

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate held on **28th October, 2023 at 11.00 a.m.** in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

1. Professor Renu Vig ... (in the Chair)
Vice Chancellor
2. Professor Devinder Singh
3. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
4. Professor Gurmeet Singh
5. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua
6. Dr. Jagtar Singh
7. Professor Jatinder Grover
8. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk
9. Dr. Mukesh Arora
10. Dr. Parveen Goyal
11. Principal R.S. Jhanji
12. Shri Sandeep Singh
13. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
14. Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra
15. Shri Varinder Singh
16. Professor Yajvender Pal Verma ... (Secretary)
Registrar

Principal Kirandeep Kaur, Director, Higher Education, Punjab and Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, could not attend the meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said, "I welcome all the Members of Syndicate and wish a very Good Morning to all".

Condolence Resolution

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

- i) Dr. P.K. Mehta, Professor (Retd.), Department of Geology, on 09.09.2023;
- ii) Dr. Sumangal Roy husband of Dr. Jayanti Dutta, HRDC, on, i.e., 27.09.2023; and
- iii) Mr. Pardeep S/o Shri Satya Dev, student of M.Tech., Department of Nano Science & Technology, on 14.10.2023.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Dr. P. K. Mehta, Dr. Sumangal Roy and Mr. Pardeep 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) The Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) awarded Rs.61 lakh grant to Dr. Deepak B Salunke and Professor Sukhbir Kaur to conduct research for the development of new vaccine formulations.
- ii) It is matter of pride for the Panjab University that as many as 32 Panjab University faculty members have featured among top 2% scientists worldwide, as per the lists released by Stanford University.
- iii) A three-day National Conference, **CHASCON-2023**, on "**Global Science for Global well-being**" was organized by Panjab University, Chandigarh, in association with CRIKC from October 12-14, 2023. Padma Shri awardee Professor Balram Bhargava, President, National Academy of Sciences, India, former Director General, ICMR, and Professor of Cardiology, AIIMS, New Delhi, delivered the keynote address.
- iv) To commemorate its establishment, i.e., 14th October, 1882 at Lahore (Now in Pakistan), Panjab University celebrated its 141st Foundation Day on 14th October, 2023 with great enthusiasm. On this occasion, foundation day lecture was delivered by **Padma Shri Dr. Jatinder Kumar Bajaj**, former Chairperson of Indian Council for Social Sciences Research (ICSSR).
- v) Padma Shri Professor G.D. Yadav, National Science Chair, SERB, DST GOI, Emeritus Professor of Eminence and J.C. Bose National Fellow, delivered the oration in the "**Panjab University Pharmaceutical Sciences Oration-2023**" on the theme "**Green Chemistry, sustainability and need of the pharma industry**" on 19th October 2023.
- vi) The Indian Council for Medical Research (ICMR) has awarded a research grant of Rs.42 lakh to Dr Vijayta D. Chadha, Chairperson, Centre for Nuclear Medicine, Panjab University, for the synthesis and bio-evaluation of nano-based radiopharmaceuticals in cancer imaging.
- vii) UIET, Panjab University, has figured in the list of 100 Institutions that will get 5G Use-case labs as part of the initiative of the Department of Telecommunication (DoT), Ministry of Communications. The objective of the labs is to build competencies and engagement in 5G and beyond technologies for students and start-up communities.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that it is a good tradition that Scientists who have visited the University to attend CHASCON, have been awarded with certificates of appreciation. This good tradition of awarding of appreciation certificates, should be continued to be followed in every field, where the faculty members or the departments put such type of contribution, in functions organized from time to time.

For the purpose, a Committee of senior members should be constituted to chalk out the schedule for honouring the faculty in such functions.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that the representation of teachers of Colleges of U.T. should be taken into consideration, who are standing outside the Administrative Block, before taking up the Agenda.

The Vice Chancellor replied that the said matter was discussed with those teachers and was resolved in consultation with Professor Sanjay Kaushik, DCDC.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that decision was taken to impose condition under 11.1 on the Colleges situated in Punjab, but for the Colleges in U.T., the teachers are not getting their due, hence the University should take appropriate decision for these Colleges also.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that this matter had already been discussed in the meetings of the Syndicate several times, but actually when the letter is issued from the office, its meaning is different. They could not comprehend as to what is the issue. It seemed that deliberately the circular letter is being wrongly issued or they did not want to issue a correct circular. There is a lot of discrimination amongst the Colleges between the teachers posted at aided or non-aided posts. Was it not the duty of the University to ask the Colleges that how they used the amount of fee enhanced @ 12.5% by them?

It was informed that three circulars have been issued to Colleges. He asked as to what ambiguity is, in these circular letters.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that first is that, the circular letter was issued only for Colleges located at Chandigarh. The Panjab University has affiliated Colleges located at Punjab and Chandigarh. Why the step-motherly treatment is being given to Colleges located in Punjab? Hence, circular letter should have been issued for all affiliated Colleges of Panjab University. Secondly, it should be written in the circular letters that within one month the pay scale of teachers should be revised under intimation to the Panjab University.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the issue raised by Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu and Dr. Jagtar Singh is serious, due to the reason that generally the Colleges of Chandigarh are considered as role model Colleges of the University. In Chandigarh, where there is no financial crunch or any other issue pertaining to Admissions, how this demarcation is being done for aided or non-aided Colleges? In University also, the number of self-financing Departments are more than the traditional departments. The condition which is not being imposed on the University Campus, Regional Centres, how the Colleges situated at 1 k.m. of the University, could impose this condition. The issue cannot be resolved only by sending a circular letter; rather, there is a need to send Fact-Finding Committees to know exactly as to what is the reason. The details regarding admissions and revenue of the Colleges should be placed on record and on its basis, they should take decision to treat both aided or non-aided Colleges equally at par. Even in Chandigarh, the faculty is divided into several categories i.e., Aided posts, non-aided posts. In Punjab, the Management has refrained the College teachers to write the designation of Assistant Professor against their names.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu and Dr. Jagtar Singh said that the common seniority list of teachers is not in the record of the Colleges.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that these things should be got examined as the letter sent by the University did not cover these things.

It was stated that in the Action taken report, these three points were mentioned. Firstly, the University asked the Colleges to implement the revision of pay scales in all the affiliated Colleges, whether aided or non-aided. Secondly, it had also been mentioned that as fee was hiked only with the condition that the recommendations of 7th Pay Commission would be implemented. Hence, separate letters were issued to the Colleges situated in Punjab and Chandigarh as in Punjab, the service conditions of Punjab Government are to be followed and for Colleges located at Chandigarh, the guidelines of U.G.C. in *toto* are to be followed.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it should not be such that as the fees had been enhanced, they are required to pay the 7th Pay Commission. The Colleges are bound to implement the 7th Pay Commission even without enhancing the fee structure.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that the arrears of pay revision have been received by the teachers posted at aided posts, but the colleagues serving with them on non-aided posts, have not been given the salaries as per 7th Pay Commission.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the decision to pay the salaries in accordance with 7th Pay Commission should be taken in a time bound manner.

It was clarified that no action has deliberately been taken in it, as pointed out by one of the members. The first circular letter was issued for all the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University, but he received several phone calls that the Colleges offering self-financing courses, are not acceding to the requests to pay the salaries according to 7th Pay Commission. He requested that they should give at least one week's time to the Management to pay the salaries in accordance with 7th Pay Commission.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that in the letters issued to Colleges located at Chandigarh, the word "guest faculty" is used. Instead of "guest faculty", the word contractual/temporary should be used.

It was clarified that the problem is that, the said letter was issued on the basis of U.G.C. notification, where nothing is mentioned and only, the word "guest faculty" has been used.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that U.G.C. is using the word "guest faculty" for part-time/temporary faculty. He asked why the University is allowing the Colleges to use other nomenclature. The University should instruct them to use only the nomenclature of the U.G.C. The Colleges should refrain from using the term contractual or part-time, they should allow to use the nomenclature as per U.G.C. The pay structure as per U.G.C. should be got implemented in the Colleges. If all the nomenclatures are to be used, all of these should be mentioned in the circular.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that in another item of the Agenda pertaining to Adjunct Faculty of the University, wherein the nomenclatures have been changed as per the University. The term "guest faculty" should be specified in the circular letter and it should also be specified that payment of salaries to guest faculty should be made in accordance the guidelines of U.G.C.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it might be so, that during inspection, guest faculty should not be counted as faculty. The purpose is to pressurize the College to implement the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission.

It was clarified that in inspection, the guest faculty is not being counted.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that letter regarding enhancement of honorarium from Rs.25,000/- to Rs.50,000/- has also not been sent to the Colleges.

It was informed that letter pertaining to guest faculty had been issued.

Professor Jatinder Grover reiterated that letter regarding contractual teachers has also not been issued. He requested that the same should be issued at the earliest.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the condition of 7 days should be imposed on the Colleges to implement the recommendations of 7th Pay Commission. After the expiry of seven days, if the Colleges failed to implement the same, Committees should be sent after approval from the Syndicate in its next meeting. He suggested that it should be got ensured that sentiments of the Syndicate in the form of condolence letters are conveyed to the concerned persons or their family.

Professor Devinder Singh said that the problems might rise in implementation of pay scales according to 7th Pay Commission without common seniority list. They are saying that courses being run are self-financed and not the teachers.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua clarified that it is not so. The matter regarding parity is being discussed, because in some of the Colleges, there no different system, there is only one common seniority list; hence, he suggested that in Colleges, where there is no parity, there is need to do so.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it is the duty of the University to have a check on the quality education. The quality education could not be delivered, till the rightful issues of teachers are not resolved.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the Colleges located at Chandigarh have the required funds; hence, they could implement the recommendations of 7th Pay Commission. But with regard to Colleges situated in the State of Punjab, there are certain Colleges, which are not able to pay in accordance with the 7th Pay Commission. Before taking decision, the condition of Colleges situated in Punjab, should be kept in mind. Strict action should be taken against the Colleges situated in Chandigarh, which in spite of having the capacity of paying, are not implementing the 7th Pay Commission.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that before allowing any course in the Colleges, the Management studies the viability of the course. The Inspection Committee of the University visits to check the viability of the course and the viability includes salaries to be paid to teachers. If the courses are not viable, why the Management had started the same? If the Management had started the course, they have to bear the expenses.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that before taking up the Agenda, he would like to refer to the Action Taken Report of the meeting.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu asked as to what is resolved for the discussion on it?

The Vice Chancellor said that it is resolved that time condition of one month be imposed on the Colleges to implement the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that time period of one month is on the higher side, as this decision to implement the 7th Pay Commission Report was taken in the month of September, 2023; hence, time of two weeks' should be given for its implementation.

The Vice Chancellor agreed to it that time of two weeks' be given to the Management of the Colleges for implementation of recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that as per news item published in one of the newspapers, the meeting of the Management Committees is scheduled on 16th November, 2023

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that meeting which is scheduled for 16th November is only for the D.A.V. Colleges.

The members agreed with the Vice Chancellor that time period of 3 weeks be given to the Management of the Colleges for implementing the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said while referring to C-18 appearing in Action Taken Report of the meeting of the Syndicate dated 26.08.2023 pertaining to the decision regarding guest faculty. At point (iii) of the Resolved part regarding decision for payment of honorarium/remuneration be paid to the guest faculty for participating or presenting papers in the Conferences/ Seminars/Workshops, he is not clear on the issue as this item was neither on the Agenda nor approved. It was only the suggestion put forth by one of the members. How could the suggestions of the members become the resolved part?

The Vice Chancellor clarified that the tentative minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate held on 26.08.2023 were circulated to the members.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that how could they justify this decision?

The Vice Chancellor asked when the resolved part was circulated, this point was not written/mentioned in the minutes.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that for attending Conference/Seminar of two days, as to what amount of honorarium would be paid to the guest faculty.

The Vice Chancellor said that in fact, this decision was taken only due to the reason that for organizing seminars/conferences, the guest faculty may actively involves in it as they are deprived from the honorarium for these two days.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that this decision is considered as vague. If this decision would be implemented, it would ultimately lead into new avenues. Resultantly, the guest faculty would be more demanding.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that this decision was taken keeping in view of the discussion held on 26.08.2023 that if the guest faculty comes for participation in seminar/conference, to pay for that one day, this provision was proposed to be created and the services taken from them would be counted as a lecture.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he had no problem in allowing this honorarium to guest faculty, but in future, it might be possible that the guest faculty would request for payment of registration fee for participation in the seminars/conferences.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that this payment should not be considered as honorarium rather it is to be treated as payment of lecture for the day of seminar/conference.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that one more consequence of this decision is that, e.g., on the day of Seminar, if one guest faculty has 4 lectures and another has one lecture in time table, one person would get the payment of 4 lectures and the other would get payment for one lecture. How could they justify this? He further suggested that this resolved part should be corrected as it was not the part of the Agenda. The major concern is that how could they bear the financial liability for the same.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this decision was taken in the spirit to compensate for their services rendered for conduct of seminars/conferences. He suggested that the resolved part should be drafted keeping in view that spirit.

The Vice Chancellor said that she agreed that this was the spirit behind the decision, but at the same time, this decision was taken for their learning and also to facilitate them for appearing before the Selection Committee.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that Audit Department would pay to the guest faculty as per the time table.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. No. (i) to (vii), be noted;
2. the Action Taken Report in respect of the decisions of the Syndicate meetings dated 26.08.2023 (**Appendix-I**), be noted; and
3. 3 weeks' time be given to the Management of the Colleges for implementing the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission failing which explanation be sought from such Colleges to know as to why they are not implementing the recommendations of 7th Pay Commission.

- 2.** Considered the following recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 04.10.2023 (Item Nos. 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 17):-

Item No. 3

That –

1. The Revised Estimates 2023-24 and Budget Estimates 2024-25 duly recommended by the Budget Estimates Committee as per Appendix-I & II be approved and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to make re-appropriation from one budget head to another within the overall approved budget allocation.
2. The Ministry of Education, Government of India, may be requested to enhance the annual salary grant for the year 2023-2024 from Rs.294.78 crore to Rs.346.07 crore which has been worked out by applying the same principle as were followed while determination of grant in unrevised scales vide directive dated 19.06.2017 with provision of 6% annual enhancement, on account of implementation of revised pay-scales.
3. In reference to the communication of Govt. of Punjab vide FD-FE-201(HEL)/36/2020-1FE2/1/ 618425/2023 dated 10.08.2023 where by intimation of enhancement of salary grant to Rs.85.37 crore for 2023-24 was conveyed to University, the Punjab Govt. may be requested to continue with the provision of annual enhancement @ 6% from the year 2024-25 onwards as has already been agreed and being followed since 2017-18 in terms of Punjab & Haryana High Court order dated 26.03.2018 in CWP No.18745/2016.
4. On account of implementation of revised pay-scales, the Governments may be requested to sanction and release one time grant of Rs.278.17 crore for payment of arrears of pay-revision.

Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 28.10.2023

The summarized position of Revenue Budget Estimates is as follows:

(A) Revenue Receipts:

							(Rupees in lacs)
Sr No.	Heads of Income	Actuals		Estimates for the current year 2023-24			2024-25
		2021-22	2022-23	Original	Actuals w.e.f. 01.04.2023 to 30.09.2023	Revised	Estimates
(A)	Revenue Receipts						
I	Fee of Examinations	11748.14	18242.30	14300.00	2866.01	14500.00	14600.00
II	Partially Self-Financed Departments	6940.63	7490.87	7401.78	3955.54	7902.00	8350.00
III	University Teaching Departments	1192.49	1322.67	1475.68	1187.83	1550.00	1800.00
IV	Centre for Distance and Online Education (CDOE)	1872.15	1686.66	1533.25	1099.43	1850.00	1950.00
V	Registration Certificate/CET fee etc.	2869.67	2829.57	3338.01	1737.45	3050.00	3300.00
VI	Income from Hostels	345.31	1028.44	1206.50	644.08	1200.00	1250.00
VII	Income from Sports Fee (PUSC)	394.97	431.17	453.26	172.59	526.35	527.35
VIII	Pub. Bureau, Lib. fee & Research Journals	16.26	19.51	24.17	11.78	21.00	21.00
IX	Other Income (i.e. Interest, Late admission fee, Sale of Admission forms, Rent of Guest Houses & Sale of Scraps etc.)	848.78	868.55	1162.30	472.03	954.79	1132.67
X	Affiliation Continuation Fee	42.18	43.97	50.00	19.90	50.00	50.00
XI	Non-Recurring Receipts such as Lapsed Securities, Rotational Entrance Test etc.	115.72	40.09	50.00	0.00	50.00	250.00
	Total (Revenue Receipts)	26386.29	34003.79	30994.95	12166.64	31654.14	33231.02
(B)	ANNUAL MAINTENANCE GRANTS						
a)	UGC/MHRD	26235.00	27809.10	29477.65	14738.82	34607.00	36683.42
b)	Govt. of Punjab	2808.78	3932.30	3830.00	1535.56	8537.00	9049.22
c)	Supplementary Grant	0.00	0.00	11867.61	0.00	0.00	0.00
(B1)	Grants against shortfall of previous years (Punjab Govt.)	0.00	0.00	0.00	425.00	425.00	0.00
	Total (Annual Maintenance Grants)	29043.78	31741.40	45175.26	16699.38	43569.00	45732.64
	Total	55430.08	65745.19	76170.21	28866.02	75223.14	78963.66
(C)	One time additional grant for payment of arrears					27817.45	0.00

NOTE: The examination fee of 2022-23 includes fee pertaining to one semester of previous academic session as the academic session of 2021-22 was delayed because of COVID-19.

(B) Revenue Expenditure

(Rupees in lacs)

Sr. No.	Heads of Expenditure	Actuals		Estimates for the current year 2023-24			Budget Estimates 2024-25
		2021-22	2022-23	Original	Actuals w.e.f. 01.04.2023 to 30.09.2023	Revised	
1	Salaries	36695.68	40736.33	48050.74	20892.92	45990.20	49585.16
2	i)Retirement Benefit (Leave-encashment/ Gratuity etc.)	2046.38	2417.80	3349.60	1464.33	4052.92	3370.13
	ii) Provision for Pension	9526.11	10974.21	13130.64	7710.69	13402.54	13726.38
3	Medical Assistance/ medicines	591.99	637.76	816.50	258.39	731.50	781.50
4	Leave Travel Concession/Home Town Concession	26.04	302.44	126.50	24.73	126.50	126.50
5	Books & Journals, Publications etc.	904.86	961.80	1112.85	67.04	1143.49	1143.63
6	Teaching & Research Aids and Other outreach activities	205.84	277.81	384.99	92.74	389.20	407.46
7	Scholarships/ Fellowship/ Subsidy/ Contribution etc.	330.94	381.16	567.79	111.64	594.92	594.92
8	New Academic Programme, NAAC Fee, Registration Fee etc.	5.03	37.68	42.11	19.26	51.53	60.03
9	Conducting Examinations (except Salary Components)	1949.84	2893.62	4074.33	1168.09	3804.72	4022.05
10	i)Office & Other General Administration expenditure	475.84	608.23	735.08	251.38	777.84	786.01
	ii) Audit Fee (Local Audit Department, U.T., Chandigarh)	175.42	145.65	275.00	0.00	154.39	154.39
	iii) Election of Fellows	142.69	0.00	2.50	0.00	35.00	185.00
11	Electricity & Water Charges	716.78	1059.06	1032.83	633.98	1272.05	1295.58
12	Running, Repair & Maintenance of equipment's and vehicles etc.	224.04	280.03	387.93	102.75	417.76	418.40
13	Annual Repair, Maintenance & Minor Improvements (Civil, Electrical, Public health etc.)	733.33	963.71	1032.82	441.65	1123.93	1123.93
14	Refund of fee & Other Non-recurring expenditure	0.00	1.13	27.00	0.00	27.00	27.00
15	Hostel Expenditure (excluding Salaries of regular employees)	137.63	338.23	473.95	186.77	522.40	546.84
16	Expenditure on Sports Activities (PUSC)	409.67	555.07	547.05	213.44	605.25	608.75
	Total	55298.11	63571.72	76170.21	33639.80	75223.14	78963.66
17	*Pay revision arrear					27817.45	

NOTE: 1. The actual expenditure includes the accrued expenditure including the provision for gratuity & leave encashment with respect to teachers who have been allowed to continue beyond

the age of 60 years as per the interim direction of Hon'ble High Court. The actual disbursement shall be made against the liabilities as reflected in the Balance Sheet.

2. Payment of Salary also includes provision for filling up of 50 teaching posts (40 Assistant Professor and 10 Associate Professor).
3. *To meet the liability of arrear of pay revision including pension & other retirement benefits, one time additional grant has been sought from the Governments.

Item No.5

That –

1. The revision of pay of post of Senior Law Officer be carried out in reference to the pay band and GP of Rs.15600-39100 GP 6600 as on 1.1.2006.
2. To make comparative analysis of the essential qualification/experience requirements of the posts of Law Officer and Assistant Law Officer, a Committee may be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor which shall make appropriate recommendations and the Vice-Chancellor is authorized to approve and implement the recommendation of said committee.

NOTE: 1. In terms of the recommendation of the Board of Finance dated 17.10.2012 (vide agenda Item No.26) and decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (vide agenda item No.26), the posts of Senior Law Officer, Law Officer and Assistant Law Officer were created for the constitution of Legal Cell, in Panjab University with qualification/eligibility conditions and pay scales as under:

Post	Pay Scale	Qualification/Eligibility/Experience
Senior Law Officer	15600-39100 GP 7400	LLB professional degree with 55% marks and 10 year experience of practice as lawyer
Law Officer	15600-39100 GP 5400	LLB professional degree with 55% marks and 7 year experience of practice as lawyer
Assistant Law Officer	10300-34800 GP 4800	LLB professional degree with 55% marks and 5 year experience of practice as lawyer

2. As per the office record (C-40 of the file of creation of above posts refers), the above pay scales were adopted on the basis of Government of Punjab Notification No. 5/10/2009-5FPI/1304 dated 21.12.2011 (**Appendix-V**) (**Page 29**) with respect to the posts of District Attorney,

Deputy District Attorney and Assistant District Attorney, respectively. Therefore, for the purpose of revision of pay scales of the posts of SLO, Law Officer and Assistant Law Officer, the corresponding scales of District Attorney, Dy. District Attorney and Assistant District Attorney as on 1.1.2006 may be allowed to be referred, as follows;

Post	Scales at the time of creation of Post, i.e., 17.10.2012	Scales as on 1.1.2006
Senior Law Officer	15600-39100 GP 7400	15600-39100 GP 6600
Law Officer	15600-39100 GP 5400	10300-34800 GP 5400
Assistant Law Officer	10300-34800 GP 4800	10300-34800 GP 4400

Item No.6

That a Committee be constituted by the University to examine Pay Anomaly cases in the light of instructions of Govt. of Punjab and make appropriate recommendations and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to approve the recommendations of the committee for implementation.

Item No.7

That an Honorarium @ 500 per day be paid to the Class 'C' employees of the Secrecy Branch and Drivers (Regular and contractual) for performing the Examination duty, i.e. Delivery and Collection of Answer-sheets (for evaluation/re-evaluation) to/from the spot evaluation Centers/Examiners' Residence/Colleges/University and Educational institutions, which are located outside Chandigarh, in addition of Daily Allowance

Financial Liability: 2,75,000/- Per Annum (approx.)

- NOTE:** 1. On the recommendation of the committee dated 01-03-2017, duly approved by the Syndicate dated 20-03-2017, the rate of honorarium for the staff deputed to deliver/collect the questions papers/answer books etc. during the annual/ supplementary/semester examinations for out stations and local examination centers were revised as follows. (Book of Instructions 2022 page No. 53 refers)

Existing Provision	
(i)	For zonal Teams, deputed for supply/collection of exam. materials included answer-books (as per approval of the syndicate vide paragraph No.12 dated 20-03-2017

<p>(ii) For Outstation Duty:</p> <p>'A' Class official: Rs. 700/- 'B' Class official: Rs. 650/- 'C' Class official: Rs. 500/-</p> <p>For Local Duty:</p> <p>'A' Class official: Rs. 250/- 'B' Class official: Rs. 200/- 'C' Class official: Rs. 175/-</p>

2. The above rule covers only the duties for collection of answers books to/from the evaluation centers. However, the office of Controller of Examination has to deliver/collect the answers book to/from residences of the examiners also. To cover the same, the proposal has been put up for consideration of Board of Finance.

Item No.8

That the following rates of remuneration as proposed be compared with rates prescribed by U.T. Chandigarh as well as under the Ayush Scheme, Govt. of India and the Vice-Chancellor is authorized to approve the remuneration structure which is considered as best for these positions:-

Sr. No	Category of posts	Last revision/fixation	Emoluments	
			Current	Proposed w.e.f. 01.08.2023
1.	Medical Officers (full time) on contract basis	Revised vide BOF dated 13.11.2018	Rs. 62738/-	Rs. 95594/-
2.	Visiting Consultant (4 hours duty)		Rs. 34854/-	Rs. 44258/-
3.	Part Time Specialists in various fields i.e. Gynae, Radiology & Eye, Medical Specialists etc.(2 hours duty)		Rs. 27883/-	Rs. 35406/-
4.	Part time medical officer Ayurvedic	Revised vide BOF dated 14.10.2022 (In November, 2018 these posts were left out)	Rs.13942/-	Rs. 17704/-
5.	Homeopathy Medical Officer		Rs. 35134/-	Rs. 44613/-
The emoluments of the above mentioned posts may be enhanced once in a year proportionate to DA enhancement/ DC rate (%age from time to time).				

Financial Liability: Rs.10, 67,171/- (1.8.23 to 28.2.24) (approx.)

NOTE: 1. The Chief Medical Officer (CMO) initiated a note highlighting the need to revise the emoluments of Medical Officers. The note of CMO is attached **(Appendix-IX) (Page 37)**.

2. A Committee was constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the matter. The Committee proposed the above enhancement as per **(Appendix - X) (Page 38-39)**.

Item No.10

That the Notification No. 4/61/2014-2FPPC/1052 dated 04.07.2019 issued by Government of Punjab, Department of Finance regarding Implementation of Judgement dated 30.09.2016 in CWP No. 2866 of 2014 titled as Karanvir Singh & ors. Vs State of Punjab & ors. w.r.t the benefit of enhanced pension for those who retired between 01.01.2006 to 30.11.2011 be adopted as per (Appendix-XII) (Page 42-46).

NOTE: The said notification has also been adopted by the Chandigarh Administration, Finance Department vide No.65/1/34-UTFII(12)-2019/12256 dated 31.07.2019 **(Appendix-XIII) (Page 47)**.

