 5-6 places and a committee in this regard has already been constituted.

14. Ms. Anu Chatrath informed that the Vice-Chancellor has also written to Prof. Deepak Kapur, Chairperson, University Business School regarding holding webinar and holding online classes. In compliance initiatives were taken by Prof. Deepak Kapur for training of the faculty members of UBS for taking online classes.

The Vice Chancellor informed that not only UBS, many Chairpersons/ Coordinators/Heads of the Departments had organized webinar and some of them have organized more than once. He further informed that many Chairpersons had organized a series of webinars. He expressed his appreciation for them.

15. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that one of his colleague who is Advocate and District Attorney. His son was a good sports person and playing Ranji Trophy is facing problem with regard to clash in exams. He requested Controller of Examination to take action for solving his problem.

16. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa further informed that one Sweeper-cum-Mali Mr. Sanjay who has been terminated without any explanation and requested the Vice-Chancellor to look into the matter and his explanation be sought.
17. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa further requested the Vice-Chancellor that while conducting the exams in this pandemic situation of COVID-19 it should be taken care off that the student may be allowed to appear a centre of their choice. For example if a student has gone to Gurdaspur then the nearest station like Zira or Moga can be given to him/her.

The Vice Chancellor informed that the University is already working on this issue.
18. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa told that in Panjab University a private contractor is providing staff under MTS for the last 1^{1/2} years without any tender and requested the Vice-Chancellor to give special attention in such cases where human resource is involved because without any agreement there is no liability of the contractor in case of any default.

The Vice Chancellor assured the House that a proper monitoring and economization will be ensured in the MTS services. A proper mechanism shall be developed to monitor the same.
19. Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she submitted a representation to the Controller of Examinations stating that there is a student whose graduation degree is clear but in one paper in which she was to appear in May 2020. As she is in abroad and will not be in a position to come and appear in exams for almost two years. Ms. Anu Chatrath requested that there should be a provision of Online Examination from the side of Panjab University.
20. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is one girl student named Ms. Manjinder Kaur of Department of Human Genome and she was a Cancer Patient due to which s he could not appear in one semester. For this purpose a committee was constituted in which he was a member and it was recommended to allow her and the matter was supposed to come in this Syndicate but did not come and requested the Vice-Chancellor that the matter may please be looked into and resolved.
21. Professor Navdeep Goyal further said that due to COVID-19 there are so many persons who were supposed to vacate the University Accommodation but could not do so. He requested that we should also follow the UT Administration that those persons should not be charged penal rent for the period after March to June due to pandemic. After June they can be asked to vacate but up to June month no penal rent be charged from April to June and penal rent be charged as was in February 2020.
22. Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the COVID has affected us all and congratulated the Vice-Chancellor for his efforts and taking care Panjab University during the period of lockdown before opening the University. He requested that during the post lockdown period when the Panjab University is opened it would be essential to take care with regard to sanitizing. He said that the Panjab University gave Hostels to UT Administration to make quarantine centers and some hostels are located adjoining the residential area could be risk to the residents and requested that it should also be taken care off.

23. Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the colonies adjoining hostels and residential areas should also be sanitized and he had also talked to the Registrar in this regard. For this purpose Fire Department, U.T. may be asked to provide Fire Tenders for proper sanitising of roads and free spaces in PU Campus and Hostels.
24. Professor Keshav Malhotra further said that there are external areas of Departments, Administrative Block, Hostels, residential areas etc. He suggested that there is a medicine named Sodium Hydrochloride and if the areas are cleaned with that medicine, it would be better to stop COVID-19. He also said that there is one more medicine named Oxivir should also be used for cleaning surface of buildings and requested that special training be given to Sweepers-cum-Malis so that they could know how to use it. He said that if the teachers are asked to come on 15th June 2020 then they should be given confidence that proper sanitization has been done in the departments.
25. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa told that the sanitizer bottles are used at the entrance of Administrative Gates which result in wastage of money and suggested that the machines of automatic spray could be installed there to avoid the wastage.
26. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there are some private candidates who could not apply for exams during the pandemic and requested that late fee for filling the form online may be waived off.
27. Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in addition to this the letters relating to re-employment are being issued in which it being is mentioned that house would be allotted to them on normal rent for two months.
- Shri Ashok Goyal said that one line should be added in these letters is that after two or four months, market rent would be charged.
- The Vice Chancellor said that he will look into the case.**
28. In last the Vice-Chancellor expressed his respect and condolences towards the corona warriors who lost their lives while saving the lives of others and also highly appreciated the work of corona warriors of Panjab University, i.e., Medical Staff, XEN (Hort.), Security Guards, Sweeper-cum-Malis, Daily wage workers, etc. who did great job during the pandemic in facilitating and safeguarding the lives in Panjab University.

Karamjeet Singh
Registrar

Confirmed

RAJ KUMAR
VICE-CHANCELLOR