Item No.12

That the pay-scale/pay band to the following Lab. Technicians in terms of orders of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 20367 of 2012 and CWP No. 20510 of 2018 (O&M), (Appendix-XVI) (Page 52-54) as per (office orders No.1536-1541/Estt. dated 27.01.2023, (Appendix-XVII) (Page 55) be granted:

Sr. No.	Name of the Incumbent	Date of Joining	Pay Scale at the time of appointment	Pay Scale w.e.f. 05.09.2014 as per O.O. No. 10089-98/Estt. dated 23.04.2015	Pay Scale w.e.f. 01.12.2011 as per decision of Hon'ble High Court, dated 16.12.2022 and B.E.2022-23
1	Sh. Deepak Bajaj, Laboratory Technician, Health Centre, P.U	10.05.2006 (AN)	Rs. 4020-6200 (Allowance for emergent case @ Rs. 75/- P.M.)	Rs. 10300-34800+GP-3200	Rs. 10300-34800+GP-3200
2	Sh. Dheeraj Gupta, Laboratory Technician, Dr. HSJ Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U.	03.04.2006 Resigned from Service of P.U. w.e.f. 22.09.2014	Rs. 3120-100-3220-110-3660-120-4260-140-4400-150-5000-160-5160 (plus allowances)	Rs. 10300-34800+GP-3200	Rs. 10300-34800+GP-3200

3	Sh. Yogesh Puri, Laboratory Technician, Dr. HSJ Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U.	12.11.2007 (AN)	Rs. 3120-100-3220-110-3660-120-4260-140-4440-150-5000-160-5160 (plus allowances)	Rs. 10300-34800+GP-3200	Rs. 10300-34800+GP-3200
4	Ms. Reshu Gupta, Laboratory Technician, Dr. HSJ Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U.	21.12.2012 (AN)	Rs. 5910-20200+GP-2400	Rs. 10300-34800+GP-3200	Rs. 10300-34800+GP-3200
In addition to above, two employees are also working on contract basis in the following Departments against the vacant posts:-					
1	Ms. Kiran Kumari, Laboratory Technician (on contract), Dr. HSJ Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U.	17.11.2008 DA+DP	Rs. 3120+DP+ADA	Rs. 10300-34800+GP-3200	Rs. 10300-34800+GP-3200
This is in partial supersession of Office Order no. 10089-98/Estt. dated 23.04.2015.					

- NOTE:**
1. The Punjab Govt. re-revised the pay-scale of certain categories of employees w.e.f. 1.12.2011. The exact nomenclatures of posts of aforementioned incumbents were not covered in the re-revision notifications of Punjab Government.
 2. In this regard, a petition was filed (by Dheeraj Gupta & Deepak Bajaj) before the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 20367 of 2012. During the pendency of such petition, the claims of such employees were considered by the University. On the recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 19.02.2015 the Establishment Branch vide office order No. 10089-98/Estt. dated 23.04.2015 has allowed the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP 3200 for the posts of above incumbents to be effective from 05.09.2014 **subject to the condition that the petitioners withdraw their Court case:**
 3. The petitioner did not withdraw the petition as they were representing for grant of pay scale w.e.f. 01.12.2011. They filed another petition CWP No.20510 of 2018 (O&M) for release the benefit of scales of Rs. 10300-34800+ GP 3200 w.e.f. 01.12.2011.

4. The Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court vide its order dated 16.12.2022, issued directions for grant of pay-scales to the Petitioners w.e.f. 01.12.2011 instead of 5.9.2014. Since other two regular employees (i.e. Sh. Yogesh Puri and Smt. Reshu Gupta, Laboratory Technician) were also similarly placed, therefore the Establishment Section vide the office order dated 27.01.2023 granted the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP 3200 (w.e.f. 01.12.2011) to those employees also in terms of Panjab Government notification No. 12/39/2002-5PP-II/9406 dated 17.07.2002. In addition, Ms. Kiran Kumari working on contract basis in regular scale) was also granted the same benefit.
5. The Assistant Controller Local Audit (ACLA) vide noting dated 01.06.2023 has observed

“previously two cases of Deepak Bajaj and Deepak Gupta were admitted to avoid contempt of orders of court. These two cases along with cases of others staff to whom the PU wants to grant the benefit may be got approved from the Board of Finance/Syndicate /Senate at the earliest to avoid hardship being faced by employees”.

**Financial Liability: - Arrear Rs.37,90,473/-(approx.)
Rs.4,58,280/- p.a.(approx.)**

Item No. 13

To ratify the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Committee dated 26.04.2023 that the rates of stipend of the following Apprentices be revised from Rs.3542/- p.m. to Rs.8000/- p.m. in terms of Circular No. BT/AA/Revised Stipend/ 2021/991 dated 31.12.2021 issued by the Board of Apprenticeship Training (Northern Region) as per **(Appendix-XVIII & XIX) (Page 56-57 & 58):**

Sr. No.	Name of Department	No. of Apprentices	Current Stipend	Prescribed minimum amount of Stipend	Government share of Reimbursement to Establishment
1.	Architect Unit	4	Rs. 3542/ p.m.	Rs. 8000/ p.m.	Rs. 4000/ p.m.
2.	A.P.J. Abdul Kalam Computer Centre	3	Rs. 3542/ p.m.	Rs. 8000/ p.m.	Rs. 4000/ p.m.
3.	A.C. Joshi Library	5	Rs. 3542/ p.m.	Rs. 8000/ p.m.	Rs. 4000/ p.m.
4.	Extension Library Ludhiana	2	Rs. 3542/ p.m.	Rs. 8000/ p.m.	Rs. 4000/ p.m.

Item No.15

That the recommendations of the committee dated 19.09.2023 (Appendix-XXIII) (Page 66-69) regarding revision of Pay of those contractual/temporary Teaching and Non-Teaching employees who were appointed before 17-07-2020 and drawing the initial of the pay band and grade pay along with prescribed allowances be approved.

- NOTE:**
1. The Board of Finance in its meeting dated 10.04.2023 vide resolved para (iii) of Agenda Item No. 10, authorized the Vice-Chancellor to approve the recommendations of the committee.
 2. The notification issued by the Chandigarh Administration vide No.27/284-IH(7)-2023/ 658 dated 18.01.2023 is available as per **(Appendix-XXIV) (Page 70-71)**.

Item No. 16

Audited Financial statements of F.Y. 2022-2023 as per **(Appendix-XXV) (Separate documents)**.

Item No. 17

To note the status of paras of Principal Director Audit (Central) and Local Audit Department, Chandigarh Administration as per **(Appendix-XXVI) (Page 72-75) & (Appendix- XXVII) (Page 76-80)**, respectively.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dinesh Kumar, while referring to page 32 of Financial Statements for the year 2022-23 pertaining to amount under the heading Electricity and Water Charges, said that the amount of water charges is very high, i.e., Rs.5,79,26,247/- and Electricity and power charges as Rs.,6,52,52,447/-.

It was informed that so far the University's green area is irrigated through potable water, now it is suggested that tertiary water should be used for the same and a separate connection would be obtained for the purpose. Moreover, the University has 21 hostels and the University has a huge consumption of water, for which the payment of water charges is to be made to the Government.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that tertiary water is only for the green area of the University. The consumption of water through 9 tube wells is not included in the bill of water charges.

It was informed that till date the green area was irrigated through the potable water and no connection of tertiary water existed in Sector 14. It was further clarified that it is not an issue of debate as this amount is being paid to the Government as consumption charges.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, while referring to page XV of Appendix-I at S.No.8, said that under the heading "Roof Treatment of various types of houses" Rs.1 crore had been sanctioned every year. He is not in favour of incurring such a huge amount of Rs.1 crore for this purpose. This amount of Rs.1 crore is being spent every year for treatment of roof of various types of houses. In fact, from this amount of Rs.6-7 crores for six years, new houses would have been constructed. Even Rs.1 crore had also been spent for re-wiring of various types of houses in February, 2021.

Dr. Parveen Goyal, while endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, said that this matter was placed before the meeting of the Senior Tender Committee under the chairmanship of D.U.I., where this expenditure of Rs.1 crore was recommended to be approved. It was also enquired by the D.U.I. as to how many houses are included in this expenditure, but the XEN Office did not annex the list of houses. After obtaining the list of 25 houses, which was also shared with the Vice Chancellor, it is a matter of concern that they had not obtained the satisfactory report of work of roof treatment from the allottees of the houses? The XEN office further said that the roof treatment of remaining houses would be done out of the unspent amount of Rs.11 lacs. This issue could not have been raised in the meeting of the Syndicate, if the satisfactory report of the houses would be annexed/provided.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he is not pointing out that each and every document in support of expenditure should be annexed, but it should be the accountability of the concerned department to provide the supporting documents in support of the sanctioned amount. He further pointed out that at page XVII of the Appendix-I, an amount of Rs.50 lacs has again been spent on rewiring of various type of houses.

It was stated that what could be gathered from the observations is that, all the points raised by the members are well taken. The work of rewiring of almost all the houses has been completed. The rewiring work of the houses as well as of hostels, is being done in different phases, and that is why, sometimes an amount of Rs.50 lacs to Rs.1 crore is spent every year, as it is not possible to complete whole of the work in one go. It is a valid concern that there should be some mechanism to monitor it, but it is a separate aspect, it is not the part of the budget. For this purpose, a separate Committee has been constituted.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should be made the resolved part that whenever any repair/maintenance work with regard to roof work of any house is done by the Construction Office, the Construction Office would prepare a format regarding satisfactory performance and get it signed from the allottee of the house, where the repair work has been done. The Allottee of the House would sign the satisfactory performance of the work done by the Construction Office. If the satisfactory performance report is not signed by the Allottee of the House, the payment would not be made to the firm/contractor. No payment to the firm/contractor would be made till the receipt of the satisfactory report of the consumer.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that, that is why, he is pointing out the huge expenses of Rs.50 lacs to Rs.1 crore incurred every year for the maintenance work of roof. They could not defend this huge expenditure before the media. If the satisfactory performance report is on record with the office of the Vice Chancellor and the DUI, then they could say that this repair/maintenance work has been done.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the water is flowing from the tertiary water pipe in front of Government School, Sector 25.

Sh. Varinder Singh pointed out that the field workers of the XEN Office are not capable to do the repair/maintenance work.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Shri Varinder Singh.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that if the said repair work is to be got done from outside, less expenses as compared to the expenditure put forth by the XEN Office would be incurred for the same work.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that he would like to make it more clear the viewpoint expressed by Shri Varinder Singh regarding capability or incapability of the field workers of the XEN Office on the basis of the document he had with him. The work of roof treatment of Gymnasium Hall was executed on 20th March and the work has been started on 21st March at the cost of Rs.14,59,000/- with discount of 2.59%. Thereafter, for another contract for renovation of toilets in Boys Hostel No.5, the discount of 4% was given on 19th July and the work has been completed in one month. Again, the work related to maintenance of Public Health in both Boys and Girls Hostel was started on 17th March and completed by 31st August with the discount of 0.11% discount on the estimated price. How could it be possible that a vendor/Contractor is offering 0.11% discount?

The Vice Chancellor asked first question is that “are they allowed to take the discount”?

Some of the members said that it might be possible that discount is offered by the Contractor after negotiation.

The Vice Chancellor said that if after negotiation, the discount is offered, they would reduce the quality of maintenance work.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that in e-tenders, EMD is received from the contractors, e.g., two contractors had deposited the EMDs and after receipt of EMDs, both these contractors become eligible for E-tender.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if Dr. Parveen Goyal is deputed as O.S.D. (Construction Office), majority of problems would be got resolved.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that a Committee of only two persons should be formed for the purpose.

The Vice Chancellor said that Committee had already been constituted and circulated for the evaluation of quality of construction work. The members of the Committee are from the Engineering Department of Punjab Engineering College, where they could check the quality of construction with the tools.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if they would like to improve the system, they should engage capable personnel as the workers on their rolls are not professionally sound.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that not a single tender has been allotted to another Contractor. All the tenders had been allotted to one Contractor, i.e., M/s Sudhakar Contractor Private Limited, House No.419, Phase 11, Sector 65, Mohali.

The Vice Chancellor said that three decisions had been taken in this regard. A Quality Monitoring Committee comprising of three senior Professors and both the Technical Advisers (Civil and Electrical), have also been appointed. The University should have a third party Inspection/Audit where they would involve the faculty of Civil & Electrical Departments of PEC and NITTR, so that they could evaluate the

civil and electrical work with the tools available with them on the basis of check list to be given by the University.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he had himself got done the roof treatment from outside agency at the cost of Rs.15,000/- in his house, whereas in this estimate, the expenditure of Rs.4 lacs has been provided for roof treatment of one house. He could not comprehend, why this has happened and it is beyond the level of the corruption. Secondly, being a member of the Junior Tender Committee, it came to his notice that the estimate of one tender has come to Rs.4 lacs, whereas this contractor had offered to complete the work in Rs.1.5 lacs. The estimate of Rs.4 lacs is more than 70% of the actual cost of Rs. 1.5 lacs. How could it be possible that the Contractor is offering 70% discount? Instead of following the criterion of the U.T., the University should evolve its own criterion for the purpose. Why the University is following the U.T. Government, whereas the University itself is an Inter-state body with its own Governing body, own budget and individual decision making. The University is not bound to follow the U.T. Government for each and every thing.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are some checks and balances are imposed by the Government on the members of the Junior and Senior Tender Committee.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he agreed that checks and balances are imposed. Several times, he himself had rejected the tenders, but after some time, again they placed the same tenders with the same version that the firm is offering discount of 70% and for the work, the University would have to pay Rs.1.5 lacs instead of Rs.4 lacs. When any work is estimated to be completed in Rs.4 lacs and the Contractor is offering to complete the same in Rs.1.5 lacs, which meant that for the work of Rs.1.5 lacs, the estimate of Rs.4 lacs was given or it might be possible that quality of the work done with expenses of Rs.1.5 lacs would not be up to the mark. The old document of 1970 was placed before him, wherein it was mentioned that a fixed percentage of price per square feet, would be enhanced every year, to which he does not agree. He reiterated that when the University itself an independent body with its own finances, they are not bound to follow the conditions of the U.T. Government.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that, in future, before having a meeting of Junior Tender Committee, they should conduct a pre-meeting with the Technical Adviser of the Civil Department as the Technical Adviser, who has been appointed is working as Executive Engineer in the Chandigarh Administration.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that when the meeting of the Junior Tender Committee is convened, the Technical Adviser of Civil Department of Chandigarh, should be called as Special Invitee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Technical Adviser is the part of the Senior Tender Committee.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that another Committee has been formed where he along with the Registrar is included as member, wherein the Vice Chancellor had directed that all the works pertaining to Civil, Electrical, etc. would be looked after by the said Committee. The tenders are being allotted to huge firms of Delhi, he could not understand, why the condition of working of 8 hours from 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. has been imposed on the workers of the firm. If the Contractor is willing to get the work done through the workers after 5.00 p.m., why the University is

having a problem? The University should have to think only to get the work done; rather than, the timings during which the work is completed.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that as earlier told by the Vice Chancellor that Junior Tender Committee should impose check and balances, but how could it be done? During the meeting of the Committee held on 16th October, 2023, it was asked in the presence of the D.U.I to prepare the minutes. Though the D.U.I. Madam dictated the minutes, till date the minutes have not been prepared and submitted. In the meeting, it was also enquired as to what decision was taken in the meeting of Committee held on 29th August, 2023, but the XEN Office misled the D.U.I. When it was again asked on 16th October, 2023, he replied that he did not know anything. Later on, it was decided to enquire the matter from the Chief of University Security and the Chief of University Security replied that their office would reply in writing for the queries.

The Vice Chancellor said that before convening the meeting, the office of the XEN be asked to bring his staff along with them for recording and preparation of minutes.

It was informed that every time during the meeting of the Committee, confrontations took place.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that only such decisions should be taken, which are in favour of the University instead of taking decision under any pressure or constraints.

It was informed that no agenda items are approved wherein confrontation took place.

Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that the Vice Chancellor should give the charge of XEN either to the Registrar or F.D.O. or any other senior Officer.

Several members supported the suggestion made by Dr. Parveen Goyal and opined that at least they should try to give the charge of XEN to some other Officer.

Several members, including Professor Jatinder Grover, Dr. Jagtar Singh, Dr. Dinesh Kumar, Professor Gurmeet Singh and Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to take the decision regarding giving additional charge of XEN to some other senior Officer, whosoever is deemed fit by her.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that his request is that in the resolved part dictated by the Vice Chancellor, it should also be added that along with the satisfactory report from the allottee of the House after the completion of the work, the satisfactory report form the allottee is again required to be provided to the XEN for the work pertaining to roof treatment after the rainy season as it was only after the rainy season, a person could verify that the work of roof treatment has been done satisfactorily.

It was informed that the resolved part as suggested by the Vice Chancellor would be recorded in the spur of the moment, but later on at the stage of implementation, it would be difficult to implement it. Hence, such decision should be taken, which are to be implemented. His submission is only that these are the fair decisions and are very well taken, therefore, a Sub Committee should be constituted on the spot for the evaluation of construction work. These payments are made to the firms in piece meals, if this decision is taken in the Syndicate, the

Finance Department would stop immediately all the payments to be made, thereafter the issue may come to the Syndicate that payments are not being made. Hence, a Sub-Committee should be constituted to prepare the payment schedule, to take decision regarding obtaining of certificate/report from the user.

Several members suggested that Vice Chancellor should be authorized to take decision on behalf of the Syndicate to form a Sub-Committee for finalizing the payment schedule and preparation of guidelines for obtaining certificate/satisfactory report from the user.

Professor Jatinder Grover said while referring to page 142 of the Appendix-I, where budget head was allocated to the office of D.S.W., for providing amenities for the office. A request was made to the Budget Estimate Committee from their office that Special Repair of the already installed Water Coolers, Purifiers and Stabilizers, etc. (at S.No.6) to get these Water Coolers repaired as there are no funds available with them, but instead of approving the same, the request was moved to be placed in the year 2024-25, but it was required for the year 2023-24. The water cooler installed at Health Centre, also needs immediate repairs, hence, it is requested to approve the estimate for the year 2023-24 instead of 2024-25. Similarly, at point No. 13, the request to approve Purchase of the Projector/Screen for Law Auditorium, has also been moved to the year 2024-25. So, he requested that an estimate of Rs.7,00,000/- should be approved for the year 2023-24, instead of 2024-25, as there is an immediate need to purchase Projector/Screen for Law Auditorium, as the existing Projectors/Screens are beyond repair.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that while referring to page XIX of Appendix-I, that under the heading Establishment of Student Centre at South Campus, Sector 25, Chandigarh, Rs.8 crores were allocated from Amalgamated Fund and Rs.2 crores from Student Holiday Home Fund and for the same in the remarks column, it has been mentioned that "tender yet to be invited". Some Companies/Outside Agencies should be contacted to involve the construction of Student Centre. He had observed that the construction of Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan, the day when it was inaugurated, after three days, the face of the building was collapsed. The outside Agencies/Companies, which are listed at the State level or national level, should be contacted, so that proper guidance could be provided before inviting tenders, as its construction involve huge amount of Rs.1 crore, also reflected at page XX at S.No. 13 under the heading "Renovation of toilets of residential area at P.U. Campus, Sector 14 & 25, Chandigarh". The Finance Department had prepared the budget estimate on the basis of the requisition received from the XEN Office, but actually from Rs.1 crore, a lot of repair and maintenance work could be done. If such a huge expenditure is to be done, it should be spent in a proper way, so that it could be made the asset of the University. He further referred to page 7 of the Appendix-I, where Rs.15 crores has been sanctioned for the printing and dispatch of study material/lessons.

It was informed that this figure of Rs.15 crores is the fee of the Centre for Distance and Online Education (CDOE) and not the expenditure.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that CDOE was proved to be asset of the University, several years before. Till date, the process of inviting tenders for the dispatch of study material and lessons could not be completed, even though the examinations are going to be held in December, 2023. The situation is that the strength of the students in the University has been reduced up to 50000. It is a matter of concern for the University as the CDOE used to be the major source of revenue generation. This should be taken into account as to how the CDOE could

be strengthened. Earlier the Private Universities did not have the permission to teach the students through distance learning, but now all the Universities have got the permission for distance learning, resultantly, the strength of the students in CDOE has declined. The Private Universities have allotted the work of delivering the lessons on contract basis, resultantly the students would get lessons immediately after depositing the admission fee. He is not saying that this system should also be adopted in the University. From the total budget, it has been observed that UIAMS and even the UBS had also come under the loss. That is the reason that Syndicate had approved the recommendations of the JAAC of the various departments in giving relaxation in the eligibility criteria. If UIET is moving towards a loss of Rs.25-30 crores, it could be in more loss in future, which would be an alarming situation for the University. In Private non-aided Colleges of Punjab Technical University, as per their model, they admit Nigerian students. In 90's, the University had the major strength of Nigerian students, but now the Nigerian students preferred to study in rural Colleges in the South Region. Till date, no MoU has come from any department of the University for execution with any Embassy. When the visas are applied, a list of institutions, where the students could opt for study, is being displayed in the Embassy. These institutions have their tie-ups with the Embassy, so that the University could opt for their institution for study. If more than 700 students are residing in the hostels of the rural area, then how it become difficult for the Panjab University, Chandigarh to tie ups with the Embassies for getting more and more students. At page 11 under the heading, "Misc. receipts", Rs.11.3 crores have been mentioned and below there, sum of Rs.332 crores has been entered under the non-recurring receipts, such as Lapsed Securities, Rotational Entrance Test Fee (B.Ed. Pb. & Chd.), to which he pointed out, if 10% saving is done, the amount of Rs.282 crores which the University have sought from the Government, would be reduced.

On a point of order, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he also felt happy to read the income of the total heads at page 3 of the Appendix-I, but whole of the said amount is spent on first two items.

It was informed that it is only the expenditure of Rs.650 crores, where no work of construction has been involved. The 80 – 85% of the grant is spent on the salaries and pension. It was informed that at page No.4 of the Appendix-I, the total budget has been shown as of Rs.700 crores, where no construction cost has been included.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that for example under the heading "Companies hired for doing the work pertaining to Double Entry Accounting System" a sum of Rs.7.5 lacs has been spent. The matter is that where the cost cutting of any service is to be done.

It was replied that how the University would function without manpower. As suggested by Dr. Dua, if cost cutting is done, it is meant that they would have to start the shunting out the staff.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he is talking about the Company not about the persons.

It was replied that there is no Company hired for the purpose. The things should be observed with a perspective view. By cutting expenses, they could save Rs.2 or Rs.3 crores. They all should look at the figures. Do they know the expenditure? Every year, Rs.40 crores are enhanced due to hike in D.A. and increments.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that from the last several years, he has been hearing the budget speech of the Finance & Development Officer. He said that main motive is for all this discussion is the benefit of the University. They always deal with the problems just like their own problems. If the University pays the amount of Rs.7.5 lacs for 5-6 hiring Companies, it would not be in the financial benefit of the University.

It was clarified that the statement made by Dr. Dua is wrong as the University had not hired any Company or Agency, rather the services of only one retired person as Accountant has been hired, as in the University there is not even a single Superintendent and Assistant Registrar, who could prepare or even understand the balance sheet.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if it is so, then they should write "Salary of one person engaged as Accountant" instead of writing "hiring services for the double entry system".

It was replied that as in the University they could not create a post, that is the reason, the term "hiring services" has been written.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that could the employees of the University not be trained under the guidance of the Accountant?

It was informed that compilation of balance sheet is not a one man's job, it is a full-fledged section, where 5-6 employees of the University have been posted. In today's date, there is not even a single Officer in the Accounts Branch who is capable to handle the work related to compilation of balance sheet independently. Hence, the services of a retired Audit Officer from the Institute of Public Auditors of India, has been hired on payment of Rs.45,000/- per month.

The Vice Chancellor said that this issue had been discussed with the F.D.O. and decided to employ a person as Accountant. The annual expenses of employing a person on regular basis would be more than the expenses incurred for hiring the services of Accountant.

It was informed that it is not possible to meet the expenses of the University out of the sanctioned grants, the University has to seek Rs.278 crores to meet the basic expenses of the University.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they cannot cut any expenses from the budget as the expenditure mentioned in the budget estimate is only to meet the basic needs of the University. They should work to improve the quality of the work.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that for any tender of the University, instead of controlling the quality of the work, they would also give more emphasis on the insurance of the work.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua asked while referring to page 91 of the Appendix-I pertaining to an amount of Rs.3 crores for Infrastructure Development of Social Sciences, Humanities and Languages Departments including CDOE and DES, whether the said amount of Rs.3 crores have been spent or not.

It was informed that common provision has been proposed for the procurement of Infrastructure and for the development of Social Sciences, Humanities and Languages Departments, as these departments are allowed less

finances. The income generated through the examinations of UIAMS would be used for the procurement of infrastructure and development of these departments in a phased manner.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua while referring to page 176 at S.No.275 of Appendix-I, pertaining to construction of Natraitava Bhawan (Rs.4.7 crores, B.E. 2023-24) asked as at which place this Natraitava Bhawan is being constructed.

The Vice Chancellor replied that this Bhawan would be the extension of Vice Chancellor's Office.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar asked which offices are proposed to be included in the Extension block of the Vice Chancellor's Office.

It was informed that this block would comprise of offices of Director, Research & Development, D.U.I. and Conference Hall, which was got approved by the then Vice Chancellor through building Committee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the state-of-the-art technique should be used for construction of the offices in the extension block of the office of the Vice Chancellor. It should not be such that as was done in the case of construction of Multipurpose Hall, where Rs.100 crores were spent, later on, they could not decide as to what to do with this Hall. The matter was deliberated at length during the meeting of the Senate on 30th December, 2022 as such type of construction is considered as dead investment. Similarly, the figure of Rs.4.0 crores, which has been earmarked for the construction of extension block of the office of Vice Chancellor, would become a huge amount, which would bring the budget low.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that, while referring to page viii of the minutes of the Board of Finance, it seemed very good, which has been written that "the Vice Chancellor apprised the members that University is in touch with the U.T. Administration to run this project jointly as a facility for the tri-city as a whole, so that the project of this magnitude can be optimally utilized". In this matter, the detailed project report has already been obtained for running this project jointly. While referring to Department-wise Income & Expenditure, appearing at page xxiii, Appendix-I, he said that for example, the expenditure of the Department of Botany is Rs.6.86 crores and the income of the department is Rs.18 lacs. Similarly, the income of the Chemistry and Chemical Engineering Departments is less than the expenditure of both these departments. The income is less than 2.8% of the expenditure and 11% of the expenditure of the Departments of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering. In traditional departments like DCSA, CDOE and other Departments, running traditional courses, are having 3% to 18% of the income of the expenditure. In Department of Laws, the income is 32%, in UIET, it is 50%, in Dental Institute, 26%, in UILS, 200%, in UIHTM, it is 80%, and in the Department of Evening Studies, the income is 200% of the expenditure. He personally would like to request that in these Departments, if it is possible to enhance the fees in these departments annually i.e., from 2% to 5% every year instead of 10-15% in one go. He further stated that the income of the University is Rs.332 crores and expenditure is Rs.789 crores as per Budget estimates 2023-24(Appendix-I and II), hence there is a dire need to generate the income of the University. Secondly, he referred to page 70 of Appendix-II, where in the list of Emeritus Professors is attached, the list is needed to be corrected. The names of the Emeritus Professors, who are not alive, are needed to be removed from the list. This list was started to be annexed in Appendix since then, he asked about it under RTI. He humbly requested that names of those Emeritus Professors, who did not visit the University

even once in a year, should be removed from the list. A request letter should be sent to those Emeritus Professors, if they could vacate the room in the Department, which they are occupying, it would be made use by other faculty of the department.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if the members agreed, a request letter be sent to the Emeritus Professors for vacating the rooms, so that other members of the faculty could be accommodated in these rooms.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that instead of notice, a request letter should be sent to them by giving them 3-4 months.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Chairpersons of the departments are verbally contacting the Emeritus Professors of their departments at their own level. Some of the Chairpersons of the departments are not ready to get the rooms of the Emeritus Professors vacated as mark of respect towards them, e.g. Chairperson of the Department of Pharmacy is not agreed to get the room of Professor B.S. Bhoop vacated.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that two examples, one of Department of Pharmacy and other of the room of the Vice Chancellor herself has been quoted, but they are not saying to get the rooms vacated from the Professors below the age of 65 years of age. Professor B.S. Bhoop has already joined a Private University and offering his services there, so he could be asked for the same.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that a policy should be framed that Emeritus Professors may be allowed to kept their lien for a period of one year, so that space could also be provided to the new incumbents.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that he is not saying to get their rooms vacated forcibly. The family of those Professors, who are not alive, could be requested to vacate their rooms by simply sending a humble request letter.

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

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that when a person is staying at home at the age of 75 years and not willing to come to University, in that case only, he may be requested to vacate the room, so that new faculty members could be accommodated in the departments.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the first instance, as per the decision of the Syndicate, they had become the Emeritus Professors, now in the meeting of the Syndicate, they are asking to take decision to get their rooms/offices vacated. It did not seem nice gesture.

Professor Devinder Singh said that it should be left to the department to decide, whether to get the rooms/offices of the Emeritus Professors of their departments vacated or not. He opined that respect for someone is also considered as a policy.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he would like to make it clear the viewpoint expressed by Professor Devinder Singh that it is not so. Professor Veer Singh, who was the Dean of University Instruction of the University was from the Department of Laws. The request was made to Professor Veer Singh before the term of Professor Devinder Singh as Chairperson of the Department. He had been the Vice Chancellor

of the Nalsar University of Hyderabad and thereafter he became the Director of Chandigarh Judicial Academy. At that time, when it has come to knowledge that he did not join back in the University and was rendering his services in some other University, then he was requested to get his office vacated.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Emeritus had never been made as per their choice, the Syndicate/Senate usually approves the appointment of Professor Emeritus. They should not try to undo, what has been done by their seniors. The Chairperson of the Department should handle this matter at their own level. If any faculty member requires room, he/she would get it vacated.

Professor Devinder Singh said that from the year 2015, no new recruitments have been made. If any department requires the room/office for its faculty, the Chairperson of the Department would get it vacated at their own level.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that recently he has intimated that all the tenders are being allotted continuously from the year 2017 to M/s Sudhakar Contractor Private Limited. He further would like to inform the House that as per the latest tender for “repair and renovation of the newly allotted cluster of 100 bedded” wherein the contract was executed for an amount of Rs.27,37,113 /- without placing the same before the Senior Tender Committee. The tender amounting to more than Rs.15 lacs is required to be placed before the Senior Tender Committee, but it was not done in this case. This tender was allotted to the same Contractor, i.e., M/s Sudhakar Contractor Private Limited with discount of 3% in the month of September, 2023. He requested that this should be got examined. The details of the Contractor should be got examined and checked from any one, so that the Vice Chancellor could know as to whether it is correct or not.

Professor Gurmeet Singh thanked the Vice Chancellor while referring to Item 3 of the minutes of the Board of Finance, for enhancement of Rs.50,000/- from the existing grant of Rs.25,000/-. Secondly, the matter regarding hiring of services, which had also been mentioned in point 5 that instead of manpower recruitment, the work could be got done from outsourcing agencies, is absolutely right. The main issue, which is written at point 18 under sub points a, b, c, d and e, (e) was added later on, the residents of houses below category E, would be given 40% out of the provision of Rs.1 crores and 60% for remaining type of houses i.e., for houses from E1 to G. As per his knowledge, he felt that houses from A to E are more than 700 and houses from E-1 to G are half from 700. As per his opinion, it is not good that 40% of grant for these houses is not sufficient, it should be reversed or there should not be any type of ceiling for use of funds. He further said that he had already placed his suggestion in the meeting of the Board of Finance regarding Multipurpose Auditorium that some timeline should be fixed e.g., the tender was processed from 0-2 months, but how could it be aware as to when was that zero started and again from 2-5 months. After the completion of tendering process, 6 months had elapsed and nothing was done. Logically it is correct that timeline has been specified, but technically, no timeline was specified. He further suggested that the word “brush cutter” should be replaced with bush cutter.

Professor Jatinder Grover clarified that the correct word is “brush cutter” which meant that brushes grown at the corners of the wall.

Professor Gurmeet Singh enquired about the procurement of 50 Water Coolers which have recently been purchased, as to which places, these were installed.

Professor Jatinder Grover apprised that in some departments, the existing water coolers require repairs, for these departments, the said water coolers were procured.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that another issue which he would like to bring to the knowledge of all is that in Sector 25 Campus, the payment for procurement of 103 acres of land had been made to U.T. Government, but out of which the University had received only 40 acres of land, where the buildings of Dental Institute and UIET had been constructed and 11 acres of land had been allotted near the Gurudwara in Sector 14. The U.T. Government had promised the Panjab University to allot the remaining 50 acres of land, its cost comes to millions of rupees, in Sarangpur. The PGIMER has already acquired the land and constructed its building. It could be imagined, if that land was not surrendered, what would be the status today. Recently, a meeting was held, where he participated as member and came to know that no one had the papers of that land including the XEN Office and Estate Branch. Resultantly, the Chandigarh Administration had refused to allot the land to the University. The money, which the University had deposited as cost of the land, is being got deducted from the Administration annually as lease money. If they continued to do so, the University would lose its claim over the land. Hence, if it is so, this practice should be stopped immediately. In today's date, the University would get land in Sarangpur, it would be in the interest of the University; hence, they should fight for the procurement of the land, as it is a huge asset of the University. This matter should be got examined at senior level.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that there is no transparency in the renovation work being done after allotment of house. At one house (F-4), the work is being done at fast pace and in another house (F-29), the work is lingering on. Several complaints in this regard are made in the office of the Registrar in this connection.

On a point of order, Professor Jatinder Grover stated that it is for the information of Dr. Parveen Goyal that the renovation of F-9 is being done through outsourcing agency.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it is correct that Dr. Parveen Goyal had incomplete information with him regarding renovation of House No. F-9 as Professor Jatinder Grover is getting the work of renovation of his house through his Private Contractor, but Professor Jatinder Grover should not talk in this way in the House.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that everything should not be examined on the basis of profit and loss. If this type of approach is to be adopted and the issues are examined on the basis of income and expenditure, the small departments would get close down. In the Department of Laws, the budget provision of Rs.23 lacs has been made for purchase of books, where in the Department of Hindi, it is only Rs.14,000/- . If fee would be increased in these small departments, the students would prefer to move to other Universities.

To this, Dr. Dinesh Kumar intervened to say that Department of Laws is a huge department where there is also a short fall of 50 teachers.

Dr. Mukesh Arora clarified that he is only quoting the example and not pin-pointing a particular department. He further submitted that income of the Sports Department is very less as compared to its expenditure. Everything should not be compared with money. After analysis of all the departments, he observed that every small department has been granted equal budget provisions except huge departments. Citing an example of Sadhu Ashram, he said that building is needed

to be renovated as the building is in dilapidated condition, so budget provision should be made for renovation of the building. The funds should also be allocated for the provision of lift in Law College at Ludhiana, in fact, the Law College have sufficient funds in their account, there is only need to allow the funds to be spent for the purpose. He requested that Vice Chancellor should visit in Ludhiana so that she could know the condition of Library and Auditorium as both the places are in bad condition. There is need to start the work of construction, the funds are available in the respective accounts. The provision should be made in the budget, if not so, the funds available in the Amalgamated fund should be allowed to be utilized for the same. He suggested that if the building of Sadhu Ashram is initiated for renovation, he from his own side would donate Rs.25 lacs for the same, as he had attained all his education from the Institute and from that Institute he earned his earnings for whole of the life.

Dr. Parveen Goyal and Dr. Dinesh Kumar congratulated Shri Sandeep Singh for electing as Halka Incharge from one the constituencies.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that if Dr. Mukesh Arora would donate Rs.25 lacs for the renovation of building of VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur, he would also donate Rs.5 lacs for the renovation work. He suggested that said renovation work should not be got done through the process of tendering, it would be his responsibility to provide labour at the economical rates. He further said that he had various good sponsors with him, they could be contacted to help in initiating the renovation work.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar asked while referring to page 6 of the financial statements for the year 2022-23 at page 5, where Rs.26 lacs has been earmarked as opening balance of PUCC, Mohkam Khan Wala, Ferozepur and Rs.42 Lacs, Rs.2 Lacs, Rs.17 lacs for other constituent Colleges, why these amounts are different from each other when the Constituent Colleges were opened at the same time.

It was informed that this opening balance is different from other Constituent Colleges as out of these, two Colleges had come into existence after these Colleges. He replied that this amount is different, is due to the receipts and funds. These are actual figures, after analysis, it is observed that it is due to number of reasons, as these two Colleges were started at the later stage and for the remaining Constituent Colleges, the opening balance is more due to more number of students. For example, in PUCC, Baba Balraj, Balachaur, the number of students are much more than that of other Constituent Colleges.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar, while referring to page 19, under the heading Academic Expenses, said that an expenditure of Rs.48,869/- was incurred on Seminar, Symposia & Workshops in P.U. Constituent Colleges. If the members deem fit, they could decide to enhance the budget provision in these heads.

It was clarified that these figures are not the budget provisions for Seminars, Symposia & Workshops, these are the actual expenditure incurred by these Constituent Colleges.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that these Colleges should be encouraged to organize Seminars/Symposia & Workshops.

Dr. Harpreet Singh enquired about item No.4 of the Agenda of the Board of Finance.

Several members apprised him that this item has been withdrawn.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that he would like to appeal to the Government of Punjab on Ph.D. increments through this platform. In the discussion of the meeting of the Board of Finance, it has been recorded in the resolved part to wait for the decision of the Punjab Government regarding issue of grant of Ph.D. increments to teachers. He submitted that as the new recruitment, which is to be made in accordance with the U.G.C. Regulations, suppose, a person from the Central University would join the Panjab University and he is getting the Ph.D. increments in the Central University. Do the Panjab University would allow Ph.D. increments to the said incumbent? If it is allowed, then it would create controversy, so the Government of Punjab should be requested to take decision in the matter at the earliest, so that Ph.D. increments be allowed to new appointees.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that while referring to item No.5 pertaining to the revision of pay of the posts of Senior Law Officer, Law Officer and Assistant Law Officer, its first part is correct, but in the second part, the recommendations of the Committee have not been received. Similar is the situation with regard to item No.6 of the Board of Finance, wherein the recommendations of the Committee have not come in spite of authorization by the Board of Finance. He suggested that on these two items, the Committees should have been constituted and its recommendations should be placed before the Syndicate, so that, it could be more feasible to approve. He requested that the recommendations of the Committee so constituted should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting pertaining to these two items so that deliberation could be held.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it seemed that it is just a blanket approval for these two items.

The Vice Chancellor replied that it was only approved in these items that Committees would be constituted.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it is only the authorization of the Board of Finance to the Vice Chancellor to constitute a Committee, so that it would not be required to place these items again before the Board of Finance.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that both these Committees should be constituted in the House itself.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that it was decided in the Board of Finance that Committees would have to be constituted by the Syndicate for these items.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that for item No.6, whatever would be the recommendations of the Committee, the same are required to be placed before the Syndicate for getting it approved.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that for the issue pertaining to leave encashment, for future, it should be made clear in issuing appointment letters for persons to be appointed on contractual basis that service condition of paying all the allowances, should clearly be mentioned, so that such type of issues would not raise. As this item has been withdrawn, hence no discussion is required to be made on it. He requested that his request to justify the budget provision for renovation of houses in the ratio of 60:40 should be considered as it is very important to reverse the entries of provision of amount for the renovation of 700 houses in the ratio of 60:40.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that for this item, the discussion was held in the Budget Estimates Committee. It was on the request of Mr. Honey Thakur that 40% of the amount be reserved for renovation of houses for categories from A to E.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that he is only saying this after asking from Mr. Honey Thakur on this issue. He did not know, whether he is right or wrong. Mr. Honey Thakur requested him to reverse the entries of budget provision of renovation of houses in 60:40 ratios.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar, while referring to item No.8 of the Board of Finance appearing at page xvi, said that in the resolved part, it has been written that "unanimously resolved to recommend that the rates prescribed by U.T. Chandigarh", wherein he would like to enquire whether for Medical Officers, the rules of Punjab Government or U.T. Government are applicable as for non-teaching employees, the service conditions of Punjab Government are applicable.

The Vice Chancellor said that the nominee of the Punjab Government was also present there and it was discussed there that what financial benefits the Medical Officers of the Chandigarh Administration are getting, be given to the Medical Officers of Panjab University.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that benefits of course, the University could allow to them, but when the issue regarding age of retirement would be raised, this matter would be quoted that when the Medical Officers were allowed to pay at the revised rates of Chandigarh Administration, they would also have to follow the criterion regarding age of retirement as laid down for the employees of Chandigarh Administration.

It was informed that the appointment of Medical Officers is on contractual basis.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in that case, the regular employees might say that their retirement age would also be considered as per the age of retirement laid down by Chandigarh Administration to contractual employees.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that when someone comes to attend the meeting out of Punjab, they might not be aware about the functioning of the Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor said that the nominees of the Punjab Government were aware about it, they were saying that the Committee of the Punjab Government had been constituted for the purpose and also stated that in the absence of any instruction of State Government, they could not agree with the proposal for revision of pay of contractual/temporary employees.

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

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that his main purpose was only to enquire whether on contractual employees, the service conditions of Punjab Government are applicable or the conditions of U.T. Administration are applicable on them.

It was clarified that this is the only difference between regular and contractual employee, the rules which have been written in the contract are applicable to them. The service conditions of employees on regular scale are

amended from time to time, as per the notifications issued by the Government. In University, there is some confusion in it. The contractual appointment is only the nature of service; it does not mean that it is some specific designation or assignment. Any emolument can be fixed for the contractual employees, they might be paid either Rs.25,000/- or Rs.50,000/- per month. It is only a contract between one person and another. During the discussion in the meeting of the Board of Finance, the nominees of the Punjab Government were of the view that even in Punjab, there is acute shortage of Doctors as under the AYUSH scheme of Government of India, they are paid less remuneration.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that it was clearly discussed in the meeting that it should be asked from the U.T. Government as to what amount of salary is being paid to Ayurvedic Doctors. It should not be such that the service conditions of Chandigarh Administration are to be implemented on the Doctors posted at P.U. Health Centre.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that seeking information from the Chandigarh Administration for payment of salaries to Doctors and decision to make payment to the Doctors, as per the Chandigarh Administration, are two separate things. He further suggested that they might pay Rs.1 lac, but it should be from the University.

It was apprised that the Financial Adviser had opined that University should not refer to any of the Government. In that case, the decision is to be taken arbitrarily. Later on, it was decided that what would be the best should be considered, they might compare the remuneration proposed by the University with the U.T. Government and AYUSH scheme. Hence, this was approved by all the members of the Board of Finance.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is good that item 14 has not been placed before the Syndicate. Without going into the depth of the case, firstly, he would like to congratulate Professor Gurmeet Singh for representing on behalf of them, and expressed a better viewpoint there. If that point of view was not expressed there, in that case, how the office of Registrar would pursue as they are not having the copy of the conditions. Everyone in the house is aware that in Punjab Government, the rules which are applicable, were implemented from the year 2021. Before that, leave encashment of 300 days were not allowed, when a person has retired in 2018, how could it be possible?

It was informed that a clarification is required to be made in the matter is that Col. G.S. Chadha was earlier posted on the teaching post and thereafter, he had come in non-teaching cadre.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the facts in accordance with the statutes of the University, have not been quoted in the Court. If these were quoted in the court earlier, this situation would not have arisen. In the speaking order, which had to be issued by the University, the Vice Chancellor had passed the orders on the prevailing orders of the former Vice Chancellor. This point has been apprised that encashment of leave should be allowed on the pattern of Punjab Government, but it was not specified that for it, the minimum service of five years was required. The condition of completion of five years' service has not been fulfilled in the case of Col. G.S. Chadha.

Professor Gurmeet Singh stated that instead of withdrawing this item, it would be better for the Vice Chancellor to place the item before the Syndicate and get it approved.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this item should have been placed before the Governing body, so that the endorsement of the Syndicate should have been recorded in the minutes. It would become plus point for the Vice Chancellor. Secondly, the facts observed by them only reflect that the decision of Punjab Government is pending and the copy of the petition is not in record. The speaking order has not been annexed. The reference of precedents of only two Vice Chancellors has been quoted. Only two Vice Chancellors had not retired till date; rather, more than 10 Vice Chancellors had retired. Secondly, the appointing authority of the Registrar and the Vice Chancellor is quite different. There are two separate methods of pay fixation of the Registrar and the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor is on the permanent post and the Registrar is on contractual post. If these facts were not produced before the Court, it meant that University was helping them. He further said that he would give in writing the facts known to him in that particular case.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that a notice has been issued from the office of the Registrar to all the departments of the University regarding updation of earned leave at the departmental level. The UIET has updated the data up to a maximum, he urged that this should also be implemented in other departments also so that the entries of earned leave be updated by the office of the Chairperson in the service books of the faculty.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he would like to enquire about that what amount of pension would be drawn by Col. G.S. Chadha. Would he get full salary or salary minus pension?

It was informed that rules are different from different categories of employees. There are different levels of posts for ex-servicemen, e.g., if he is a person of short commission or on other post, the rules are quite different. If a pensioner is appointed as Consultant or on contract basis, in that case, rules are different. There are two things under which Col. Chadha was paid the pension, in their case it was decided either to protect the pay or would get the salary at the minimum. Instructions and Rules have been quoted in the Board of Finance, there were two options either the incumbent be placed on the minimum of the pay, so that he could draw the pension. If the incumbent has joined after getting his/her pay protected, the pension would be minus from the salary. This rule and instructions of the U.G.C. were followed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there had been Vice Chancellors in the University from the Department of Laws who always got deducted pension from the salary after selection in Himachal Pradesh Board as Chairman. The certificate of pension was always issued to Professor Chauhan, from the University.

It was apprised that for the employees of University, the NOC from the Punjab Government has been received in the University. It was opined that this case should not be discussed at this platform. The office has received the instructions from the Punjab Government, which are available in the University.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that copy of the instructions of the Punjab Government should also be provided to him.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 04.10.2023 (Item Nos. 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 17), be endorsed to the Senate for approval.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor for preparing payment schedule and guidelines relating to obtaining certificate/satisfactory report about the work done by the XEN office/contractor, including roof treatment, from the users.

- 3.** Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 30.08.2023 (**Appendix-II**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss the matters related to condonation of Lectures and Medical Certificates:-

Item No.1

1. Medical certificates of Government Hospitals be dealt with at Department/College level only.
2. The students who are having certificates from Private Hospitals where candidate is admitted in IPD will also be checked and verified with proper admission and discharge summary at the level of Department/College.
3. That Deans of respective faculties be empowered to condone the deficiency of ten lectures on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor. However, in cases of extreme hardship, the condonation of lectures authorized by the Syndicate continues to be vested with the Vice-Chancellor (as per the Syndicate Para No.27 (R-5) dated 04.02.2023)) and a Common Office be created in Guru Tegh Bahadur Bhawan for Deans of various faculties comprising of Senior Assistant (1), Clerk/Steno-typist (1) and Peon (1).

Item No.2

That the ceiling of Rs.2000/- be removed so that candidates shall pay Rs.100/- for each day as late fine after the specified date for submission of medical certificate.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that point 2 listed at item No.1 should have been included in point 1 both for Government and private Hospitals.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the medical certificates issued from the Government Hospitals have less probability of fake, hence these certificates should be dealt at the level of the Department. On the one hand, they are talking about reducing the strength of non-teaching staff, and on the other hand, the proposal is being made to provide non-teaching staff (Clerk, Peon and Steno-Typist) for the creation of respectable offices for the Deans. There should be some different methods, if they wished to provide offices to the Deans; this should not be linked with this. How could it be possible to verify the medical certificates by the Deans? The problem to him in this issue, is that, as per current practice the medical certificates are verified by the Chief Medical Officer and on the basis of that the Chairperson of the Department recommends it. Ultimately the document on the basis of which the Chairperson recommends is the medical certificate. It might be the genuine reason for the CMO that students in large number, approached her office at the nick of the time for getting condoned the shortage of lectures. He is aware of the facts and circumstances under which such types of medical certificates are issued to the students. If, this should be made more flexible by authorizing the Chairperson of the department to deal with it. If it is to be considered on the basis of the medical certificate, in that case, the verification from the C.M.O. is mandatory.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is very much clear as per Rules laid down in P.U. Calendar that whenever a student avails a medical leave, he/she has to provide a medical certificate within one week. Whereas the students did not provide medical certificates, they approached at the nick of the time to the authorities with medical certificates in their hands to get their lectures condoned, so that they could appear in the examinations.

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

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he just simply asked a question earlier, whether Government or Private Hospitals should be included in it. It was replied by Professor Gurmeet Singh that Government hospitals issues genuine certificates, whereas the certificates issued by private Hospitals are not genuine. There are reputed private Hospitals like CMC in the City, they could not issue non-genuine certificates. If it is so, it might be possible that Government hospitals could also issue non-genuine certificates.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it is very good thing that the University has fixed that this much of lectures are to be condoned on production of medical certificates. Sometimes, in general reasons, 5 lectures are condoned on medical grounds, but in certain cases where due to prolonged illness, a student could not be able to join the classes, hence the number of lectures to be condoned for this purpose should have to be fixed.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that if a student is not able to join the classes due to prolonged illness, he/she is not allowed to appear in the examinations. In Manipal University also when a student is admitted in a hospital and is lacking in fulfilling the condition of having 75% of lectures, the University will not allow to appear in the examination.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the viewpoint of the Vice Chancellor is right, but it should also be added in it that the student should be given relaxation to appear in both the semesters simultaneously.

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

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that Rules regarding condonation of shortage of lectures and medical certificates, are laid down at page 99 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, wherein it has been written that "in a year if a student is on medical leave of 5 days in two spells, there is no need to provide medical certificate".

It was pointed out that these Rules are applicable to teachers and not on the students.

Several members also stated that these Rules are only applicable to teachers.

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

Professor Jatinder Grover said that agenda is only to decide that medical certificates are to be verified at the level of the Department.

The Vice Chancellor pointed out that Rules are not to be violated in it.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that no department could do the job of the Medical Department as the Chairpersons of the department are not aware whether any medical certificate is genuine or not. He could not comprehend, why the Doctors are working on part-time basis, he also raised this issue in the meeting of the Syndicate held in the month of January, 2023 that doctors are only working for 4 hours in the morning from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. and one hour in the evening from 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. It is not mandatory that all the medical certificates are to be verified by the CMO, she could delegate the powers to sign/verify the medical certificates to other Medical Officers. How could the Chairperson of the department do the work of the Medical Officer? Ultimately, the result would be that corruption would prevail. He should be informed that why the University has centralized the evaluation of certificates for getting admissions under SC/ST/Defence/Border Area? This process has been centralized since the last three years. This was centralized in the office of the D.U.I. to bring uniformity amongst the departments in evaluating the certificates pertaining to above mentioned categories. After verification of certificates in the D.U.I. office, these were forwarded to the departments and ultimately, the uniformity in the Admission has come. He requested that these medical certificates should be verified/evaluated by the Doctors only.

The Vice Chancellor pointed out that it is agreed that these medical certificates are not received on daily basis, but these should have come in a stipulated period of time.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar replied that for the timely receipt of medical certificates, the penalty has been imposed. The point listed at agenda item 2 is pertaining to imposition of penalty of Rs.100/- for each day as late fine by the students after the specified date for submission of medical certificate. The student should be asked only to follow the rules. Till date, why the CMO has not remarked that the medical certificate furnished by the candidate, is fake. Why only the upper portion of the Rules appearing at Page 314 have been taken into consideration? Why the penalty for producing fake medical certificate has not been imposed as per Rules and why the same has not been apprised to the members? The matter regarding penalty amount of Rs.15,000/- has not been brought to the knowledge of the members.

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

It was informed that the said matter was discussed with C.M.O., and it has come to the notice that if the student is to appear in the examination at 9:00 a.m., he/she reaches the office of the CMO for getting the medical certificate verified and pressurize her to verify the same before 9:00 a.m.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that how the Department could verify the medical certificate before 9:00 a.m. In this case, the University is facilitating the person who is committing the mistake.

The Vice Chancellor said that CMO had requested that she would not be able to perform this job of verifying medical certificates as she is over-burdened. There are 16000 students in the University, it is not that only 2-3 students are furnishing medical certificates.

It was informed that CMO has informed that before the 15 minutes of the commencement of the examination, 100 students carrying 100 supposedly fake medical certificates in their hands come to her and under pressure, she could not decide whether the student should be refrained from appearing in the examination or not. How could she immediately certify that the medical certificate is fake, she has to give justification in support of it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Chairpersons may not be the medical experts, but the teachers of the Departments have control over the students and the students do not misbehave with them, whereas the students approached in numbers in the office of Chief Medical Officer at the nick of the time.

Shri Varinder Singh said that one weeks' time should be fixed for submission of medical certificate before the commencement of examinations.

Professor Devinder Singh said that as majority of the cases of condonation of shortage of lectures are pertaining to the Department of Laws. As stated by the CMO that she has to face the pressure of work, it is pertinent to mention here that such type of pressure is also being faced by the Chairpersons of the departments. They also keep their offices opened till 11:00 p.m. before the examination. The department also managed at their own level to cope up with this pressure. If the CMO is facing difficulty in handling this pressure, it does not mean that the work to verify the medical certificates be entrusted to the Chairpersons or Deans. Generally, five days' medical leave is allowed to the students, there is still another category which is of sports, where shortage of lectures is completely condoned. In sports category, a student who had attended the camp or participated in some event is

entitled for even 3 months of condonation in shortage of lectures, whereas the lectures of those students, who have even submitted true medical certificates for a long duration of 3 months, were not condoned.

It was informed that there are other departments including the Department of Laws, where the CMO had returned the medical certificate of students by marking as fake. In such cases, the Chairperson of the department again and again sends the same to the CMO for verification.

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

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that point No.2 of the Agenda is alright, but point 3 of the Agenda should not be approved, as it is not feasible to provide non-teaching staff for a whole year in the office to be created for the Deans for dealing with the work of examinations.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it is not appropriate to give the charge of the work of condonation of shortage of lectures as the Deans are elected members, how could they do the job in the interest of the students, they would work to meet their political interests only.

Professor Devinder Singh said that if the rooms would be allotted to the Deans, then the University would have to allot rooms to the Senators also.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that ceiling of fine of Rs.2000/- should be removed. If the candidate submits the medical certificates late, he should be directed to pay the fine @ Rs.100/- for each day, as late fine after the specified date for submission of medical certificate.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that when the University is proposing to provide infrastructure and manpower for the office of Dean, the services of the Medical Officer could also be engaged for the purpose who would deal with the work relating to verification of medical certificates.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that sub item 2 of the Agenda is approved and the sub item 1 of the Agenda is not acceptable.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that like other items, all the members have discussed this item at length without reaching to any conclusion. All are aware that the medical certificates furnished at the nick of the time are fake. Instead of deliberating on the issue, the process which is continuing should be continued. It should be made a time bound condition that after the specified date the medical certificate of any student would not be accepted.

It was informed that it is not simple as that it appears. The students even complained that lists of the students with shortage of lectures are not displayed by the Chairpersons of the Departments on time.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that these lists are uploaded on the website every month.

Professor Jatinder Grover intervened to say that these lists are not displayed on the notice boards by every department.

The Vice Chancellor replied that the item 2 of the Agenda is approved and item 1 has been considered as withdrawn.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 30.08.2023 that the ceiling of Rs. 2000/- be removed so that the candidates shall pay Rs. 100/- for each day as late fine for submitting medical certificate late after the specified date.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 30.08.2023 contained in item 1 be treated as withdrawn.

4. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 12.09.2023, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to delegation of authority in the cases of Research and Examinations like, Ph.D., Postgraduate Examinations, M.Phil., theses/dissertations related to administrative processes without compromising quality for smooth and speedy execution of work.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that while constituting Committees for research centres, one of the members of the faculty from the Colleges should also be included in the Committees as the Research Centres have also been created in the Colleges, so that the problems of the Colleges could also be considered in the meetings. While referring to minutes of the meeting of the Committee, he said that according to New Education Policy, the letters are being sent to the teachers of the Colleges that now they would not be allowed to supervise the Ph.D. candidates, whereas they had already been supervising the Ph.D. students. There are other Colleges like M.C.M.D.A.V. College, where Supervisors had been approved, without College as Research Centre.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that the cluster of Colleges is going to be created.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that senior members have been incorporated in the Committee, he observed that it is for the first time that power of the Vice Chancellor have been dragged, which should not be done. The power of the Vice Chancellor pertaining to Ph.D. students should not be delegated by the Vice Chancellor as it is the dignity of the post of the Vice Chancellor to deal with this important task, as also being done in other Universities. The University should not interfere in the Regulations as laid down in the U.G.C. guidelines or P.U. Calendars with regard to the matters related to Ph.D. students.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the decision of decentralization could be considered in all points, but in point (i) where the list of examiners is to be ticked, the Vice Chancellor should do herself that job, as the post of the Vice Chancellor has a specific aura. While referring to point No.6, appearing at page 6 pertaining to approval to act as Supervisors/Co-Supervisors (Clause 6 of P.U. Ph.D. Guidelines 2023) and point No (i) regarding approval of the examiners of the Ph.D. thesis for all the faculties and appointment for substitutes, wherever necessary, in the Appendix attached with the minutes of the Committee, he is of the view that except these two, all the recommendations of the Committee could be approved. Majority of powers like approval of examiners and paper setters have been recommended to be delegated to Controller of Examinations and other powers have been proposed to be delegated to DUI and Director, Research & Development Cell. The term of reference of the Committee that "minutes of the meeting of the Committee to consider

delegation of authority in the case of Ph.D. Research Scholars to fasten up administrative process without compromising quality”, is not correct. As per his opinion “without compromising quality” should not be used in it. The proposed simplification of jobs is a good proposal, but he suggested that for the jobs such as seeking NOC to visit abroad, the file related to issue of NOC, should not be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor, this job should be delegated to the Registrar. To protect the sanctity of the Ph.D., point (1) and (6) should not be approved. The decision had also been taken to fasten up the administrative process for award of Ph.D. degree, but the same could not be implemented. Before submission of thesis, the Supervisor should be directed to send six names of persons through Chairperson before 3 months, so that the process could be completed before the submission of thesis.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he is in favour of this decision that powers of the Vice Chancellor be delegated. As being head of the institution, the members are in ease to approach her but when such jobs are delegated, the politics would be involved.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this item is very much clear that to deal with the work related to Ph.D. the power lies with the Syndicate. It was earlier decided as the Syndicate meets once in a month, and candidates have to face difficulty, keeping in view the interests of the students, the powers of the Syndicate were delegated to the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor could say that her workload is more and she could not handle the powers delegated by the Syndicate to her, the same should be taken by the Syndicate. It would not be right on the part of the Vice Chancellor to re-delegate the powers of the Syndicate to other officers.

The Vice Chancellor said that she worked as DUI for one year and as per her experience, no Vice Chancellor was interested in doing all this. The files related to Ph.D. were kept pending in the office of the Vice Chancellor at that time. Thereafter, in the absence of the Vice Chancellor, the DUI approves the files on behalf of the Vice Chancellor.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the word “Executive Government” has been used for the Syndicate in P.U. Calendars.

The Vice Chancellor interrupted that when the Rules were framed, Research & Development Cell was not created and post of Director, Research & Development Cell was existed.

Shri Varinder Singh, while citing the example of D.S.W., said that at that time, the incumbent holding the post of the D.S.W. was nominated as Fellow. It is but natural that politics would be prevailed on the posts, where the persons have come after facing election. He suggested that as proposed by the Vice Chancellor to delegate the powers to the officers, is not correct, because these officers are also the part of the Senate and this decision could become political.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the second alternative of the proposed recommendation of the Vice Chancellor would be to constitute a Committee to handle the matters pertaining to Ph.D. as laid down in P.U. Calendars. It is pertinent to submit here that these guidelines are not the part of the Rules; rather, these are the part of the Regulations. Last time also when the issue had come, he at that time also said that before placing the item, every aspect of the case should be examined. The Syndicate could say that the powers delegated to the Vice Chancellor are being withdrawn from the Vice Chancellor or the Vice Chancellor

could say that she is over-burdened and requested that said powers should be withdrawn.

It was informed that these recommendations are proposed to the Syndicate only to decide upon it.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the proposal is inappropriate, on this proposal, no Committee could be constituted. Citing an example, he said, if he has been assigned the work to inspect and visit some Colleges and he refused to do so and further constitute a Committee comprising 3 members. It was questioned as to who had authorize him to form a Committee. The powers lie with him. Similarly, in this case, the power delegated by the Syndicate to the Vice Chancellor on behalf of the Syndicate, because the members of the Syndicate could not sit daily to deal with the work pertaining to Ph.D.; hence, the Vice Chancellor was authorized to take decision in this matter, as also authorized her to form the Committees, viz: Affiliation Committee, Screening Committee. Secondly, the authority to appoint the Vice Chancellor is with the Chancellor whereas the authority for appointment of other officers is different. Even the *honoris causa* degrees have to be got approved from the Chancellor of the University before handing over the same to the dignitaries.

The Vice Chancellor said that let this item be withdrawn.

It was informed that about 10-15 files are being received in the office regarding Evaluators. While endorsing the viewpoint, it was apprised that all the six names of the Evaluators had already been got approved by the Supervisors and at that place, no corruption is expected because all the names had already been decided. This list of recommendations only appears to be long, but it emerges from dozens and dozens of things. In some cases, the extension of one week, extension of term papers, is placing placed before the Vice Chancellor. These issues are only research based which never reach to the office of the Director, Research. Several times, the Director, Research had spoken to her that such files are not placed in his office, resultantly, the work flow in his office is nothing and his office is bereft of such work. At point (i), Secrecy Branch, Controller, DUI and the Vice Chancellor are involved, where is Director, Research & Development in it. About the Rules laid down in the Calendars which had been quoted by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, she clarified that at that time the office of Director, Research & Development was not in existence. At serial no.5, actually it is not the Vice Chancellor who is relinquishing all her authority in the office of D.U.I. There are the levels of mind that is needed to be applied on a number of issues that are so pressing, let the Vice Chancellor or at least the D.U.I. be free to consider all those things, rather than pushing the files.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said he had earlier also stated that except recommendation listed at point (1) and (6), all should be approved. At one point of time, the degrees of Ph.D. to be awarded had been placed before the Syndicate for approval which presently after conducting of VIVA is being placed to the Controller of Examinations. If the Vice Chancellor deems fit, a Committee comprising of the members of the Syndicate should be constituted to deal with Ph.D. work. Secondly, he observed that files are not pending in the office of the Vice Chancellor in the present state. The procedure to fasten up could be that the list of evaluators be invited before three months of completion of Ph.D. thesis. This decision was taken at the time of the then Vice Chancellor Professor R.C. Sobti.

It was informed that in the office of D.U.I., a file hardly take half day to reach at the designated location.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra suggested that the files related to Ph.D. should be routed through the office of the Director, Research & Development, which was also seconded by Professor Gurmeet Singh.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the existing system of dealing with the work of Ph.D. should be continued to prevail; otherwise, the Vice Chancellor would have to constitute the Committees for the same, but it could not be advisable to do so.

Several members with one voice said that this item should be withdrawn.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that this item should be referred back and after reconsideration and applying mind over it, the process should be proposed to be curtailed without violating the Rules/Regulations laid down in P.U. Calendar.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that generally all the files whether academic and administrative are routed through the office of the Vice Chancellor. There is no issue pertaining to the sanctity of any of the offices. For example, the Chief Minister of the Punjab, is not supposed to report to the Local Police Station, he is only to ask as to what is going on at that place? The Syndicate has to deal directly with the Vice Chancellor. Earlier also in the meetings of the Syndicate, no provision was existed to sit in the House for any other person, rather till date there is no provision for it. For example, the Controller of Examinations was asked to sit in the House to provide his inputs on the issues related to examinations. Similarly, the Dean College Development Council, F.D.O. and Secretary to Vice Chancellor, has been permitted for the same. They should not mind, but before Professor Rumina Sethi, none of the Dean of University was allowed to sit in the meetings of the Syndicate.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that D.U.I. was allowed to sit in the meetings of the Syndicate during the term of former Vice Chancellor Professor Raj Kumar.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it was only because at that time the Syndicate felt that in the presence of these Officers, the issues could be resolved personally instead of conveying through the Vice Chancellor. He further said that when the Convocation would come, all the degrees would not be read.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that this is the reason due to which the statements made by them are not recorded in the minutes and only the viewpoints of the Vice Chancellor are supposed to be recorded.

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

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this item should not be deferred. It should be withdrawn, but its discussion should be recorded.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that being the head of the family, the Vice Chancellor should maintain the sanctity of the degrees of Ph.D. to be awarded to the students and the main files related to Ph.D. degree, should be sent to the Vice Chancellor. The majority of the research scholars enrolled in the Departments as well as in the Colleges, are facing a huge problem in this connection, which he would like to bring to the knowledge of the Chair. As per New Education Policy, Clause 6.1 says that the teachers of the Departments and the Research could pursue supervision of Ph.D. thesis but the teachers of the Colleges, where their Colleges are

not approved as Research Centres are not allowed to supervise Ph.D. students. In current time, there is a big flaw that teachers who are eligible to supervise Ph.D. degree are not allowed to enroll the students for Ph.D. degree. Their career is at standstill due to this very decision. This issue has been raised in the Colleges largely. While citing the issue relating to Department of Music, he pointed out that the letters have already been sent to the Supervisor in the year 2022 regarding his eligibility to act as Supervisor. Last year also, the students had applied for enrolment in Ph.D. degree and the date for the presentation was fixed and teachers and students were informed accordingly. Later on, another e-mail was sent to the Colleges that due to some issues, the presentation to be held on today's date had been postponed. These teachers were from MCM DAV College, Dev Samaj College of Education, whose students were not enrolled for Ph.D. degree while referring to clause 6.1 of National Education Policy. The meeting has been fixed by the said department on 31.10.2023 for enrolment of one of the Principals, he has no objection in his enrolment, but he desired that equal treatment should be given to all the teachers. In one College, the registration of students in Ph.D. course is being rejected, but in the case of student(s) of Government College, Raikot, which is not an approved Research Centre, the presentation of the student(s) has been fixed on 31st October in the Department of Music, whereas for another candidate, the same Department of Music had rejected the registration of student a few days ago. This should not be allowed to happen and should seriously be got examined. He requested that clusters should be created at the earliest. Without creating the cluster, one College is being allowed to enroll their students in Ph.D. course and others are not.

The Vice Chancellor assured that after creation of clusters, the enrolment of students without Research Centre be discontinued.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu again requested that the matter regarding enrolment of student, which has been rejected by the Department of Music, should be got examined. He pleaded that the presentation of the Ph.D. students of Department of Music, whose cases had been rejected citing the provision of Clause 6.1 saying that that their guides are not eligible to become supervisor, should be got done. He suggested that the presentation of those students should be got done. Clause 6.1 of new Regulations would be got implemented as and when clusters are created by the University. If they implemented this provision right now without creating the clusters, a vacuum would be got created and the students as well as the teachers would be a great loss.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the clusters would be created district and zonal-wise keeping in view the strength of each and every College. Moreover, it would take at least 1 year for creating the clusters of Colleges. There are certain subjects, including Music where research is not being promoted. If research is being carried out in certain subjects, why they are creating hindrances there? Research should be allowed to be carried at least in the approved Research Centres. They should implement this provision after the creation of clusters of Colleges.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu pointed out that the University had received applications from certain Colleges for approval of research centres in the year 2016, but inspections are yet to be done by the University. Citing an example, one such request had been made by the Postgraduate Government College for Girls, Sector 11, Chandigarh, for approval of research centre in the subject of Sociology. If the Vice Chancellor wished, he could forward the said request to her.

The Vice Chancellor directed Professor Sanjay Kaushik, Dean, College Development Council, to note it down.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 12.09.2023 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to delegation of authority in the cases of Research and Examinations like, Ph.D., Postgraduate Examinations, M.Phil., theses/ dissertations related to administrative processes without compromising quality for smooth and speedy execution of work, be **not** approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the college teachers, who have earlier been allowed to act as Supervisors and enrol/register Ph.D. students, be continued to act as Supervisors and enrol/register Ph.D. students until clusters are prepared as provided under new UGC Regulations for Ph.D./NEP.

- 5.** Considered minutes of the Committee dated 14.09.2023 (**Appendix-III**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, for appointment of Adjunct Faculty in Panjab University, Chandigarh.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 28.05.2019 (Para 10) (**Appendix-III**) had considered minutes dated 02.04.2019 of the Committee, regarding proposal for appointment of outside adjunct faculty (as per UGC Guidelines) at the University Teaching Departments and resolved that the minutes dated 02.04.2019 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding proposal for appointment of outside adjunct faculty (as per UGC Guidelines) at the University Teaching Departments, as per Appendix, be approved.
 2. Based upon the above decision of the Syndicate dated 28.05.2019 (Para 10), a circular No.5624-5704/Estt. dated 17.07.2019 (**Appendix-III**) was issued by the Deputy Registrar (Estt.).
 3. A copy of draft circular containing modification as per minutes of meeting dated 14.09.2023 is enclosed (**Appendix-III**).

Professor Gurmeet Singh pointed out that it has been mentioned in the circular under Clause 6.1 that the Adjunct Faculty travelling internationally will not be given travel expenses. It has been done, because as per the financial position of the University, they could not bear these expenses. In one of the other Clauses, it has been written that the international faculty will be paid U.S. \$100 per lecture (whether online or offline). It seems that they are going to invite only the international faculty, who had already come to India, for delivering the lecture as Adjunct Faculty. According to him, the faculty and students learn more from the interaction after the lecture than from the lecture given by the expert. As such, they should prefer that the Adjunct Faculty should give lecture offline. It seemed that they had made the provisions of Professor of Practice and Adjunct Faculty just for the sake of formality, because there were three categories in the Professor of Practice, but they did not address other two categories. How they would be able to invite the Chairman of ISRO to this University on remuneration of Rs.50,000/-? Experts would come only, if they ensured that they would pay him/her in accordance with Professor. With the proposed provision of Rs.25 lac, they would be

able to invite only 5 persons. If they invite an international person, who has already come to India, as Professor of Practice, he would get an honorarium of Rs.50,000/- per month, which is given to the guest faculty. If they could not make adequate payment to the international Adjunct Faculty, they should remove the provision of offline lecture. There might be international Adjunct Faculty, who wanted to interact with the University through online mode. The purpose of the Government of India/University Grants Commission for creating the provision for Adjunct Faculty is that, if someone is prominent in his field, but has not done Ph.D., could be invited as Adjunct Faculty. He reiterated that they would be able to invite Adjunct Faculty as well as Professor of Practice only if they give them respectable remuneration. He, therefore, suggested that the provisions of Adjunct Faculty should be got re-examined; otherwise, it would not serve any fruitful purpose.

The Vice Chancellor said that the remuneration to be paid to the Adjunct Faculty had already been approved by the University Grants Commission in the year 2019. The norms of Adjunct Faculty are as per the UGC guidelines.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that these are two different issues. The person, who would come to the University as Adjunct Faculty, would certainly be working in the University/Higher Educational Institution on regular basis. They are just using the words Adjunct Faculty in place of guest faculty. People working in the Higher Institutions go to IITs and IIMs as Adjunct Faculty. As such, this is not a big issue. The only difference is that they give them travel allowance there, but here they have not given the travelling allowance to the International Adjunct Faculty. So far as Professor of Practice is concerned, it is entirely different from the Adjunct Faculty and they could not compare them with one another, because no teacher could be appointed as Professor of Practice, whereas persons already working in other Universities/Institutes, could be invited as Adjunct Faculty. The IITs had evolved the criteria that one person could only give up to 20 lectures in a year. Hence, the criteria evolved by the University are correct. The only thing is that there seems to be contradiction between Clauses 6.1. and 6.2 as it has been written in Clause 6.1 that two lectures could be given in a visit, whereas in Clause 6.2 it has been written that an honorarium of Rs.2,500/- per lecture per month would be given. If someone delivers two lectures, he would demand an honorarium of Rs.5,000/-, but as per Clause 6, honorarium of Rs.2,500/- per month is to be given.

The Vice Chancellor said that the words 'per month' would be got deleted.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that Rule 7 at page 63 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2019, which had been framed much earlier when the salary of Professors was less Rs.25,000/- p.m., says that if a teacher receives an honorarium of more than Rs.25,000/- per month from any outside duty, he/she would deposit the entire amount with the University. He requested that Director, Research and Development should be asked to suggest amendments in the Rules for acceptance of outside assignments and permission for doing other than normal work, which are available at pages 63 and 64 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2019, as these rules are very old. Now-a-days, the persons, who go on NAAC visit get more than Rs.25,000/-. If the persons have to deposit so much amount in the University for outside assignments and also to pay tax on the remaining amount, why would they take outside assignments? Since it is a discouraging rule, it should be got amended.

Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out that it has been mentioned under Clause 3.7 at page 35 of the Appendix, "International Faculty These lectures can be both offline or online". What does it mean?

It was clarified that it meant that the lectures to be delivered by International Adjunct Faculty could be in offline or online mode.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the words 'per month' mentioned in Clause 6.2 in the Minutes of the Committee meeting dated 14.09.2023 (page 24) should also be deleted.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee as also the circular to be issued by the Deputy Registrar (Estt.), as per **Appendix**, be approved with the modification that the words 'per month' mentioned in Clause 6.2 in the Draft Circular as well as in minutes of the Committee, be deleted.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Director, Research and Development, should go through the norms for Adjunct Faculty and propose amendment in Rules for acceptance of outside assignments and permission for doing other than normal work, which are available at pages 63 and 64 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2019.

6. Considered recommendations (No.4, 5, 20, 25, 32 and 33) of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 11.09.2023 (**Appendix-IV**).

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that in the recommendations of PUSC, the TA and DA of sportspersons have been increased.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in one of the recommendations, the PUSC has recommended change in name of Sir Shadi Lal Championship Shield. Should they not introduce a new trophy in the name of Olympian Balbir Singh Senior?

Dr. Jagtar Singh pointed out that Olympian Balbir Singh Senior was an alumnus of Panjab University and had participated in Olympics for four times and the trophy has been recommended on his name. He would like to know as to what role had been played by Sir Shadi Lal in sports.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they have no problem in approving the recommendations of the PUSC, but he would like to bring to the kind notice of the members that the person in whose name the shield had been introduced, had the association with Panjab University and contribution before partition of the country. So far as he knew, perhaps, he (Sir Shadi Lal) was the first Chief Justice of Joint Punjab. The shield was named in his name (Sir Shadi Lal) keeping in view his association with Panjab University and his stature. Instead of removing his name from the shield, a new shield/trophy should be launched in the name of Olympian Balbir Singh Senior.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that so far as Sumptuary Expenses (page 37 of the Appendix) are concerned, it was recorded that it should be got verified from the Accounts Branch, because the Punjab Government did not allow more than Rs.4,000/- as Sumptuary Expenses. Even the Principals of the affiliated Colleges are allowed up to Rs.4,000/- as Sumptuary Expenses and the same has not been enhanced. If they enhanced Sumptuary Expenses here, there might be problem,

which they do not want to face. So far as Trophy in the name of Olympian Balbir Singh Senior is concerned, a lengthy deliberation took place and they had suggested that the existing Shield should be allowed to continue and a new Trophy in the name of Olympian Balbir Singh Senior should be introduced, so that tributes could be paid to S. Balbir Singh Senior.

Dr. Jagtar Singh pointed out that the enhancement in Sumptuary Expenses had been recommended keeping in view the fact that Physical Education Teachers and Principals attend the fixtures.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the recommendations 5, 20, 25, 32 and 33) of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 11.09.2023, as per **Appendix**, be approved. However, so far as recommendation 4 relating to enhancement in sumptuary expenses is concerned, the same be **not** approved.

7. Considered if, one of the Advocates from the Advocates on the High Court Panel, be appointed as Legal Retainer. Information contained in Office Note (**Appendix-V**) was also taken into consideration.

Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out that in the meeting of the Syndicate held on 4.02.2023, a Committee was constituted to recommend appointment of two Legal Retainers and panel of Advocates. The panel of advocates had already been approved on 27th May 2023; however, the Vice Chancellor should be authorized for appointment of Legal Retainers, so that the Vice Chancellor could appoint the legal retainers on the basis of her experience. He pointed out that, as per the authorization given by the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor had appointed Technical Advisors within a short period and they had now started working. If the Vice Chancellor is authorized to appoint Legal Retainers also, they would soon start working; otherwise, the appointment of Legal Retainers is lingering on for the last ten months.

Professor Devinder Singh said that they had conducted another meeting of the Committee because the term of reference of the Committee was a little bit wider, including enhancement of fees of advocates, which had not been raised for the last 10-12 years. The Committee had made certain recommendations, including enhancement of fees of advocates and inclusion of three more names in the panel of advocates. He suggested that the three names (Shri Neeraj Sharma, Shri Dharminder Singh Randhawa and Shri Jasraj Singh) should be included in the panel of advocates, which is to be approved. So far as enhancement of fees of advocates is concerned, perhaps the matter required to be placed before the Board of Finance. So far as appointment of Legal Retainers is concerned, since the appointment of Legal Retainers could not be finalized due to one reason or the other, it would be better if the Vice Chancellor is authorized for the purpose, as is being suggested. On the basis of his experience in the office of the Vice Chancellor as well as Court, he could say that the Vice Chancellor or the Registrar should have liberty to appoint/engage advocates on case to case basis. They could see the position of Punjab, where the present Punjab Government had changed the Advocate General for the fourth time. The Vice Chancellor should appoint three Legal Retainers, who she thinks could prove to be beneficial for the University. As such, he agreed with the suggestion given by the member that the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to appoint Legal Retainers of her confidence.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that, as is being suggested, the Vice Chancellor is being authorized to appoint Legal Retainers, but there should not be restriction appointing the Legal Retainers out of the Advocates on the High Court Panel. Once the discretion is given to the Vice Chancellor, she could appoint any person as Legal Retainer of her choice, and it should not be necessary that he/she should be on the panel of Advocates.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that it has been mentioned in the first paragraph that two Legal Retainers (Shri Amit Jhanji, Senior Advocate and Shri Indresh Goel, Advocate) were recommended to be appointed till the new panel of Legal Retainers is not prepared and approved. Meaning thereby, that it was a temporary arrangement made by the Syndicate. Now, two Legal Retainers are to be appointed and if the Vice Chancellor deemed fit, she could appoint more than two Legal Retainers. He had made a request to the Registrar to attach a performance chart of the Advocates facilitating them to decide the appointment of Advocates. An information was given by the Senior Law Officer and the contained information of about 11-12 Advocates having more than 30 years of experience. Since the Legal Retainers are to be appointed, the Advocates having experience of 30 years or more should be appointed. Now, the Syndicate is authorizing the Vice Chancellor to appoint 2-3 Legal Retainers.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he is also of the opinion that the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to appoint 2-3 good Legal Retainers, who could defend the cases of the University. He had experience that the other parties had got stay from the Courts for the last 10-15 years, but the University Advocates are not able to get the stay vacated. Citing an example, he said that if a College had got stay against the implementation of Regulation 11.1 imposed by the University, but the stay has not been got vacated by their Lawyers. Therefore, good Advocates should be appointed as Legal Retainers and the Vice Chancellor is authorized to appoint persons out of the panel of Advocates.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, as had been pointed out by Professor Devinder Singh, the recommendations of the Committee regarding enhancement of fees of Advocates (by Rs.5,000/-) should be placed before the Syndicate for consideration. It has come to his notice from the office that the matter relating to enhancement of fees of Advocate is required to be placed before the Board of Finance. According to him, if they wanted to enhance the budget of the Legal Cell, only then the matter required to be placed before the Board of Finance, otherwise not. Moreover, it is not certain as to how many cases are going to come and how many are to be assigned to whom. Secondly, they could not wait up to February 2024 when the next meeting of the Board of Finance is to be convened. He, therefore, suggested that the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to approve the recommendation of the Committee relating to enhancement of fees of Advocates.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he agreed with the suggestion made by Dr. Dinesh Kumar that the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to approve the recommendation of the Committee relating to enhancement of fees of Advocates.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the problem is that whichever decision is taken by the Syndicate against the affiliated Colleges, the same is usually challenged in the High Court. What happened is that the opposite party filed the writ petition in the Court one month before, whereas the University sends e-mail to its Advocates in the evening one day before the actual date of hearing asking the advocate to get

the print out and prepare the case accordingly. Still, the way the advocates of the University prepared and argued the cases in the Courts, is appreciable. He is talking about the cases related to affiliated Colleges, where the performance of the advocates is up to the mark. At the same time, there are certain advocates, who do not even bother to file the reply. He is, therefore, of the opinion that the Vice Chancellor should have liberty to engage/appoint advocates. What he meant to say is that the prompt and efficient advocates and those, who cared for the name and fame of the University, should be engaged to fight the cases of the University.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the provisions of Regulation 11.1 had been imposed on S.P.N. College, Mukerian, which had terminated the services of his brother-in-law. He would like to thank the Vice Chancellor and the Registrar as his brother-in-law has now got an arrear of Rs.40 lac. He suggested that the complaint made by his brother-in-law against the College should be treated as withdrawn.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that sometime certain cases relating to policy matters appeared before them, which had impact on the larger interest of the University. He suggested that for such matters, the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to appoint Senior Advocate and, if need be, the advocate concerned should be allowed to be paid higher fee.

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to appoint Senior Advocate depending upon the gravity of the situation.

RESOLVED: That -

1. the Vice Chancellor be authorized to appoint 2-3 Legal Retainers of the University;
2. the names of Shri Neeraj Sharma, Shri Dharminder Singh Randhawa and Shri Jasraj Singh, be included in the panel of advocates; and
3. the Vice Chancellor be authorised to approve the recommendation of the Committee relating to enhancement of fees of Advocates, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate.

8. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 05.09.2023 (**Appendix-VI**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding cheating/copying/mass copying in some examination centres of Panjab University, especially in far off areas, raised in the Senate meeting dated 03.06.2023 (**Appendix-VI**).

Shri Sandeep Singh observed that there would be problems in the implementation of recommendations, which have been made by the Committee. First of all, they should not change the Examination Centres of the students and instead should change the invigilators, because there would be difficulty in adjusting a large number of students in another Examination Centre, whereas the invigilators could be adjusted easily. The other things, which they wanted to do, including installation of CCTV cameras, should be done.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra suggested that the Examination Centres of the students could be made in the nearby Colleges.

To this, Shri Sandeep Singh said that the students should not be harassed on one pretext or the other. He reiterated that if they think that there is a problem, the invigilators should be appointed from other College(s).

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that, in fact, the issue of cheating in the Examination Centres was raised of only certain particulars Colleges. Reports about cheating in the examinations come to the University and the University is aware as to in which College(s) the cheating in examination is taking place. Instead of taking action against those Colleges, which are involved in cheating, they have proposed action against all the affiliated Colleges. So far as changing of Examination Centre is concerned, the University would certainly face a problem, as the strength of students vary from College to College. In the University campus, they conducted open book examination. Instead of moving in this direction, they should have adopted the measures, which are being followed for the students of the University campus. To appoint invigilators for the Examination Centres in itself is a big task. The teaching staff, which is assigned the examination duties, already faced a lot of problems. Remedial measures are needed to be taken only for those Colleges, where cheating is taking place.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua is rightly saying that they have been pointing out that there are certain specific Colleges, where mass copying is taking place. Instead of taking action against those specific Colleges, they are proposing action against all the affiliated Colleges. Why are they not taking action against those particular Colleges where mass copying is taking place? They used to warn such Colleges and asking them to install cameras in the examination centres; otherwise, observers would be sent or the examination centre would be closed down. They also used to strengthen their teams and flying squads were used to be sent to such colleges on regular basis. If they tried to shift the invigilators, they would certainly face problem in appointing invigilators in the Colleges where the strength of students is much higher. The Colleges, where mass copying is taking place, could be counted on fingers and everybody knew about them and such Colleges are on record. He lamented that easily, flying squads did not go to such Colleges. Whenever the flying squads visited those Colleges, UMC cases had been made and FIRs lodged. According to him, the University did not support them (members of flying squads) in several cases. In fact, they had fought the cases at their own level. He, therefore, suggested that it should be reviewed and the Colleges, where mass copying is taking place, should be identified and action taken against them, including installation of CCTV camera and other measures. However, if they implemented in small colleges, where copying/cheating is not taking place, it would prove to be a futile exercise.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu observed that the report of the Committee is not practical, as the practical aspect is missing from it. As had been pointed out, DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh, had the strength of more than 8,000 students, in which College, they would be able to adjust more than 8,000 students. Instead of taking action against those 15-20 Colleges, where mass copying/cheating is taking place, they are diluting the entire issue. The recommendations of the Committee would not be implemented and the 15-20 Colleges, where cheating is taking place, would continue to do so.

It was informed that certain inputs had been provided to the Committee, but the final decision is of the Committee. There was nothing like this that the Colleges should be penalized. In fact, they just wanted to raise the standard of examination.

Lacs of students appeared in the Board Examination, where also the students appeared in the examination in Examination Centres, which are created in other schools. The Committee had no intention to harass the students. It is being honestly shared with them that the Vice Chancellor had already been informed that it would be very difficult for the Controller of Examinations to implement the recommendations of the Committee. It is not known, how would they implement it and how much they would be successful?

On a point of order, Principal R.S. Jhanji said that no feedback has come from the affiliated Colleges. He suggested that at least the stakeholders should be taken into confidence before taking such a decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could start implementing these recommendations in the defaulting Colleges. All the affiliated Colleges could be asked to install at least CCTV cameras for recording purpose.

To this, Shri Sandeep Singh and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that installation of CCTV cameras even for the purpose of recording would prove to be a futile exercise.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that it seemed to be a positive step and they must go for it. If the examination system of the University is got improved, what would be better than it?

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that these things seemed to be easy, but very difficult to practically implement.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that to begin with, CCTV cameras must be installed in the Examination Hall at the Campus. Moreover, the staff, which is deputed there on regular basis, should at least be rotated, as something wrong is happening there. Students usually get their Examination Centre changed at the last moment on medical ground and appeared in the examination at Examination Hall at the Campus, where the staff deputed on duty is involved in wrong activities, including allowing the students to use Mobile Phones. He, therefore, suggested that the staff deputed in this Examination Centre should be changed frequently and CCTV cameras should be installed there.

On a point made by Shri Varinder Singh, the Vice Chancellor said that CCTV cameras would be got installed by the Colleges themselves.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the members would be astonished to know that the papers appended with the item related to proceedings of the Senate dated 03.06.2023, wherein an issue had been raised that in such and such College(s) copying/mass copying/cheating had taken place during the examination.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee has been formed on the basis of the issue raised in the meeting of the Senate.

Shri Varinder Singh said that cheating certainly takes place in the Examination Centres, but along with the Colleges, the staff deputed in the examination duties, including from the University, is also involved in it. Whenever an Examination Centre is created in a College, a condition should be imposed that CCTV cameras should be installed in the Examination Centres.

Shri Sandeep Singh reiterated that Examination Centres of the students should not be shifted. Citing an example, he said that where the Examination Centre of the students of Government College, Talwara, would be made.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that would they not create the Examination Centre, if the College did not install the CCTV cameras? He lamented that even if the College did not install the CCTV cameras, the University would give the Examination Centre to it.

When the Vice Chancellor cited the example of Lovely Professional University (LPU), Phagwara, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that not only CCTV cameras should be taken into consideration, but also the admission, examination and other processes.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they should not compare the Panjab University with LPU.

Dr. Jagtar Singh apprehended that the CCTV proposed to be installed in the affiliated Colleges for the examination purposes would be used by the Managements of the Colleges against the teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that CCTV cameras would be got installed in all the affiliated Colleges and the Examination Centres would not be created in the defaulting Colleges; rather, their Examination Centres would be shifted to other nearby Colleges.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is not approved. The CCTV cameras would only be got installed in the defaulting Colleges.

After lunch, when the meeting resumed, the Vice Chancellor said that since much expenses are not involved in it, CCTV cameras should be allowed to be installed in all the affiliated Colleges.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that CCTV cameras should be got installed in only those Colleges, where the complaints are there.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the Colleges, where copying, mass copying, cheating, etc., has been reported, should be issued notice to install CCTV cameras within a stipulated time.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would issue a circular to all the affiliated Colleges to install CCTV cameras in the building(s) where they plan to conduct the examinations.

When it was said that the Colleges might question as to why they have specifically been asked to install CCTV cameras, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that they should discuss the names of the Colleges where copying, massing copying, cheating, etc. has been reported, so that they could say that it is the order of the Syndicate to get CCTV cameras installed in these particular Colleges. If they have any grievance, they could give their representation, and the same would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that the problem is that the issue remains as such. In fact, they should take a step, so that the problem gets resolved. If they did not get CCTV cameras installed, the problem would remain as such.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that the CCTV cameras would be used for examination purposes only for 1 month, but during the remaining 11 months, the managements and Principals would harass the teachers on one pretext or the other.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Colleges could outsource the installation/use of CCTV cameras or video recording of the Examination Centres during the examinations. They also get video recording done during the visit of NAAC.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that in all the competitive examinations, video recording is got done through outsourcing.

Professor Devinder Singh said that examination of students is conducted in about 10 rooms in a College, would they get video recording done of all the 10 rooms by 10 cameras.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that if they did not get CCTV cameras in the corridors and at the gate, people would get examination of certain students taken outside. Hence, CCTV cameras should also be got installed in the corridors and at the gate.

Dr. Mukesh Arora enquired as to who would bear the expenses.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the expenses would be borne by the Colleges themselves.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that video recording would prove to be more costly than the invigilation staff. Moreover, if 10 persons would be hired for the purpose of video recording, they would charge at least Rs.1,000/- per day each.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that if they go through the guidelines for creation of Examination Centres, they would find that the infrastructure, furniture, etc. for the Examination Centres is/are to be provided by the Controller of Examinations/University. Further, the University gave some funds per student also.

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that they should start installation of CCTV cameras in the Examination Centres or video recording of the Examination Centres from the Colleges, where copying, mass copying, cheating, etc. had been reported.

Professor Jatinder Grover endorsed the suggestion given by Principal R.S. Jhanji.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should take, in principle, decision that the Colleges would get the video recording done of their respective Examination Centres.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that first, the University should take a lead on this issue and only then they could ask the Colleges.

Principal R.S. Jhanji, Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu and Dr. Jagtar Singh said that the University should take lead.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that the University should at least install CCTV cameras in the Examination Centres, which are created at the Campus.

Professor Devinder Singh remarked that the Controller of Examinations had said that CCTV cameras in the Examination Centres would be installed within a period of ten days.

It was clarified that since several Examination Centres are being created at the Campus, including in the Arts Block, the installation of CCTV cameras in all the Examination Centres at the Campus would take time.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that if they do not want to permit installation of CCTV cameras in the Examination Centres, the videography should at least be allowed.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the meeting of the Senate dated 03.06.2023, the names of the Colleges, where copying, mass-copying, cheating, etc. had taken place, was discussed. Stringent measures, including installation of CCTV cameras, shifting of examination centres, etc., should be taken against those Colleges. So far as other Colleges are concerned, since the system is working there properly, these measures should not be implemented there.

Dr. Mukesh Arora remarked that the issue had initiated from the Colleges and had now reached the University.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that in the beginning, they should install CCTV cameras in the Examination Centres or start videography of the examinations at the Campus as well as of the defaulting Colleges.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu reiterated that if the CCTV cameras are got installed in the Examination Centres in the Colleges, the Managements and Principals would exploit the teachers on one pretext or the other. Their focus should not be restricted only up to the installation of Cameras; rather, they should contemplate as to how they could strengthen their Examination System, including providing more invigilators and how more surveillance could be done to stop cheating/copying in the examinations. He thought that the recommendations of the Committee are inappropriate as it had stuck up only on the installation of CCTV cameras in the Examination Centres. He, therefore, suggested that the recommendations of the Committee should not be approved, and if approved, his dissent should be recorded.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they are not approving the recommendations of the Committee. He suggested that they should first think over this issue and then decide as to what is to be done.

When the Vice Chancellor enquired, do they want to ask the defaulting Colleges to install CCTV cameras in their Examination Centres or get video-recording of the examination done, the members in one voice said, "Yes".

Principal R.S. Jhanji pointed out that this very Syndicate and Senate had got installed CCTV cameras in Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu intervened to say that the cameras, which were installed in Guru Nanak College, did not work.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the cameras did not work because the students cut the wires.

It was suggested that instead of getting installed CCTV cameras in such notorious Colleges, their students should be shifted to other nearby Colleges.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that he was a member of the Committee in the years 2002-2004, when he was a teacher in a College. The Committee submitted its report in the years 2010 and 2012 to close down the Examination Centre at Guru Nanak College, Ferozpur, but the Examination Centre is still there.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu suggested that if there are 1000 students in a College, all the 1000 could not be shifted to a single College; rather, the batches of 250 students should be shifted to four different Colleges, so that they could be adjusted there easily.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired, could they not take help from local police for inspecting Examination Centres by the flying squads/observers on regular basis.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that they had sought help from the SSP on several occasions, but they were usually told that their request had been forwarded to the IG. Their reply more often than not is that they did not have adequate manpower. They demand salary of the personnel even for providing security to the Zonal In-charges. When the University requests the DGP to provide security, the DGP referred the same to the SSP, but the SSPs did not follow the instructions of the DGP. The Principals of the Colleges had requested the Controller of Examinations on several occasions that the University should directly requests the SSPs to provide security at least at the Zonal Centres.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the cases had never been registered by the police against the students, who were handed over to them by the University staff.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the defaulting Colleges, be directed to install CCTV cameras in their Examination Centres. Alternatively, their Examination Centres, be shifted to other nearby College(s).

- 9.** Considered recommendation of the UMC Standing Committee-II dated 27.07.2021 (**Appendix-VII**), to scrutinize the gist of cases of unfair means and misconduct that Ms. Mansi Jain, student of LL.B. 3rd Semester be disqualified from appearing in any university examination for two years including that in which she was found guilty i.e., Dec, 2020 (held in February/March 2021) to May 2022 (four Exams), under Regulation 7 at page 11 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007. Information contained in Office Note (**Appendix-VII**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.08.2023 (Para 11) has approved the similar case of Ms. Nancy Aggarwal, student of LL.B. 3rd Semester.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that whenever the recommendation/ decision of the UMC Committee is to be reviewed, the same should be got reviewed from another Committee.

Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out that during the meeting of the Syndicate held on 26.08.2023 when the recommendation of UMC Committee – II dated 27.07.2021 was considered, he had stated that “his dissent on this item should be noted as the recommendations of the Committee are not being accepted”. The Registrar had also instructed the concerned persons to record his dissent, but his dissent has still not been recorded.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that when the case of Ms. Nancy Aggarwal was considered, he was thinking that perhaps injustice is being meted out to the student, because the reports of the first and second Committees were appended, whereas the report of the third Committee was not. The recommendation of the third Committee was that the recommendation of first Committee that the candidate(s) should be debarred from appearing in University examination, should be upheld. Although, Dr. Parveen Goyal was stressing that the recommendation of second Committee that the candidate Ms. Mansi Jain be disqualified from appearing in any University examination for two years should be accepted, yet he argued that it would be an injustice to the candidate. Later on, he had to realize that this/these is/are the case(s) about which several Fellows had raised their voice and the Vice Chancellor had to leave the chair. He did not know as to why three Committees were required to be formed in these two cases? He had to go through the proceedings of all the Committee to satisfy his curiosity. In one of the earlier meeting of the Syndicate, it was discussed that the review is always done by the same Committee, which had earlier considered the case. If unfair means had been used in this case, the Vice Chancellor should not have any hesitation to give this case to the Police. The student(s) had tried to play tricks with the UMC Committee and the Syndicate.

On a point of order, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that in the High Courts also, the Judge said that the case is not to be reviewed by him/her, it should be referred to another Judge.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the point of order of Dr. Mukesh Arora is not correct, as it has been mentioned in the Regulations/Rules.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the review is always done by the same Committee, which had given the decision earlier.

The Vice Chancellor said that as per the discussion took place in one of the previous meeting of the Syndicate, a Committee has been formed to consider the issue and recommend whether the case is to be reviewed by the same Committee or another.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if they go through the discussion and resolved part, they would find that it has been written, “In the interest of the student, her result be declared as a one time exception, not to be quoted as precedent”.

The Vice Chancellor said that both the cases are similar, but this case got left out at that time.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that although Shri Lajwant Singh Virk had apprehended that this would not be tenable in the Court, still they took the decision

that the Inquiry Report be sent to the Chandigarh Administration for taking necessary action, including lodging of an FIR. The Vice Chancellor is correct, but they must give a signal to the society that the University would not tolerate such things, and this is the case of that nature.

The Vice Chancellor said that she would like to bring to the kind notice of the members that this examination was conducted in online mode.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that one of the students is saying that she was at home and the other is saying that she was in the hospital, but the answers of both are same and they are saying that they had asked their servants to upload the answer-books. This way, they are accepting their mistake.

Professor Gurmeet Singh remarked that the decision to be taken in the case under consideration, should also be made application in the previous case, i.e., Ms. Nancy Aggarwal.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that, that is what, he is saying. Moreover, the minutes of the third Committee were not made available to them at that time.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the cases of both Ms. Nancy Aggarwal and Ms. Mansi Jain should have been placed before the Syndicate for consideration together.

The Vice Chancellor said that at this stage, they could not undo, which they had already done. In fact, it was recommended by the 2nd Committee and the same was implemented by the Controller of Examinations. The candidates had appeared in the examination in 2020, but the University could not take decision in their cases up to 2023. Hence, they should improve their system and must fix timeline to decide the UMC cases. She was of the opinion that the UMC cases should be decided within a period of 15 days, because the students have to move ahead in their career. She said that the decision, which was taken in the case of Ms. Nancy Aggarwal, should be taken and implemented in this case, and if someone does not agree with it, he/she could record his/her dissent.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he did not agree with the proposal made by the Vice Chancellor. In fact, the decision to be taken in the case under consideration (Ms. Mansi Jain), should be implemented in the case of Ms. Nancy Aggarwal also. The third Committee, which was formed, was not formed by him.

The Vice Chancellor said that the students had appeared in the last examination and left the institution, but the Syndicate and Senate continued to constitute Committee after Committee. She cautioned that this should not be done. She remarked that whatever has been done, could not be undone.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is true that the students had gone after appearing in the examination, but had tarnished the image of the University.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that being a part of the University, it is their responsibility to improve the system and come with an asset for the society. If they come with such a harsh punishment or adopt coercive methods against the students, they would not be creating assets for the society; rather, they would be creating liability for the society. It is not a good trend to debar the students from appearing in the University examination for two or more years.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that they need to change the relevant Regulations.

The Vice Chancellor said that along with amending the Regulations, they have also to improve the system. If the UMC case of a student is made during the December examination, his/her case must be decided by the end of January next year. If the case of the student is not decided by the UMC Committee for two or three years, they could not stop the student for such a long period.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he had taken the item as it was presented in the meeting earlier. What was under cover, he was not aware. His statement has been recorded in the minutes which is "Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that taking into the legal aspect when the student had re-appeared in the papers, could the University withhold the result". Although there were about 10 students against whom UMC cases were made, the Committees were formed for only two candidates.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the past be buried, and improve the system.

Professor Devinder Singh said that what he had said in the previous meeting had also been recorded. In fact, he had said that if they wanted to punish the students, their examination in question should be taken again. He would like to also add that in February/March, they had taken a decision that the DMCs/Degrees to these students should not be released. The student, whose case is under consideration, had passed out and got the degree in November 2022, and they had no control over it, as the decision not to release the DMC/Degree was taken in February/March 2023. However, the DMC/Degree of the second candidate (Ms. Nancy Aggarwal) was not released and a communication in this regard was sent to the office of the Controller of Examinations. Even then attendance certificate was also not issued to the student. About 10 days back, the student came to him for getting the attendance certificate, but the same was not issued to her.

Continuing, Professor Devinder Singh said that earlier, there used to be one UMC Committee and if any case came for review, the same was reviewed by the same Committee. However, when they started constituting two UMC Committees, they started following the practice of getting the case reviewed from another Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the case was got reviewed from the second Committee.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that he was the member of the second UMC Committee and they decided that, as per Regulation, the candidates should be debarred for two years, and it should not be referred to another Committee.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he had been observing for the last 15 years that the case is always sent to another Committee for review.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they agreed that something hanky-panky has occurred in these cases. In the morning, in another case they had observed that if they had taken wrong decision earlier, it does not mean that they should not correct themselves.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that it is not good to give benefit to one candidate and not to give the same to another.

When it was argued that both the cases are same, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that then both the cases should have been placed before the Syndicate together.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar remarked that it is astonishing that the huge amount, which had been reported in the newspapers alleged to be paid in these cases, could not have been arranged by the students concerned without the knowledge of their parents.

The Vice Chancellor said that then they should take action against the people involved in these cases, including the members of the Committee, who had taken the money. She requested the members to constitute a Fact-Finding Committee to unearth the hanky-panky taken place in these cases.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua enquired, how would the Committee be able to unearth the money taken, if the students are set free as they would not give the statement to the Committee? The students would not appear before the Committee and give the statements, if the DMCs and Degrees are released to the students. In an earlier meeting, he was not aware of the full facts of the case.

The Vice Chancellor said that she again disagree with Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua. Had any such thing happened, they should have identified the concerned person(s) and taken action against him/her/them? Why should they penalize the students?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that so much about these cases had been reported in the newspapers. However, they would agree with him that when the members from outside the Campus came to attend the meetings, they are not usually aware of the full facts of the cases.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra pointed out that several media trials took place in the country.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to what action they had taken when the matter was highlighted in the newspapers.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that reports are published in the newspapers before the same are received by the members.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members themselves approached the media and gave interviews.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if the Vice Chancellor had information about the members, who gave interviews to the media, she should share the same with them.

The Vice Chancellor said that she is saying that only those persons, who were alleged to be involved in these cases, should be taken to task.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua requested the Vice Chancellor to disclose the names of the persons, who had given interviews to the media including electronic, and had tarnished the image of the University. She (Vice Chancellor) should tell any case of corruption in which he (Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua) had ever supported the culprit.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the last meeting of the Syndicate, in the case of Shri Satish Kumar Padam, they decided to constitute a Committee to enquire into the matter, even though the Court had convicted him.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they had approved the recommendation of the Committee and had never altered the recommendations of the Committees, which had been constituted to enquire into the cases of corruption.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the case of Shri Satish Kumar Padam, it was decided by them that an Inquiry Committee should be constituted to enquire the matter.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that the Inquiry Committee was decided to be appointed for passing the orders. He had told at that time also that the Syndicate had the power to punish the convicted employee, but not to decide whether the person is guilty or not. That was why he had requested that they could ask the Registrar to conduct the Inquiry to prove whether Shri Satish Kumar Padam is guilty or not, so that the Syndicate could take decision accordingly.

When the Vice Chancellor said that legal opinions were appended with the items and the same were brought to the notice of the members, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that punishment could not be awarded on the basis of legal opinions.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is also an opinion that the people had paid bribe as it had only been published in the newspapers, but the members did not have proofs that so and so persons had given bribes to so and so persons. Although Shri Satish Kumar Padam had been convicted by the Court, they instead of awarding punishment to him constituted an Inquiry Committee.

Professor Jatinder Kumar Grover said that they should not spoil the careers of the students.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that they treat all the students as their own children, but it is for the Committees to see whether the students concerned are guilty or not, and then they have to take the decision in accordance with the Regulations/Rules of the University.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the UMC Committee-II had recommended that the candidate(s) be debarred from appearing in any University examination for two years in the papers in which they were found guilty, including in the examination in which they were found guilty, i.e., December 2020. He confesses that he could not give much input in the previous meeting as he had not full facts of the case. If they had taken a wrong decision in the previous case, it does not mean that they should commit the same mistake in this case also. He suggested that the punishment recommended by the UMC Committee-II should be awarded to the students. If they do this, maybe the students give their statement to the Committee, which is proposed to be constituted. Having information that something wrong had been done by the students and they still allow them got scot free, would not be appropriate at their part. They should not ignore the wrong action done by the students and must give punishment to them, but if any relief is given to the students by the Court, they would not have any problem. They could not undo, which had been done in the previous meeting, but in the item under consideration, they must take correct decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that she disagree with Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua. Since both the cases are similar, the decision which was taken in the earlier case, is to be taken in the case under consideration. A Fact-Finding Committee would be constituted to unearth the truth. The student would be awarded the degree and the student would not suffer anymore.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that his dissent should be recorded, if degree is awarded to the student, whose case is under consideration.

RESOLVED: That as decided by the Syndicate in meeting dated 26.08.2023 in the case of Ms. Nancy Aggarwal, the result of Ms. Mansi Jain, a student of LL.B. 3rd Semester, be declared (if not declared) and her Detailed-Marks-Cards and Degree, be released.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Fact-Finding Committee be constituted to find out the circumstances under which the case was sent to other UMC Committee for review, whereas it should have been sent to the same Committee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua recorded his dissent.

- 10.** Considered if, the Faculties (**Appendix-VIII**) opted by the following Fellows, be assigned as mentioned against each:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Fellow	Faculties
1.	Shri Honey Thakur, President, PUNTEF	1. Arts 2. Law 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce
2.	Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, President, PUTA	1. Medical Science 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education

Dr. Dinesh Kumar, referring to page 117 of the Appendix, said that Shri Honey Thakur has sent his request for assignment of Faculties, but in the letter he has neither mentioned the letter No. nor date. He would like to see the letter through which Shri Honey Thakur was requested to send the Faculties to be opted by him. He pointed out that Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura had mentioned the letter **No.ST9219** and date **11.10.2023** (page 118 of the Appendix).

It was informed that since Shri Honey Thakur has got again elected as President, PUSA, he has requested for assignment of Faculty afresh.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he has just asked whether the University had requested him to send the Faculties afresh or not.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if they accept that Shri Honey Thakur has got elected as Present, PUSA, afresh, that meant, his previous term had got ended before

the election. On the basis of President, PUSA, he was got elected as member of the Board of Finance. The day his first term as President, PUSA, got ended, he should have ceased to be the member of the Board of Finance, but he had attended the meeting of the Board of Finance held on 4.10.2023, the minutes of which was considered by the Syndicate in the morning. How he was allowed to attend the meeting of the Board of Finance on 4.10.2023? Election to the vacant seat of Board of Finance should have been conducted again, because he has got elected as President, PUSA, afresh.

It was clarified that if same person gets elected as President, PUTA, he/she is requested to give Faculties afresh. Similar is the case here.

Dr. Dinesh Kuamr said that it is not his question. His question is that he (Shri Honey Thakur) has got elected as President, PUSA, again this year. How he remained member of the Board of Finance when his previous term as President, PUSA, had expired well before the election? When the meeting of the Senate had also been conducted after his election, why the election of member of Board of Finance against the seat vacated by Shri Honey Thakur was not conducted. What has happened is that Shri Honey Thakur had taken all the benefits by continuing as President, PUSA and now making request for change of assignment of Faculties on the plea that he has been elected as President, PUSA, afresh? If his (Shri Honey Thakur) term is to be treated as continued as his term as member of Board of Finance had not to be ceased, he could not be allowed to change the Faculties and if he is to be treated as President, PUSA, elected afresh, he was not to be allowed to continue as member of Board of Finance after his previous term as President, PUSA, was got ceased. The office rightly did not request him to send Faculties afresh as he was treated continued and sought Faculties only from President, PUTA, through a letter. The office did not sought Faculties from Shri Honey Thakur, because it knew that he could not change Faculties after the period of two years. Shri Honey Thakur at his own made a request for change in assignment of Faculties. How could they allow him to change the Faculties? If Shri Honey Thakur is allowed to change the Faculties, several other Fellows, including him could make a request for change of Faculties. He further said that he is clear on this issue. If all the members of this Syndicate get elected to the next Syndicate in the month of December 2023, would the Affiliation Committee be not appointed afresh or the same would continue automatically? Affiliation Committee could not continue automatically.

It was clarified that whenever a new President of PUTA or PUSA, is got elected, they request him/her to send the Faculties, which he/she wanted to be assigned.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that had they treated him elected as President, PUSA, afresh, they would not have allowed him to continue as member of the Board of Finance. He reiterated that the election of the seat of Board of Finance vacated by Shri Honey Thakur should have been conducted in the meeting of the Senate. Moreover, the election of Panjab University Staff Association was held in the month of April, 2023, why his request for change of Faculties is being placed before the Syndicate in the month of October? So far Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, President, PUTA, is concerned, he has got elected only in the last month and his request has been placed before the Syndicate in this meeting. Why they did not request him (Shri Honey Thakur) to send Faculties again for so many months? Rather, the office did not seek Faculties from him even now.

It was clarified that there are three such ex-officio members, i.e., Dean of University Instruction, President, PUTA and President, PUSA, and whenever they get changed or elected afresh, Faculties are sought from them.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it is not like this. Here one of the persons (President, PUSA), who has got elected as member of the Board of Finance, is saying that he should be allowed to continue as such, and at the same time, is requesting that he may be allowed to change the Faculties. How both the things could be done?

It was said that this is the request of President, PUSA, and it is for the Syndicate to take decision on it.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that question is not about the decision to be taken by the Syndicate. Question is, if the office of the Registrar did not seek Faculties or request for change of Faculties, could they request for change of Faculties, and the same could be placed before the Syndicate? When it was informed that Faculties have been sought from President, PUTA, because he had got changed, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it meant that when the President, PUTA or PUSA got changed, Faculties are sought from them and if one of them continued, he/she is to be treated like other members and could only be changed the Faculties on completion of two years. How Shri Honey Thakur is allowed to change the Faculties?

It was informed that President, PUSA, is elected every year.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that earlier, President, PUSA, was not elected member of the Board of Finance, because he is elected every year and election against the vacant seat has to be conducted again. Hence, they could not allow this request for change of Faculties. Earlier, the Vice Chancellor was saying that whatever has been done could not be undone. Otherwise, at the time of discussing the recommendations of Board of Finance, he could have taken the objection that since Shri Honey Thakur is no more a member of the Board of Finance, what is the fate of these recommendations? Since neither any number nor date has been mentioned by Shri Honey Thakur, he gauged that the office has not made any mistake. He, therefore, reiterated that his request for change of Faculties could not be accepted. If he was to be allowed to continue as member of the Board of Finance, he has to retain the same Faculties.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that if being continued as President, PUSA, Shri Honey Thakur was allowed to continue as member of the Board of Finance, he should be allowed to retain the Faculties, which he had opted earlier.

Professor Jatinder Grover enquired, is the term of President, PUSA, for one year? Had a new person been got elected as President, PUSA, they would certainly request him/her to opt for Faculties and assigned the same to him/her? Similarly, if the President, PUTA, got changed, they take Faculties from him/her and did not apply Regulation for change of Faculties after two year.

It was said that earlier, they used to received notification from the office of the Chancellor regarding approval of nomination of President, PUTA.

On a point of order, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if Shri Honey Thakur was President of PUSA up to March 2023, and in April somebody else is got elected as President, PUSA, would they allow the other person to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Finance? When the reply was received in negative, Dr. Dinesh Kumar

enquired as to how Shri Honey Thakur was allowed? The President, PUSA, is not a member of Board of Finance; rather, he is an individual. He has been elected the member of the Board of Finance as a Senate member and not President, PUSA.

At this stage, few members started speaking together and a din prevailed.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that normally, the non-teaching employees are not in the Board of Finance.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the non-teaching employees are not made members of the Board of Finance because election is held every year.

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a bedlam prevailed.

Dr. Jagtar Singh and Professor Jatinder Grover said that they should have objected to the membership of Board of Finance of Shri Honey Thakur, when he was ceased to be the member of Board of Finance.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that then the recommendations of the Board of Finance could not be approved.

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

When Dr. Jagtar Singh said that from five of them, the item is approved, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if the item would be approved, there would be a big anomaly and he would write to Chancellor about this.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that letters are being written to the Chancellor by the persons within and outside the University.

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

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the election of the Senate was held in the year 2021 and the term of the Senate was commenced from 1st November 2020. Resultantly, the Fellows were asked to change the Faculties, if wanted. Shri Honey Thakur changed the Faculties in the month of December 2022 and now again requesting to change the Faculties. He is taking two benefits – one as former President of PUSA and another as present President of PUSA, which is wrong. Had someone else been got elected as President of PUSA, could Shri Honey Thakur been allowed to continue as member of the Board of Finance and the Faculties of the person elected been placed before the Syndicate in the month of October?

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he should be told why Shri Honey Thakur has never been transferred after his appointment as clerk. The Vice Chancellor issued order for his transfer for the first time, when he got promoted as Superintendent, four Senators went to meet the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that four Senators met her and the other talked to her on phone.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that then the Vice Chancellor had to withdraw the orders.

Dr. Jagtar Singh intervened to say that even if Dr. Dinesh Kumar does not want to disclose the names, he would like to tell that he had gone to meet the Vice Chancellor to request her not to transfer Shri Honey Thakur.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar remarked that after getting the orders withdrawn, he is paying this price to the members.

Dr. Jagtar Singh pointed out that this is not the standalone case as several non-teaching employees are working in the same departments/branches for the last 10 or more years. All such persons should be transferred, if Shri Honey Thakur is to be transferred.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he had always gone to meet the Registrar to get somebody transferred and never to stop the transfer. Technically, until the office writes a letter to the Fellows requesting them to change the Faculties, none could request for change of Faculties, even though re-election had taken place.

At this stage, it was informed that an e-mail had been sent to Shri Honey Thakur requesting him to send the Faculties afresh.

To this, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the office could not send an e-mail to Shri Honey Thakur for this purpose in the month of October, because he was re-elected as President, PUSA, in the month of April, 2023. He had already told that this is totally wrong.

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

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that since the recommendations of Board of Finance are being questioned, Shri Honey Thakur be allowed to retain the previous Faculties and should not be assigned new Faculties.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that no question would be raised on the recommendations of the Board of Finance.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that whenever any person is got re-elected, it is the duty of the University office to issue him/her a letter stating that he/she has again been elected, he/she should give the Faculties to be assigned to him/her. Then he/she should be asked whether he/she would like to leave the membership of Board of Finance or not.

To this, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said, is it an option?

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

At this stage, some of the members, including Dr. Jagtar Singh, Professor Jatinder Grover, Dr. Mukesh Arora, said that the item is approved. However, Dr. Dinesh Kumar and Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the item is not approved. When some of the members insisted that the item is approved, Dr. Dinesh Kumar stood

up and said the Syndicate has no power to assign Fellows to the Faculties as this power is vested with the Senate.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua requested the members not to request the Vice Chancellor to have voting or count raised hands on this issue, because if voting is started, it would never end.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that it is not right for the members to dominate the discussion and at the same time ask for voting.

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

The Vice Chancellor said that the request of Shri Honey Thakur for assignment of Faculties afresh is being recommended to the Senate.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that views of Shri Lajwant Singh Virk, who practice as a lawyer in the High Court, should be obtained.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that Fellows are assigned to the Faculties by the Senate.

Professor Devinder Singh said that when the person has got elected after winning the election, the office is duty bound to give the option.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that this is totally wrong, especially when he is allowed to continue as member of the Board of Finance and at the same time accepting his request for change of Faculties.

Professor Devinder Singh said that it was the duty of the office to ask him to send his Faculties afresh, when the person had got re-elected in the month of April. At that time, the legality of his membership of Board of Finance should have been checked - whether the person, who has been re-elected could continue to be the member of Board of Finance or not. He remarked that the person is the President of the Association concerned for a period of one year, but not on the mercy of the office. Rather, the person has gone to his voters and got re-elected. Hence, it was the duty of the office to ask him to send his Faculties afresh. He had not sought another term from the Senate or the Syndicate or the Vice Chancellor and instead he had gone to his voters and got re-elected. Why they had waited for the election of PUTA and sought Faculties from him in the month of October? Why have the Faculties not been sought in the months of April/May? So far as his membership of Board of Finance is concerned, the same should have been checked. To fight election and winning the election is entirely different. He strongly felt that the persons, whose term as President of the Association is one year and come again to the Senate after winning the election of Association, deserved to be given option of assignment of Faculties again. However, those whose term as members of the Senate is four years, is to be given the option to change the Faculties only once, i.e., immediately after completion of two years.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that Dr. Dinesh Kumar had raised question as to how Shri Honey Thakur was allowed to continue as member of the Board of Finance. Election for membership of Board of Finance was held in February 2023 and he won the same as a member of the Senate. His membership of the Senate never ceased and he continued to be the member of the Senate. Had his membership of the Senate ceased, they could have the right to raise objection?

Secondly, his membership for the Board of Finance is for a particular term, i.e., 1st February 2023 to 31st January 2024. According to him, there is no illegality of assigning him to the Faculties afresh as now he has got re-elected as President, PUSA, for another term of one year. So far as membership of Board of Finance is concerned, his membership is in continuation of his membership of the Senate. They should not complicate the issue as it is a simple and clear-cut issue.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired, would they communicate the decision of the Syndicate regarding his assignment to the Faculties to him or gets it approved from the Senate first. Professor Devinder Singh had clearly pointed out that the office has committed the mistake in allowing him to continue as member of the Board of Finance. Would she (Vice Chancellor) conduct an enquiry?

The Vice Chancellor said that the office would check whether Shri Honey Thakur could continue as member of the Board of Finance.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since now no meeting of the Board of Finance would be held, they are allowing him to seek assignment to the Faculties afresh. How could they do this?

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the election of the Board of Finance is totally different from the Syndicate, which is held in the month of December every year. The election of the Syndicate is totally based on the Faculties. Since there is continuity in his membership of the Senate, there should not be any problem in his membership of the Board of Finance. Had he lost the election, there would have been problem?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, that is what he is saying that if he is continuing as member of the Senate, he could not change the Faculties after a period of two years.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following Fellows, be assigned to the Faculties as mentioned against each:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Fellow	Faculties
1.	Shri Honey Thakur President, PUNTEF	1. Arts 2. Law 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce
2.	Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura President, PUTA	1. Medical Science 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education

- 11.** Re-considered the employment of Dr. Rakesh Khullar as Medical Officer at Bhai Ghaniya Ji Institute of Health, P.U., on contract basis after the age of 70 years, as per the legal opinion of Shri Akshay Kumar Goel, Advocate dated 11.09.2023 (**Appendix-IX**).

Dr. Jagtar Singh sarcastically remarked that Dr. Rakesh Khullar should be employed as Medical Officer at Bhai Ghaniya Ji Institute of Health till death.

It was informed that they had been time and again discussing in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate that new Doctors should be recruited at Bhai Ghaniya Ji Institute of Health. At the moment, they have re-employed two Doctors as Medical Officers – Dr. Devinder Dhawan and Dr. Rakesh Khullar. No extension in employment had been given to Dr. Devinder Dhawan and he was relieved on 14.05.2023. Dr. Rakesh Khullar has attained the age of 70 years on 15.09.2023. When extension was not given to Dr. Devinder Dhawan, he went to the Court stating that Dr. Kanwal Vilku and Dr. Rakesh Khullar had been given re-employment by the University beyond the age of 65 years. Dr. Kanwal Vilku was on contractual appointment and now they had not extended her contract. The Senate approved the appointment of Dr. Rakesh Khullar, Medical Officer (on contract) at Bhai Ghaniya Ji Institute of Health beyond the age of 65 years, till such time the post of Medical Officer is filled in on regular basis. Now, they have started the process of appointment of Medical Officers at Bhai Ghaniya Ji Institute of Health. Since Dr. Devinder Dhawan had already filed the case in the Court, it is for the House to decide whether extension in employment beyond the age of 70 years is to be given to Dr. Rakesh Khullar or not.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that there should be a policy in place that no person is given employment/re-employment beyond the age of 65 years.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the orders that Dr. Rakesh Khullar is appointed as Medical Officer on contract basis beyond the age of 65 years till such time the post of Medical Officer is filled on regular basis, was wrong, because none could be appointed for the whole life. He suggested that no one should be employed/re-employed after the age of 65 years.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there is a lacuna in the Regulations/Rules of the University that no upper age has been prescribed, which is also being pointed out in the legal opinion and office notes again and again. This might be the reason that the Syndicate approved the appointment of Dr. Rakesh Khullar as Medical Officer on contract basis beyond the age of 65 years till such time the post of Medical Officer is filled on regular basis. He, therefore, suggested that the relevant Regulations/Rules should be amended and upper age of 65 years should be mentioned in them. If they showed the decision that Dr. Rakesh Khullar, Medical Officer has not been given extension, the same would not be considered by the High Court. Hence, they should take a policy decision that no one beyond the age of 65 years would be employed/re-employed on regular/contract/temporary/ad hoc basis in the University.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the legal opinion, it has been written that the age of retirement for all categories of employees is prescribed in the University Calendar. Since amendment in the University Calendar is yet to be made, the extension in employment/re-employment should be given as per the existing Regulations/Rules mentioned in the Calendar.

Professor Devinder Singh said that if no upper age limit has been mentioned in the University Calendar and the Syndicate and Senate had given employment/re-employment to certain persons beyond the age of 65 years.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua intervened to say that it has been mentioned at pages 123-124 of the Appendix, "It is relevant to state here that there are two

permanent posts of Chief Medical Officers, three posts of Medical Officers and one post of Ayurvedic Medical Officer (with prescribed Pay-Scales) which fall under the category of 'A Class' and their Appointing Authority is 'Senate' as per the provisions of Chapter VI(A) of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2022 (pages 117-118). Retirement age is prescribed for all the categories of employees in the University Calendar. Re-employment of teachers after superannuation is prescribed up to 65 years on contract basis, under Regulation 17.4 of Chapter VI(A), the age of retirement of whole time Medical Officer is 60 years and extension can be granted for a period up to two years in special cases on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor". He, therefore, suggested that reply in the Court should be given in accordance with the provisions of the Calendar and should not quote employment/re-employment up to the age of 65 years at their own.

Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that they should try to fill up the post of Chief Medical Officer at the earliest.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Rakesh Khullar, Medical Officer on contract basis at BJK, Health Centre, P.U., be not given extension/re-employed after the age of 70 years.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That, in future, no person, be employed/re-employed on regular/contract/temporary/*ad hoc* basis in the University or given extension in service beyond the age of 65 years.

12. Considered the following recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 18.10.2023 (**Appendix-X**):-

Item 1

That Regulations for various courses under NEP-2020 in the light of increased credits, i.e., 24 per semester and Regulations for dual, major, interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary degree, be approved, as per **Appendix**.

Item 2

That amendment in Regulation 1.1 for Doctor of Philosophy in Faculty of Business Management & Commerce appearing at page 369 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007, be made as under:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>1.1 The enrolment to the Doctor of Philosophy in Faculty of Business Management and Commerce shall be open to a candidate who has obtained Master's degree with not less than 55 per cent marks in the aggregate from Panjab University or from any other University (approved by the Academic Council) in anyone of the following subjects :</p> <p>(i) Commerce or Management.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p>	<p>1.1 No Change</p> <p>(i) No Change</p>

<p>(ii) Economics, Mathematics, Statistics, Sociology, Psychology, Public Administration, Operations Research, Social Work, Engineering and Laws.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(iii) Any subject other than those mentioned in (i) and (ii) above provided that the candidate has either not less than 5 years' work experience at the managerial (including administrative service) level or is a member of the Faculty in the Department of University Business School, Panjab University with not less than 5 years' experience of teaching postgraduate classes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(iv) Those MFC candidates, who qualify the Pre-Ph.D. programmes of the University Business School can get themselves registered for Ph.D.</p> <p>Provided further that candidates with qualification, mentioned in (ii) & (iii) above shall be eligible for enrolment only if the area of research relates to the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) Economics, Mathematics, Statistics, Sociology, Psychology, Public Administration, Tourism Management, Hotel Management, Operations Research, Social Work, Engineering and Laws.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(iii) No Change</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(iv) No Change</p> <p>No Change</p>
--	---

Item 3

That amendments/additions/deletions in Regulations relating to 'Conditions of Service and Conduct of Teachers in Non-Government Affiliated Colleges', under Chapter VIII(E) of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2022, as per **Appendix**, be made.

Professor Gurmeet Singh stated that first of all, he would like to make a request that where 'University School of Open Learning or USOL' has been mentioned in the Regulations, should be replaced with 'Centre for Distance and Online Education or CDOE'. Secondly, he would like to point out that they talked about new National Education Policy on several occasions and had also implemented the same. It had been deliberated at every level that the education is required to be provided in mother tongue. The State of Madhya Pradesh has started imparting Medical Education in Hindi medium. Usually, an argument is given that study material in Hindi medium is available in Science subjects, but it is never said that the students could give their answers in Hindi or Punjabi medium. If few students gave answers in Hindi or Punjabi medium, is it very difficult to get the answer-books evaluated? He would like to point out that at page 23 and at certain other place of the Appendix, it has been written that "The candidates shall write their answers (i) in English in the case of Science subjects; (ii) in the language

concerned in the case of English, Punjabi or any other language”. When they took this type of decisions, the implications go far ahead, including to the Ministry of Education, University Grants Commission, etc. When at other places, the students could give answers in their mother tongue, why could the students of Panjab University not? When new National Education Policy (NEP) is saying, why could they not allow its students to give answers in Hindi or Punjabi? At one point of time, they have to take a courageous decision, and should not be so discourgeous that Science could not be taught other than English language. What he meant to say is that if Medical Education could be imparted in Hindi medium, why could not the words “Hindi or Punjabi” be mentioned in the proposed Regulation 4.8(i) and (ii), i.e. –

- (i) In English or Hindi or Punjabi in the case of Science subjects; and
- (ii) In the language concerned in the case of English, Hindi, Punjabi or any other language.

What he is saying is that they should also make a start to give freedom to students to give answers in Hindi or Punjabi medium, if they trust him, they would get a lot of benefits from the Ministry of Education and University Grants Commission. At the moment, they should not teach in Hindi and Punjabi Medium and should just give an option to the students to write the answers in Hindi or Punjabi. An argument against this is given that if the students are allowed to give answers in Hindi and Punjabi mediums, who would evaluate their answer-books. To this, he would like to say that in the application pro forma for employment/appointment as Assistant Professor, a column of languages known is there, wherein everybody wrote English, Hindi and Punjabi. How could they say that they would not evaluate the answer-books in which the answers have been given in Hindi or Punjabi?

Continuing, Professor Gurmeet Singh, referring to proposed Regulation 7 at page 133 of the appendix, said that it has been written that all whole time teachers in non-government Colleges affiliated to the University shall retire as per UGC Regulations. In this regard, he would like to bring to the kind notice that this issue is pending. It had been told that they are pursuing this matter. In the case of capping on the finances, they perhaps would be able to remove the capping with the intervention of the office of the Chancellor. He would also like to tell them that the Ministry has changed their stance in the meeting of the Board of Finance. The Ministry has asked the UGC to re-consider the request of the University. Similar efforts should be made to get the issue of age of retirement resolved. He is sure that if the Vice Chancellor takes up this matter with the Ministry personally, she would definitely succeed. When the Vice Chancellor would inform the Education Minister that she has introduced Hindi and Punjabi mediums in Science subject, he/she would be very happy.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that he endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor Gurmeet Singh, because there is a student in his class (Roll No. 54), who had studied up to 12th in Hindi medium. He approached his teacher with the request that he would like to leave the study, because he could not study in English medium. If an option is given to the students to write answers in Hindi or Punjabi, it would definitely help such students.

Dr. Mukesh Arora and Dr. Jagtar Singh said that he also endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor Gurmeet Singh.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they should not have any problem in promoting their mother tongues (Hindi and Punjabi languages). He added that now even the Civil Services exams are also being conducted in Hindi and Punjabi.

The Vice Chancellor said that the words 'Hindi and Punjabi' would be incorporated in the Regulations at appropriate places.

Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out that the meeting of the Academic Council was held on 28th June 2023, but the minutes of the same had perhaps not been circulated amongst the members.

Continuing, Dr. Parveen Goyal, referring to page 49, said that somewhere the table has been given and somewhere not.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that these Regulations are supposed to be placed before the Senate in its meeting to be held in the month of December 2023. The members of the Regulations Committee had made strenuous efforts to draft these Regulations, but Dr. Jagwant Singh, Chairman of the Committee, had to go outside, due to which all the mistakes could not be got corrected.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, referring to proposed Regulation 7 at page 133 of the Appendix, said that "All whole-time teachers in Non-Government. Colleges affiliated to the University, shall retire as per the Regulations prescribed by the University Grants Commission from time to time and as adopted by the Punjab Government". There are two types of age of retirement of teachers, i.e., 65 years as per UGC and 60/58 years as per Punjab Government. As far as age of retirement is concerned, they should go by the Regulations of UGC and not of the Punjab Government. Hence, they should amend the Regulation to say, "All whole-time teachers in Non-Government. Colleges affiliated to the University, shall retire as per the Regulations prescribed by the University Grants Commission from time to time".

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the Regulations/Rules of Punjab Government would prevail in the Colleges situated in the State of Punjab. Citing an example, he said that they are hitherto not able to pay remuneration to the guest faculty in accordance with the UGC.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they are fighting the case in the High Court relating to enhancement of age of superannuation from 60 years to 65 years on the basis of UGC Regulations. However, if they write that all whole-time teachers in Non-Government Colleges affiliated to the University, shall retire as per the Regulations prescribed by the University Grants Commission from time to time and as adopted by the Punjab Government, they would immediately lose the case. The teachers have been allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years, because the UGC Regulations say that the teachers will retire on attaining the age of 65 years, whereas the Punjab Government has reduced the age of retirement from 60 years to 58 years. As such, they could not follow the Regulations of Punjab Government.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that they had deliberated on this issue in the meeting of the Regulation Committee in detail. Why the words, "as adopted by the Punjab Government have been mentioned", because the UGC in its Regulations of 2010 and 2016 did not put any such conditions, whereas in the Regulations of 2018, the UGC has put the entire onus of age of retirement on the State. The UGC has categorically mentioned in its Regulations of 2018 that the Institutions/Universities, which come under the jurisdiction of the State, the Regulations/Rules of State Government

would apply on them. Hence, they could not ignore the Punjab Government. They had discussed the issue in detail and also whether they could use the word 'adopted or notified or so and so'. Therefore, the suggestion given by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua should be noted so that they could discuss the issue in the meeting of the Senate and take appropriate decision.

On a point of order, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they had already adopted the UGC Regulations, 2018. Even the recruitments of Assistant Professors, which are being made in the University as well as in its affiliated Colleges, are being made in accordance with UGC Regulations, 2018. Had they issued any separate circular that they would also follow the Regulations of Punjab Government? In fact, they had prepared the template for recruitment of Assistant Professors and Principals in accordance with UGC Regulations, 2018. The Punjab Government had not even agreed to insert the column for languages known. When the University decided to follow UGC Regulations, 2010, new Regulations, 2016 were notified. Similarly, when the University decided to follow UGC Regulations, 2016, new Regulations, 2018 were notified by the UGC. Ultimately, the teachers suffered. The teachers, who were got appointed in the year 2010, are being debarred from becoming Principals. Hence, they all are required to be extra vigilant. If any lacuna remained on the part of the Government, the sufferers are only the teachers.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that his own and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu's promotion is due, but they are not being promoted.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that if the Government did not agree to something, the University used to coordinate and take a judicious decision at its own level.

The Vice Chancellor asked whether Director, Higher Education, Punjab, was present in the meeting of the Committee.

Principal R.S. Jhanji and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that Director, Higher Education, Punjab, was present in the meeting. In fact, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, was asked that when Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, is agreeing to the decision being taken, why he is not agreeing. When Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they are sending Selection Committees to the Colleges for recruitments/promotions and getting the interviews conducted, Principal Jhanji apprehended that the approval to such appointments/promotions would not be granted.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to who would not give approval to the appointments/promotions.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that Director, Higher Education, Punjab, would not give the approval.

Dr. Jagtar Singh pointed out that Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, is not even sending the teams.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this treatment is being meted out to them since 2013. If the managements appointed/promoted teachers at their own level, the Government did not approve the same. This approval by the Government could be understood, if the shortcoming/lapse is on the part of the teacher concerned. He, therefore, requested the Syndicate that the teachers of aided and un-aided Colleges, who fulfilled all the requisite conditions, and their appointments/promotions have

been made by the duly constituted Committees in accordance with the UGC Regulations 2010 and 2016, be approved. The problem might be due to UGC or the Punjab Government, but the sufferers are only the teachers. Usually, they say that certain Managements are not giving such and such benefits to the teachers, but where the Managements are giving, the Government is saying why the same are being given. Citing an example, he said that if team is sent to consider the promotion of Dr. Jagtar Singh, he should be promoted because he was eligible before the notification of UGC, 2018. The team has been delayed by the Government. The University had also received certain cases of the Principals. It has been written there that the University would issue the circular after every six months. Since it was not in their notice, the circular could not be issued. They could not blame the University for non-issuance of circular. There are certain Colleges, which pay full salaries to the teachers.

Principal R.S. Jhanji pointed out that the template prepared for the U.T. Colleges is as per the UGC Regulations, 2018.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar intervened to say that they are taking the discussion to some other direction.

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a bedlam got prevailed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he had made a request to them that they should go through the UGC Regulation, 2018. Dr. Dua was saying that the words, "as adopted by the Punjab Government" should not be mentioned. He challenged that if they deleted these words, they would not be able to execute the proposed Regulations, especially when they had given an affidavit in the High Court that they would not give grant after attaining the age of 58 years by the teachers. The Regulations Committee had spent so much time and proposed best possible amendments. He would like to ask Dr. Dua, whether whatever he was saying is part of the recommendations of Regulations Committee? He would also like to be enlightened as to what they had been able to improve about the affiliation during the last 25 years. He had said that meeting of the Syndicate held on 4th February that whatever they are saying should be proposed in the Regulations concerned through amendment, but the proposal is yet to see the light of the day. Whatever Dr. Dua is saying should be given in writing for consideration by the Regulations Committee. He requested that they should discuss the amendments in Regulations, which are under consideration and should not go beyond them.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that he stated that the UGC says that the age of retirement of teachers is 65 years, but the Punjab Government says that the age of retirement of teachers is 58 years. If they amended the Regulations and made it a part of the Calendar, the teachers of Colleges, who are fighting the case with the Punjab Government in the High Court that their age of superannuation is 65 years and not 58 years, would lose their case. The teachers, who had been appointed earlier, whose retirement age had been reduced to 58 years, had won the case and their grant has been released by the Government. So far as newly recruited teachers are concerned, they would only get the relief, when approach the Court. They as Syndicate had condemned the letter of the Punjab Government regarding reducing the age of superannuation from 60 years to 58 years and had returned the same to the Government after rejecting it. On the one hand, they had written to the Government that their decision to reduce to age of superannuation from 60 years to 58 years is not acceptable to the Syndicate, and on the other hand, they are

mentioning in the proposed Regulation that they are accepting the age of superannuation as 58 years.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that they are not accepting the age of superannuation as 58 years; rather, they are accepting the UGC Regulations adopted by the Punjab Government.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar clarified that they had discussed to use of the words 'notified by the Punjab Government'.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the Syndicate of Panjab University in the year 2011 had proposed the age of superannuation as 65 years and the University seeks reply from the Government, but the same is yet to be received. Is that amendment in accordance with the circular of Punjab Government? They always referred to provisions of the University Calendar and did not refer to Regulations of Punjab Government. Citing an example, he said that their Provident Fund is also deducted in accordance with the Regulations of Panjab University (10% of the total salary minus HRA), whereas as per Punjab Government Regulations, 10% Provident Fund is to be deducted of the Basic Pay. Whenever any College did not follow the Regulation of the University, the teacher concerned approached the Court and get the relief. As such, they could not mention in their Regulations that they are going to accept the Regulations of Punjab Government. They could verify this fact from the Calendar. If they quote the Punjab Government, the Principals of Constituent Colleges would retire on attaining the age of 58 years, whereas at the moment, they had got stay from the Court to continue in service up to 65 years.

The Vice Chancellor said that what they could do is that they could refer back recommendation 3 to the Regulations Committee for re-consideration, and the remaining (recommendation 1 and 2) be approved.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, if they deemed fit, they could delete the words 'as adopted by the Punjab Government', but they should go through the UGC Regulation 2018 before doing so.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there are still certain minor mistakes in the Regulations and they were not able to correct them as Dr. Jagwant Singh, Chairman of the Committee, had to leave the station to attend to some urgent work. He, therefore, requested that the Syndicate should authorize the Vice Chancellor to approve the amendments/corrections to be carried out, on behalf of the Syndicate, so that the Regulations are placed before the Senate in its meeting to be held in the month of December 2023.

When Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua tried to refer to Regulations mentioned in Chapter VIII(A), Conditions of Affiliation for affiliated Colleges contained in Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2022, the Vice Chancellor said that she knew that they had amended these Regulations and sent to the Ministry of Home Affairs for approval.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that when these have already been amended and sent to the Ministry of Home Affairs for approval, why the same had been placed before the Regulations Committee? He, however, could tell that as to why these had been placed before the Regulations Committee, because when they had proposed amendments, they had mentioned the year of UGC Regulations. But now, they are not writing the year of UGC Regulations and are writing the words, "prescribed from

time to time”, so that the latest UGC Regulations could immediately be implemented for all times to come.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that except ‘as adopted by the Punjab Government, every else is absolutely correct.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that when the teachers of Union Territory, Chandigarh, went to the Court, the viewpoint of Chandigarh Administration was that since the age of retirement of teachers, as per Panjab University Calendar, is 60 years, they are retiring them on attaining the age of 60 years. In fact, they presented the provision of the Calendar in the Court. Value in the Court is of the Calendar, to which they usually called their Bible. Hence, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua has raised a serious issue, to which they should agree. Referring to proposed Regulation 2.8, he pointed out that it has been written that “the teachers should be appointed on contract basis only”, whereas in the morning they had discussed that the UGC had suggested nomenclatures ‘part-time, guest faculty’. Why they had created another nomenclature ‘contract basis’ at their own level, but they are not ready to issue a letter to the affiliated Colleges that they should be given regular pay-scale? Today, they must resolve that all the teachers appointed on temporary, contract, *ad hoc*, part-time basis and as guest faculty should be given salary in accordance with the pay-scale. It has been mentioned in the proposed Regulations itself that “the fixed emoluments paid to such contract teachers should not be less than the monthly gross salary of a regularly appointed Assistant Professor”. He pleaded that letter on the basis of this Regulation should be issued to the affiliated Colleges. In nut shell, either they should amend their Regulations or issue letter to the Colleges on the basis of the Regulations. Further, while referring to Regulation 4.2, “Annual increments shall be granted by the Governing Body to each teacher on the recommendation of the Principal and to the Principal on the recommendation of the Chairman of the Governing Body”, he said that annual increments are not being granted to the teachers in majority of the Colleges. Several teachers had been appointed on a salary of Rs.21,600/- per month and they are still there even after 10 years. Such a discrepancy should be resolved through Periodical Inspections, which they are conducting. Referring to proposed Regulation 13.1, he said that they had written that the teachers shall be granted gratuity by the Governing Body as per Rules and rates prescribed by the Punjab Government and Chandigarh Administration for their respective employees. He suggested that they should specify in the Regulation as to how much gratuity is to be paid to the teachers. Punjab Government did not adopt the notifications of the Central Government for years together. If they had to go by the Punjab Government, there was no need to have their own Calendars. If something is a part of the Calendar, power lay with them to amend the same. Otherwise, they had to follow the Civil Services Rules of Punjab Government, which are framed/amended by the Punjab Government. He pleaded that this should be seriously looked into and amended accordingly.

Continuing, Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that Regulation (h)(i) says, “to obtain the degree of the Panjab University, the candidate shall obtain more than 50% credit from Panjab University”. The credits could be 50% or 51% or more. However, according to him, it should be at least 70%. If they calculate the workload of 50% credits in accordance with the NEP-2020, several teachers would be without workload.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar clarified that as per NEP, the students could move from one University to another. Discussion took place that if a student, who was studying at Punjabi University, Patiala, and shifted to Panjab University, Chandigarh, in third

year, which University would award him/her the degree. The UGC had itself mentioned it in its mandate and they had just incorporated the same in their Regulations.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that a clarity is required that in case a student had moved from another University, he/she has to obtain at least 50% credits for obtaining degree from Panjab University.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that necessary addition would be made in this Regulation/provision.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the recommendation of the Regulations Committee dated 18.10.2023 relating to Item 1, as per Appendix, be approved, with the modification that –
 - (a) University School of Open Learning (USOL), be replaced with Centre for Distance & Online Education (CDOE); and
 - (b) Regulation 4.8(B) mentioned at page 23 of the Appendix, be amended as under:
 - (i) In English or Hindi or Punjabi in the case of Science subjects;
 - (ii) In the language concerned in the case of English, Hindi, Punjabi or any other language; and
 - (c) Regulation 1.1(h)(i) be amended in the light of the discussion.
2. the recommendation of the Regulations Committee dated 18.10.2023 relating to Item 2, be approved;
3. since the regulations have been framed within a short time and there could be certain mistakes, the Vice Chancellor be authorized to approve the regulations revised after carrying out minor mistakes, on behalf of the Syndicate; and
4. the recommendation of the Regulations Committee dated 18.10.2023 relating to Item 3, be referred back for reconsideration.

13. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 27.09.2023 (**Appendix-XI**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to the issue of evaluation of MBBS course, re-evaluation and golden chance via online mode.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation(s) of the Committee dated 27.09.2023, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

14 Considered minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 13.04.2023, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of the decision of the Syndicate dated 27.09.2022 (Para 12) regarding pension policy of Panjab University.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.9.2022 vide Para-12 considered the minutes of the committee dated 7.11.2019 and legal opinion dated 19.7.2020 of Shri Anupam Gupta, Senior Advocate, regarding pension policy of Panjab University. After due consideration the Syndicate resolved that:

“That a Committee comprising 3-4 persons, be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to look into the entire issue, including, how much additional financial burden would be there, if these persons are given another chance to opt pension scheme, how the employees could be categorized, etc. The recommendations of the Committee along with the detailed note to be prepared by the Finance & Development Officer be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

2. In terms of the aforesaid decision of the Syndicate the Vice Chancellor constituted the following Committee:-

- i) Prof. Sukhbir Kaur, ... Chairperson
Fellow
- ii) Prof. Mukesh Arora, Fellow
- iii) Finance & Development Officer
- iv) A.R.A. (Pension)... Convener

3. The minutes of the meeting of the said Committee dated 13.04.2023 were submitted to the Vice Chancellor for approval on 18.04.2023.

4. With respect to the aforesaid minutes of the committee, the Vice-Chancellor ordered that *“the committee has calculated the implications by taking some assumptions. In order to have more scientific estimation, an Acturial Study from an independent Acturial professional may be got carried out, which can form basis for a rational decision making as well as base for seeking grant from government, if required.*

5. Accordingly, a professional actuarial firm namely Charan Gupta Consultant Pvt. Ltd., Noida was engaged to carry out this exercise. The said firm was engaged on the reference of NIIPER, Mohali as the same firm has carried out similar exercise for NIIPER, Mohali. The report of acturial valuation is attached.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar requested the Vice Chancellor to defer the consideration of the Item as they had received all the documents today itself. Moreover, there are so many calculations. He had made a cursory look and found that the total liability is of Rs.654 crore. He suggested that the consideration of the Item should be deferred, so that they could go through all the papers carefully and give their inputs.

Professor Devinder Singh said that members had been demanding in the last three meetings of the Syndicate that Item relating to opening of Pension again should be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a bedlam got prevailed.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that the persons, who had been employed between 2006 and 2009, had neither been given the Old Pension Scheme nor New Pension Scheme. He, therefore, suggested that these persons should be given an opportunity to opt for the Old Pension Scheme, because after this, the New Pension Scheme was made compulsory for all.

Professor Devinder Singh said that irrespective of whether the liability is of Rs.600 crore or Rs.700 crore or Rs.1,000 crore, they have to give pension, especially when their Pension Policy is in accordance with the Punjab Government and the Punjab Government is saying that they are going to give old pension to all. As such, now they did not have any other option, but to give old pension to all.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that now the Punjab Government has implemented Old Pension Scheme in place of New Pension Scheme. Moreover, for the reopening of option for the old Pension Scheme, the Presidents, PUTA, has perhaps set aside the demand of making this University a Central University. If the Old Pension Scheme is implemented by the Punjab Government, whether all the employees, who have not opted for the New Pension Scheme, could be given an opportunity to opt for the Old Pension Scheme? Secondly, so far as New Pension Scheme is concerned, the Government of India has also constituted a Committee to have a relook at it, and rumours are there that they would perhaps bring another Pension Scheme, maybe slightly different from the Old Pension Scheme. When enquired, he clarified that the Central Government has constituted a Committee to review the New Pension Scheme. They should not have any problem, if the serving employees liked to opt for the New Pension Scheme. He added that if the Old Pension Scheme is to be implemented, it should be implemented in the way, the Himachal Government has implemented or Punjab Government would implement. At the same time, he would like to ask, if someone has not opted for the New Pension Scheme and is covered under the Contributory Provident Fund, how would he/she get Old Pension Scheme? However, if the Old Pension Scheme is to be given, then it should be given to all. So far as the liability is concerned, they are finding it hard to count. But as a Policy, if they wanted to extend/give a benefit, then it should be for all and not only up to 2009.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that firstly, another option should be given to these persons to opt for the Old Pension Scheme and, thereafter, if possible, the Old Pension Scheme should be given to all.

Dr. Parveen Goyal and Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Pension should be given.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that firstly, New Pension Scheme should be given.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that whenever any new scheme is implemented, people do have doubts in their minds, whether the scheme would prove to be successful or not. When this Pension Scheme came in the year 2006, he was a member of the Senate, and the employees had doubts in their minds, whether the scheme would prove to be successful or not. Resultantly, several employees could not opt for the Old Pension Scheme. Now, the Committee had made the recommendations about the financial liability, which should be accepted, because the Syndicate had already taken certain decisions about the Pension in its March 2020 meeting.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the Item should be approved because the employees concerned demonstrate entire day outside on the day of the meeting of the Syndicate.

Professor Devinder Singh and Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra suggested that the Item should be approved.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that they should pray that the persons, who are left out, would also get the Pension.

Dr. Parveen Goyal and Professor Devinder Singh said that the Old Pension Scheme should be given to all those employees, who had joined the University service up to 2006.

The Vice Chancellor said that the option would be reopened only for the employees/retirees, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004.

Professor Devinder Singh and Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the option should be reopened only for the employees/retirees, who were in the University service up to 23rd February 2006.

Principal R.S. Jhanji and Professor Jatinder Grover said that Punjab Government has given Old Pension Scheme to the employees, who were in service up to the year 2009.

Professor Gurmeet Singh and Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra suggested that then the Pension should be given to the employees, who were/are in the University service up to the year 2009.

It was clarified that it is a joint Item for giving another option to the employees, e.g., (i) for those employees, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004; and (ii) for those employees, who were in the University service up to 23rd February 2006.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the Pension Scheme of the University was notified on 23rd February 2006.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired as to when the Pension Scheme was adopted by the University. Usually, they adopt all the notifications of the Government.

It was clarified that this notification is not a general notification; rather, it is a notification for Panjab University alone.

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

Professor Devinder Singh said that Item, which had come to the Syndicate, is for grant of another opportunity to exercise option to those employees/retirees, who were in the University service up to 22nd February 2006.

The Vice Chancellor enquired, would the notification of Government of India be followed or not?

The members replied in affirmative.

Professor Gurmeet Singh clarified that the Government of India notification is for grant of pension to the employees, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004.

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a bedlam got prevailed.

The Vice Chancellor said that though the Pension Policy had come on 23rd February 2006, it was for the employees, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004. When the members stressed that option should be given to all those employees/retirees, who were in the University service up to 22nd February 2006, the Vice Chancellor said that they are not above Government of India. They have to follow certain Regulations/Rules.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they decide that those employees, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004, be given another option to opt for the Old Pension Scheme.

The Vice Chancellor said that they might decide to give another opportunity to exercise option to those employees, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004, but wherefrom the additional financial liability would be met? First, they have to evolve/found some mechanism for meeting the additional financial liability. They should first send a proposal to the Government for giving additional grant to the University to meet this additional financial liability.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the Government might ask from the University as to why the University has again given option to its employees to opt for the Old Pension Scheme. The Government could also say that since the University has re-opened the option without the permission of the Government, it should meet the additional liability itself. He, therefore, suggested that the matter should be placed before the Board of Finance for consideration, where the representatives of both Central and State Governments would be present.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that since the matter related to finance, it should be placed before the Board of Finance.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that these are the same categories of employees, who had been given option to opt for the Pension Scheme earlier. They are not adding any new employee in the pension fold. Since they are not including new employees, objection from the Government is not expected to come. The persons, who are not covered in the Pension Scheme, as per the decision of the Government of India, would not be able to opt for the pension. Keeping in view the long services rendered by the employees, they are taking a sympathetic view and giving them another opportunity to opt for the Pension Scheme.

The Vice Chancellor said that earlier also, they had given option to opt for the pension to those employees, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004. Hence, they could give another opportunity to the employees, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004, but could not opt for the Pension Scheme. However, still they have to go to the Board of Finance to get the additional financial liability met. When Professor Devinder Singh said that option should be given to all those employees, who were in the University service up to 22nd February 2006, to opt for the pension, the Vice Chancellor said that it could not be done,

because earlier also option was given only to those employees, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that all those persons, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004, should be given another option to opt for the pension subject to approval by the Board of Finance.

Professor Devinder Singh said that all the employees are entitled to pension as it has been mentioned at page 7 of the Appendix that the employees below the age of 35 years, who joined service between 01.01.2004 to 22.2.2006 are also entitled to exercise an option as provided in Panjab University Regulation.

The Vice Chancellor said that as per the Scheme, pension could only be given to those employees, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004, but the Committee considered and recommended that pension should be given to all those employees, who were in the University service up to 22.02.2006. When Professor Devinder Singh pointed out that the notification was issued on 23rd February 2006, the Vice Chancellor said that whenever the notification might have been issue, but only those employees were allowed to opt for the Pension, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that moreover, from 2004 onward, the Government of India has also stopped giving Old Pension even to its own employees.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that now, all are saying that another opportunity should be given to the employees to opt for the Pension, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004, but he could not understand whether the financial liability has been calculated up to 22nd February 2006 or up to 31st December 2003.

The Vice Chancellor said that the financial liability has been given both up to 31st December 2003 and 22nd February 2006.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired, which estimated financial liability, are they approving?

The Vice Chancellor said that, at the moment, they are not approving anything.

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a bedlam got prevailed.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk pointed that the employees/retirees, who would opt for the Pension, would also deposit between Rs.20 lac to Rs.25 lac or more.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Dr. Mukesh Arora requested the Vice Chancellor to approve that the employees, who were in the University service before 01.01.2004, be given another opportunity to opt for the Pension.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that it was argued in the beginning that since the members had not been able to go through all the documents as they had been provided the Item on the tables, a general discussion should be allowed, and thereafter, the consideration of the Item should be deferred and the Item be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he did not know from where the amount of Rs.600 crore would come.

RESOLVED: That matter as to how an additional financial liability of Rs.654,18,72,670/- would be met for giving another opportunity to the employees/retirees, who were in the University service before 1.01.2004, to opt for the pension, be placed before the Board of Finance for consideration.

When the discussion on Items for ratification and information was over, it was pointed out that there is a current agenda item, which pertained to report of the Committee, constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to look into the complaint against G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sudhar, Ludhiana. Should the item be placed before the House?

The members said that the item should be placed before the House.

- 15.** Considered the report of the Committee (**Appendix-1**), constituted by the Vice Chancellor (comprising Professor Rattan Singh (Chairperson), Dr. Jagwant Singh, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Principal Kirandeep Kaur, Fellows), to look into the complaint against G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, Ludhiana, regarding irregularities in payment to the teachers, Dearness Allowance, M.Phil./Ph.D. increments and promotion under CAS.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stated that since he was a member of the Committee, he could brief the members. Briefing the members, he stated that the 4-member Committee visited G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, Ludhiana, on 29th May 2023 and submitted its interim report. The Committee asked the College to provide certain documents within a stipulated time. Thereafter, the College was again written to provide the documents in accordance with complaint received against the College, and asked to submit the same within 4 days, but the College submitted the same after 30 or 40 days. The Deputy Registrar (Colleges) gave a note that these documents have been received by him on such and such date and the documents are without date. However, the College did not append the required documents. Hence, the Committee did not have any option except to prepare its reports on the basis of the record available in the Colleges Branch. The first issue before the Committee was relating to the eligibility of the Principal. The complainant had written in his complaint that most of the experience of the Principal (Dr. Harpreet Singh) is of the College(s) affiliated to Punjab Technical University and Dr. Harpreet Singh had qualified the UGC-NET in Management in the year 2012 and did Ph.D. in the year 2013. In the Regulations appended, it has been clearly mentioned that the eligibility is to be counted from the date, the candidate qualified the UGC-NET or obtained Ph.D. degree. If they count his experience from 2012, he did not fulfil the requisite experience of 15 years in the year 2019. Moreover, the University had never ever accorded approval to any person appointed as Assistant Professor, who did not qualify the UGC-NET or done Ph.D. As such, Dr. Harpreet Singh is not eligible for the post of Principal. Second issue is that up to the month of May 2023, the salary of teachers of 14 months was pending and now 20 months salary is pending. Third issue is that the College had discontinued 8 courses without the permission of the University, and letters to the College on these issues had already been issued. Although the College had discontinued 8 courses, the teachers had not been forcefully terminated. One of the teachers, who was on leave for two months, had not been allowed to join. As such, he/she had to leave the College. Fourth issue is that the teachers are not being given promotion under CAS. When

the salaries are not being paid to the teachers, how could they expect that the College could give promotions to the teachers under CAS? There are different categories of teachers, e.g., teachers covered under 95% grant-in-aid and they are very less. The second category is of teachers, who are given consolidated pay and only a fixed rate of dearness allowed is given. Third category of teachers is, who are not given any dearness allowance, even though they are serving in the College for the last 10 years or more. So far as finances are concerned, they had not included anything at their own level; rather, they had just highlighted certain portions of the certified statement of Chartered Accountant. The College had spent the funds without justification and about Rs.1.5 lac per annum has been spent only on the office of the Principal. Similarly, every year, sound system had also been purchased. The complaints of the teachers had also been recorded. All these things had been given year-wise in a table. The teachers had written 19-22 types of letters/requests to the management of the College.

The Vice Chancellor said that the major matter of concern to her is that, this College (G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar) had been blacklisted by Maulana Azad Education Foundation for misuse of funds. In nutshell, the report of the Committee is: (i) abrupt discontinuation of certain courses selectively and arbitrarily; (ii) non-payment of salaries and other allowances, as per rules; (iii) non-grant of CAS promotions; (iv) selection of Principal without eligibility; and (v) non-approval of appointment of Principal for the last 2 years, besides that the College has been blacklisted by Maulana Azad Education Foundation for misuse of funds. So, the Committee is of the opinion that strong action be taken against the College Authorities for all these violations.

Professor Jatinder Grover enquired as to what is the Maulana Azad Education Foundation.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that when someone did not submit proper utilisation certificate, the funding agency blacklists the said Institution/University and put the same on its website. The decision of Maulana Azad Education Foundation regarding blacklisting of G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, Ludhiana, had been appended by the teachers with their complaints.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that being a member of the Committee Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua would agree that the College has appointed an ineligible person as Principal and the Selection Committee would have comprised Vice Chancellor's nominee and subject experts.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that since the lapses on the part of the College are serious, the action against the College should also be serious, but at the same time, the teachers should also be protected. If deemed fit, an Administrator should be appointed to oversee the affairs of the College.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the report of the Committee should be accepted and on the basis of the report, a show-cause notice be issued to the concerned College as to why action be not taken against it, in accordance with the Regulations/Rules of the University.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that this is the College, where professional courses are being taught, but the teachers from the Colleges of Education are sent there as part of the Inspection Committee, whereas there are three Professors in the Department of Physical Education & in the Department of Sports and two Fellows belonging to

this discipline. He did not know why the persons other than Senate members and University Professors are being sent to the Colleges for Inspection.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to tell as to what action is to be taken against the College.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu suggested that it should be recommended to the Punjab Government that since the Management Committee of the College is not capable to run the College smoothly, an Administrator should immediately be appointed to oversee the affairs of the College.

Professor Devinder Singh suggested that they should forward the report of the Committee to the Punjab Government for taking appropriate action against the College.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that when provision of appointment of Administrator existed in the Service Security Act, why should they not recommend appointment of Administrator to the Government?

At this stage, both Dr. Parveen Goyal and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu started speaking together, and din prevailed.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that under the Service Security Act, they could get the Administrator appointed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that they could not straightaway take any action against the College. What they could do is that they should accept the report of the Committee and on the basis of this report, issue a show-cause notice to the College as to why such and such action may not be taken against it and the College be given time to submit its reply. When the College would submit its reply, the same would be rejected by the Syndicate and then action could be taken against the College.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the suggestion given by Dr. Dinesh Kumar is one of the options.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that they could impose provisions of Regulation 11.1 on this College. As was being told by Dr. Mukesh Arora, provisions of Regulation 11.1 had been imposed on S.P.N. College, Mukerian, but he did not understand as to how the College was permitted to conduct Inter-Zonal Youth Festival for 5-6 times. The University had given a sum of Rs.15 lac to the College to conduct the Inter-Zonal Youth Festival.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the second option is that the Vice Chancellor should write a letter to the Director Higher Education, Punjab, requesting him to issue a show-cause notice to G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, as to why an Administrator be not appointed to oversee the affairs of the College.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that Dr. Dinesh Kumar is right that first, they should accept the report of the Committee and then issue a show-cause notice to the College.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Syndicate in its August meeting had accepted the reports and imposed penalties in accordance with Regulation 11.1 on

R.S.D. College, Ferozepur and Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur, and issued a show cause notice to them to give reply within a stipulated time. The College had approached the Court, but the Court did not accept their pleas, and the decision of the University still stand. So far as G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, is concerned, the College has so far not terminated the services of the teachers, though certain courses had been discontinued. Perhaps, it might not have terminated the services of the teachers keeping in view the status of R.S.D. College, Ferozepur and Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur, and might terminate the teachers next time. What they could do in regard to this College is that they should accept the report, and for the time being, impose provisions of Regulation 11.2 instead of Regulation 11.1. Regulation 11.2 says, "If after enquiry, it is found that an affiliated College under private management is not being properly administered the Syndicate may authorize the Vice Chancellor to appoint a representative or representatives of the University on the Managing body of the College for such period as may be prescribed by the Syndicate". Earlier, he (Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua) and Principal R.S. Jhanji had been appointed as representative(s) of the University on a couple of Colleges. It did not affect much, but if the Managing body of the College takes any adverse decision without calling the representative(s) of the body, the same is not tenable in the Court. Moreover, the representative(s) of the University sometime ask them not to take certain adverse decision and if the management still takes the decision, they record their dissent. One similar decision was earlier taken in the case of Guru Nanak Girls College, Ludhiana. After imposing the provisions of Regulation 11.2, they could request the Punjab Government to appoint Administrator on G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it meant, they could appoint two representatives of the University on the Managing Committee and simultaneously request the Punjab Government to appoint Administrator to oversee the affairs of the College.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that there is a provision under Regulation 11.1 that the papers for grants to the Colleges shall not be forwarded to the State Government/University Grants Commission. They did not want to impose this condition, because the salaries of the teachers would further get delayed.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that their main concern is that the teachers should get the benefits, including salaries and promotions under CAS.

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua should be appointed as the representative of the University on the Managing Committee of G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that Regulation 11.2 further says, "If a representative(s) of the University appointed on the Managing Committee of an affiliated college is/are not invited to the meeting/s of the Managing Committee, the proceedings of the meeting/s shall be regarded as invalid.....".

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu suggested that two representatives of the University should be appointed on the Managing Committee of G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, for a period of three years.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the case of Khalsa College, Muktsar, should also be taken care of.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that since the management of the College has to pay T.A. and D.A. to the representative(s) of the University, only one representative should be appointed.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the report of the Committee (**Appendix-XII**), constituted by the Vice Chancellor (comprising Professor Rattan Singh, University Institute of Legal Studies (Chairperson), Dr. Jagwant Singh, Fellow, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, Fellow, and Principal Kirandeep Kaur, Fellow), to look into the complaint against G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, Ludhiana, regarding irregularities in payment to the teachers, Dearness Allowance, M.Phil./Ph.D. increments and promotion under CAS, be accepted;
2. as per Regulation 11.2, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, Syndic, be appointed as a representative of the University on the Managing body of G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, Ludhiana, for a period of three years; and
3. a copy of the report, be sent to the Punjab Government with the request to appoint Administrator to oversee the affairs of G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, Ludhiana.

16. Information contained in **Items R-1 to R-12** was read out, viz. –

R-1. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed/grant of extension in appointment to the following persons as Assistant Professor purely on temporary basis at P.U. Giri Regional Centre, Una Road, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, w.e.f. the date they start/started working for the academic session 2023-24 in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus allowances (with one day break as usual) on same terms and conditions, under Regulations 5 at page 112-113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-1, 2022:-

Sr. No.	Name of Person	Branch
1	Mrs. Ritika Arora	I.T.
2	Sh. Gurbinder Singh	I.T.
3	Ms. Divya Sharma	I.T.
4	Sh. Kanwalpreet Singh	CSE
5	Ms. Shama Pathania	CSE

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-2. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed afresh the following faculty at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 12.10.2023 for 11 months i.e. upto 11.09.2024 with break on 11.10.2023 or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5(A) at page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, on the same terms and conditions, on which they were working earlier:

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

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-3. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Sahib Singh, Senior Technician (G-II) as Technical Officer (G-I) (under “Pharmacognosy Section of U.I.P.S) in the revised pay scale of Rs.48,700-1,54,300/- (Level-16 as per 6th PPC) plus allowances, admissible as per Panjab University Rules, with effect from the date he joins the duty against the vacant post of Technical officer(G-I) in the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences. His pay be fixed as per Panjab University Rules.

- NOTE:** 1. All the terms and conditions of service and rules of the discipline and conduct as contained in the Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I & III and other rules and instructions framed there under from time to time shall be applicable.
2. An office note was enclosed.

R-4. The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Academic Committee dated 23.08.2023 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Fee Structure of Post Graduate Diploma in Yoga Science for the session 2023-2024 as under:-

Name of Course	Tuition Fee	Mts. & other user Charges	Contribution to Funds	1 st Instalment	2 nd Instalment	Total
Post Graduate Diploma in Yoga Science (One year Course)	4190	2580	6475	11150/-	2095/-	13245

R-5. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra nee Sophia Alphonse, Associate Professor in English, PURC, Ludhiana, w.e.f. 12.06.2023, as requested by her, under Regulation 6 at page 119 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

- NOTE:** 1. Regulation 6, page 119, Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, which reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

Explanation: long leave would mean leave for one year or more.”

2. An office note was enclosed.

- R-6.** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Akshita Singh, as Medical Officer (on contract) at Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, P.U. initially for a period of 89 days (w.e.f. the date she join her duty) on consolidated salary of Rs.62738/- p.m. Duty hours will be as per OPD/Emergency schedule of BGJ Institute of Health. Her services will be extendable as per requirement of the institute by giving one day break after 89 days on satisfactory performance and good conduct as per previous practices, with the following stipulation:-

“That the above appointment is being made purely on contract basis & for the period as mentioned above. It is made clear that she will have no claim whatsoever for regular appointment after expiry of term of contractual appointment & her appointment shall be terminated without any notice. Her appointment shall come to an end automatically on completion of term of part time appointment as stated above”.

NOTE: A copy of minutes of Selection Committee dated 06.09.2023 was enclosed (**Appendix-XIII**).

- R-7.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation (No.4) of the Admission Facilitation Committee dated 14.08.2023 (**Appendix-XIV**) that the students of 2nd, 4th and 6th semesters of B.Sc./M.Sc. (Honours School) be given special chance and the same be done in a fast pace so that the entire process is completed before the last date of admission i.e. 31.08.2023.

- R-8.** In continuation to retiral benefits already sanctioned to Dr. Parvinder Singh Former C.O.E., P.U., Chandigarh, vide office order No. 14894-14903/Estt dated 26.12.2022 (considering his total service in the Panjab University upto the age of superannuation on 31.12.2022), the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate has allowed to add the 25 years lump sum past service period of Dr. Parvinder Singh in his service, in terms of letter No. 5/21-2015 BL (4) dated 15.03.2019 issued by the DPI (Colleges) Punjab. S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali, under Regulation 15.2 at page no.132-133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

NOTE: A Copy of revised office order dated 17.02.2023 was enclosed.

- R-9.** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has granted temporary extension of affiliation to Govt. Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32-B, Chandigarh for (i) MD Microbiology (increase in intake of 02 Seats i.e. from 04 to 06), (ii) MD Dermatology (increase in intake of 01 Seat i.e. from 03 to 04), (iii) MD Community Medicine course (increase in intake of 08 seats from 01 to 09), (iv) New Course/subject i.e. MD. Pharmacology Course (04 seats) and (v) MD Paediatrics Course (increase in intake of 04 seats from 06 to 10), for the session 2023-24.

NOTE: An office note along with inspection report w.r.t. above mentioned courses is enclosed.

R-10. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of Shri Rajan Sharma, O.S.D. for six months more in the O/o the Secretary to Vice-Chancellor, on the same terms and conditions.

R-11. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Dr. Rashmi, Medical Officer (Full Time on contract basis), BGJ Institute of Health, P.U., for further period of 88 days more w.e.f. 23.09.2023 to 19.12.2023 with one day break on 22.09.2023 on the previous terms & conditions.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-12. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has accepted request (**Appendix-XV**) of Mrs. Pushpa Rani, Personal Assistant, O/o the Dean International Students, Panjab University, Chandigarh for voluntary retirement w.e.f. 31.12.2023 (A.N.) from the University service and has accordingly sanctioned the following retirement benefits:-

1. Gratuity, as admissible under Regulation 15.1 and 17.8 at page 132 & 134 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.
2. Encashment of Earned Leave, as may be admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019, but not exceeding 300 days.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

Referring to Sub-Item R-5, Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra has already deposited a sum of Rs.5 lac in lieu of notice period of three month.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that she has served 15-16 years at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, before joining Pondicherry University. Since she had to join Pondicherry University immediately, she gave a cheque of Rs.5 lac in lieu of notice period of three months. As Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra has served the University for so many years, the condition of notice period of three months should be waived off as the power to waive of the notice period lay with the Syndicate. There is a strange rule in the University that one could apply in outside institutions only twice a year.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that she had already applied at two different places before applying at Pondicherry University, but the interview at other places, where she had applied earlier, were not held.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that, as per the Regulations/Rules of University, one could apply outside only twice a year.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar intervened to say that several times the posts are advertised by the Panjab University, but the interviews are not conducted. The same

situation is prevailing in the Universities/Institutions all over India. They are not talking about a person, who had appeared in the interview, but could not get selected; rather, they are talking about the person in whose case the interviews had not been held.

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

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that as per the Government of India, one could apply outside four times in a year, but according to the University Regulations/Rules of the University, one could apply outside only twice a year. He suggested that the Panjab University should also allow the teachers to apply outside four times a year.

Dr. Mukesh Arora sarcastically said that the amount of Rs.5 lac of University people should be returned, but not of the College people.

Professor Devinder Singh and Professor Jatinder Grover said that the University should allow its teachers to apply outside five times in a year.

When it was informed that as per DOPT, a person could apply in outside Institutions four times in a year, Professor Jatinder Grover, Professor Devinder Singh, Dr. Dinesh Kumar and Dr. Parveen said that they adopt the rules of DOPT in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that the rules of DOPT could not be adopted in this manner as it required amendment in the Calendar.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the person, who has resigned from the University service and joined another University, has deposited a sum of Rs.5 lac. Now, they are pleading as to how this amount could be saved.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that it is not so.

The Vice Chancellor said that, as per Calendar provision, one could apply outside only twice a year and Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra had broken the Regulation/Rule.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that she has not broken the Regulation, because she had applied two times earlier and had she been selected, she would have retained her lien in this University. Since she had been got selected on her third application, the University Regulation says that she could give the notice period of three months or give salary equivalent to notice period and join another institution.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra and Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the Syndicate had the power to waive off the notice period.

Professor Gurmeet Singh agreed with Dr. Dinesh Kumar that had she been selected anyone of the two places, where she had applied earlier, she would have kept her lien. Now, the issue is waiving off the notice period and if they wanted, they could waive off the notice period.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar drew the attention of the Vice Chancellor towards Regulation 9, mentioned in note 1, which reads as "A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months notice before resigning his post, failing which, he shall forfeit salary for the same period. Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons." He is

requested that under the provision, the notice period of 3 months, which was to be given by Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra, should be waived off.

The Vice Chancellor said that she agreed with them that the power lay with the Syndicate, but normally the notice period is got waived off in advance. None of the employee leaves until his/her notice period is waived off by the competent authority.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra submitted that an application on 10th May for waiving off the notice period, but the same was returned to her on 29th May. Thereafter, she on 12th June deposited a cheque of Rs.5 lac as she had to join Pondicherry University on 13th June.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the Vice Chancellor should herself see that Dr. Vohra had submitted her resignation on 9th June, but the same has been placed before the Syndicate in this meeting.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that if the notice period of Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra is waived off, several other persons would also seek such waiver.

The Vice Chancellor said that what she wanted to say is that they should follow the Regulations/Rules. Moreover, normally, people first get the notice period waived off and then join the duty in another Institution. The notice period was also waived off in her case, but she had first got the notice period waived off and then joined the University.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the relieving is given only when the person concerned fulfilled the condition of notice period.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra had submitted a cheque of Rs.5 lac with the request that if the amount is found to be excess, the same should be refunded to her, because she was in a great hurry. However, she had made a request on 10th May for waiving off the notice period.

A couple of members suggested that a Committee should be appointed to consider the request of Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra for waiving off the notice period and make recommendation(s).

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that Regulation 6 at page 119, Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, says, "A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period. Provided that Syndicate may waive off, this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons. Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required." Hence, in this case, this provision is not applicable.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the information contained in **Item 16 (R-1 to R-4) and (R-6 to R-12)** on the agenda, be ratified; and
2. so far as **Sub-Item R-5 of Item 16** is concerned, a Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to consider whether the 3 months' notice period, which was

required to be given by Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra, Associate Professor, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, is to be waived off or not, as also to consider the DOPT Rules w.r.t. applying in other Institutions four times in a year and make recommendation(s).

17. Information contained in **Items I-1 to I-7** was read out and noted, i.e. –

I-1. In pursuance of orders dated 07.08.2023 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.16730 of 2023 (titled 'Dr. Harpreet Kaur Bimbra Vs. Panjab University, Sector 14, Chandigarh and others), wherein, the following petitioner has been given the benefits of continuing in service, in view of the similarly situated cases:-

Name of members	Faculty	Department	Date of superannuation (i.e. 60 years)	w.e.f. the date she continue in service as per interim orders
Dr. Harpreet Kaur, Professor	Kaur,	Department of Zoology	30.09.2023	01.10.2023

In this regard, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that the above faculty member be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.10.2023, as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No. 1505 of 2016 titled Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U. and others Special leave to appeal (C) No(s) 17457-17491/2022 Choragudi Nagaraja Kumar Vs. Panjab University & others and connected matters and she be paid the salary 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 made to her will be adjustable against the final dues payable to her, for which she should submit the undertaking as per *pro forma*.

NOTE: The teacher (s) residing in the University campus (who 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 Punjab and Haryana High Court.

I-2. In pursuance of orders dated 21.04.2023 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.8218 of 2023 (titled 'Richa Puri and Ors. Vs. Panjab University others), wherein, the following faculty has been given the benefits of continuing in service, in view of the similarly situated cases:-

Name of Faculty members	Department	Date of superannuation (i.e. 60 years)	w.e.f. the date she continue in service as per interim orders
Dr. Suresh Kumar, Professor	Statistics	30.09.2023	01.10.2023

In this regard, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that the above faculty member be considered to continue in service w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of Special leave to appeal (C) No(s) 17457-17491/2022 titled Choragudi Nagaraja Kumar Vs. Panjab University & others LPA No. 1505 of 2016 (titled Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. P.U. and other & entire bunch of connected matters and salary to him be paid which he 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 him. The payment made to him will be adjustable against the final dues payable to him, for which he should submit the undertaking as per *pro forma*.

NOTE: The teacher (s) residing in the University campus (who 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 Punjab and Haryana High Court.

I-3. The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following retirement benefits to Professor Vijay Prabha, Department of Microbiology, up to the age of 60 years i.e. up to 31.08.2018 (who is continuing working in the Panjab University service up to the age of 65 years i.e. up to 29.08.2023), subject to outcome of LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & others) and other connected cases:-

- (i) Pension/Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at page 184 & 187 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.
- (ii) Furlough as admissible under Regulation 12.1 (B) at page 122 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.
- (iii) Encashment of Earned leave as may be due to her but not exceeding 300 days, as admissible as per the decision of the Syndicate dated 01.09.2022 (Para 1).

I-4. The Vice-Chancellor, has sanctioned the following retirement benefits to Professor Anil Kishore Sinha, Department of Anthropology upto the age of 60 years i.e. up to 31.10.2018 (who is continuing working in the Panjab University service upto the age of 65 years i.e.

up to 04.10.2023), subject to outcome of LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & others) and other connected cases:-

- (i) Pension/Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at page 184 & 187 of P.U. Cal. Volume-I, 2022.
- (ii) Encashment of Earned leave as may be due to him but not exceeding 300 days, as admissible as per the decision of the Syndicate dated 01.09.2022 (Para 1).

I-5. To note request dated 19.09.2023 of Mr. Deepak Goyat, Secretary, Panjab University Campus Students' Council (PUCSC) for donating 02 Air conditioners to be installed in the Lecture Theatre - 1 of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U.

I-6. 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. Renu Vig Professor University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET)	23.10.2003	31.10.2023	(i) Pension/Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 184-187 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022 (ii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due to her but not exceeding 300 days as admissible as per decision of the Syndicate dated 01.09.2022 (Para 1).

Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 28.10.2023

2.	Dr. Narasingha Charan Panda Professor, VVBIS& IS, P.U., Hoshiarpur	25.04.2007	30.09.2023	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 and 15.2 at pages 132 & 133 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-I, 2022 (including previous service) (ii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due to him but not exceeding 300 days as admissible as per decision of the Syndicate dated 01.09.2022 (Para 1).
----	--	------------	------------	---

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

I-7. 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 Dina Nath Semi Professional Assistant Department of Laws, P.U.	25.04.1987	31.08.2023	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
2.	Mrs. Shashi Bala Junior Assistant (R&D section) R&S Branch, P.U.	05.01.2015	30.11.2023	
3.	Smt. Nirmala Devi Peon Examination Br-III, P.U.	28.01.2015	30.11.2023	
4.	Mr. Reham Ali Painter (Technician Grade-I) Construction Office, P.U.	02.04.1993	31.10.2023	

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

GENERAL DISCUSSION

1. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the Inter College tournaments are going on in G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar. Last year, during the Football Inter College tournaments, a huge quarrel had taken place and a representation in this regard had also been given by Guru Nanak College, Muktsar, that due to quarrel, the Inter College tournaments should be conducted in some other College, but that representation has not been taken into consideration, so far. If Regulation 11.2 is imposed on G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, he requested that the venue for the conduct of Inter College tournaments for Kabaddi, should be changed from G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar.

Dr. Jagtar Singh endorsed the viewpoint endorsed by Shri Lajwant Singh Virk and said that instead of creating centres for creating Inter College tournaments in Colleges, the tournaments should have been conducted on the campus of Panjab University itself. He reiterated that none of the Colleges should be created as Centres for conducting Inter College tournaments.

2. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu enquired as to what has been done in the case of approval of appointment of G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar

3. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the matter which was discussed in the previous meeting of the Syndicate that the terms of the UMC Committee should be up to two years. For amending the same, the matter should be referred to Regulations Committee.

4. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that on another issue pertaining to R.S.D College, Ferozepur, which had also been pointed out by Dr. H.S. Dua, on a point of order, he said that five days' notice was given to the said College, but no reply has been received from the College. The University has not taken any action after expiry of five days' notice period. The Registration Returns of the said College have not been accepted despite that, the students of the said College have participated in the Youth Welfare Festival. He told the Registrar to send a letter to the College, but the Director, Youth Welfare has intimated that no letter has been received in this regard. Even now, the students are going to participate in the Inter Zonal Festival.

It was informed that the letter has been sent to the College.

To this, Shri Lajwant Singh Virk replied that perhaps the letter has been sent to the College, but no intimation has been sent to the Director, Youth Welfare in this regard. He further stated that the students of R.S.D. College are going to participate in the Sports programme in the Department of Sports.

The Vice Chancellor directed the concerned to ensure that the Colleges where Regulation 11.1 and 11.2 have been imposed, be not allowed to participate in any Sports programme and Youth Welfare Festival.

5. Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the panels for the selection of Principals and Lecturers should be finalized at the earliest, as the meetings

of the Affiliation Committee has also been conducted and the session is near completion. The process of recruitments in the College(s) should be speed up, if requirement of manpower is needed, the same should be enhanced so that the process of recruitments be completed at the earliest.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay".

6. Professor Gurmeet Singh enquired as to what decision has been taken regarding webcasting of proceedings of the Senate. The meeting of the Senate would be conducted in the month of December, hence, this should be got examined as in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, the Committee was constituted for the purpose.
7. Professor Gurmeet Singh said that a circular was issued from the office regarding conduct of department wise Convocations in their respective departments. But none of the department has taken initiative in this regard. He requested that that circular should be issued again to serve as reminder.
8. Professor Gurmeet Singh requested that the heritage structure of the Students' Centre should be got restored as also requested in the earlier meetings of the Syndicate.
9. Professor Gurmeet Singh requested that a policy decision should be taken on the utilization of Multipurpose Auditorium in Sector 25. So far as, no decision has been taken in the matter, he requested a policy should be framed in this regard at the earliest.
10. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk requested that a reminder letter should also be sent to the Director, Higher Education (Punjab) with regard to appointment of Administrator, as no reply has been received in the University from the office of Director, Higher Education (Punjab).
11. Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that there were construction issues in P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana which has been delayed. It was also discussed earlier. He requested that a Committee should be formed on this issue or the Vice Chancellor may give suitable time, so that, they could come to meet her with detailed proposal of the construction.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua also requested that a Committee should be constituted for construction work in P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana.
12. Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that last year in February, the posts were advertised, but the Screening of applications has not been done so far.

To this, Professor Gurmeet Singh said that after sending three reminders, the process of recruitment has not been initiated. The Vice Chancellor should call the Chairpersons of the department and direct them to complete the process of screening of applications within 15 days.
13. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that Director, Higher Education had started sending teams from August, 2016. Before 2016, the teachers, who have fulfilled the requisite conditions, should be made eligible for promotion on the posts of Associate Professors and Principals. The teachers who were

eligible after 2016 to till date, should be allowed to apply in the Colleges Branch.

14. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that a circular should be sent to the Colleges that in accordance the Regulations, in future, the panels would be made amongst the University Professors.
15. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that a retired Professor of Arya College, Ludhiana had sent his representation to the Chancellor that salary of 20-22 days has not been paid to him for some specific reason. The representation had also been sent to the University. A letter should be sent from the University to the College that till the release of the salary of 20-22 days to the retired Professor, Arya College, no panel would be sent to the College for recruitments.
16. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the faculty of P.U. Regional Centre may be considered for transfer under the transfer policy, he had also requested in the earlier meetings. The reason for seeking transfer is that there is no workload for them, whereas the guest faculty has been appointed in the University. If the faculty from the P.U. Regional Centre would be transferred, the workload of the guest faculty could be adjusted.
17. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that as per the amendment of U.G.C guidelines notified on 31st July, 2023 where under clause 6.3, teachers were got designated for which the decision of the Committee is still pending. The decision should be taken earliest, so that the same could be implemented from 31st July, 2023.
18. Dr. Parveen Goyal endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Professor Gurmeet Singh, said that the heritage status of Students Centre should be got restored.
19. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the report of the manpower Audit has not been placed before the Syndicate so far, for which a huge amount was spent. In spite of receiving the report in the Audit Branch, the same was not placed before the Syndicate.
20. Dr. Parveen Goyal thanked the faculty members, who had been allowed extension after attaining the age of 60 years and did not opt for residential accommodation, due to which the new faculty could get residential accommodation at P.U. Campus.
21. Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that for the students of Guru Nanak Law College, Sayianwala Ludhiana, the centre of examination has been created in Baba Kundan Singh Law College, Dharamkot, which is 80 kilometers away from Ferozepur. The representation of the College has also been received from the students in this regard. The examination centre for the students of Guru Nanak Law College, Sayianwala, Ludhiana, should be created in P.U. Constituent College, Mokhanwala, so that the students may not suffer in travelling so far.
It was informed that the representation has been received in the evening itself, the Centre of the students of the said College would be changed to P.U. Constituent College, Mokhanwala.

22. Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that out of MTS workers recruited in the University departments, half of them did not work. He requested that the report regarding their work and conduct should be sent through the JAAC of the department. In the Department of Laws, the Cleaners even posted on MTS did not bother to clean the area and surroundings.
23. Dr. Dinesh Kumar requested that a one research scholar (Mr. Karan Goyal), who applied for JRF in the month of July and the minutes were prepared in the month of August and the same was sent to the office of the D.U.I. in the month of September. Due to miscommunication in the office, the same were reverted back to the Department and has been rejected as they have taken the stand that the minutes have been received in October. He requested to expedite his case.
24. Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that a teacher has checked the papers of students of B.A. LL.B. 7th Semester, in such a way that students have got 70 marks out of 80. Some other students sought the copies of the answer sheets through RTI. The representation of the students has also been sent in this regard. The second teacher who had checked the papers has awarded marks below 60. The variation of the result with such a huge difference would be challenged. Some Committee should be constituted for moderation of results.
25. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that temporary teachers were allowed 10 days' casual leave after completion of 10 years of service. A Committee should be constituted to examine to enhance their casual leave also, as they also teach the students on the similar pattern of regular teachers and are getting a salary of Rs.60,000/-.
26. Dr. Mukesh Arora requested that a provision of canteen should be made in the Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan. He had earlier requested for the same in the earlier meetings of the Syndicate.
- It was informed that several times he has requested for the same and it was refused by D.R. (Estate) to make arrangement of canteen in Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan.
27. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that there are self-financing courses in some of the Colleges. When the promotions under CAS were supposed to be made, they apply the Regulations of 2018, but the Government of Punjab is following the Regulations of 2016. The decision to remove this variation should be taken by constituting a Committee or otherwise.
28. Dr. Jagtar Singh said that Department of Youth Welfare is organizing Youth Festival. The Judges, who were appointed to judge the performances, were not of the desired calibre. The College which was to be disqualified was declared on the first position. The video of the function was also provided to the Director, Youth Welfare, but no action has been taken on it. He requested that some action should be proposed to be taken. All the competitions should be conducted in fair manner by the Colleges.
29. Professor Jatinder Grover said that during the visit of the Colleges for the panel, there is a condition that screening which is being held in the office of Dean, College Development Council, should be done in the presence of the

Dean. In the condition, it has been mentioned that the Dean or his nominee should be present; hence, the faculty of the Departments should be called for the speedy screening of applications, so that the teachers could be appointed and the conditions imposed by the Affiliation Committee would also be met.

30. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said as also requested in the previous meetings of the Syndicate, that the remuneration to be paid for evaluation of papers should be enhanced,

31. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the issue pertaining to approval of appointment for the Principal of G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar was discussed in today's meeting. If the Principal of the College is not eligible, a letter should be sent to the College regarding non-approval of his appointment.

32. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that similar is the case of Dashmesh Khalsa College, where a teacher has been suspended for aided post. He requested that if the report has been submitted, the same should be placed in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

33. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that as per the provisions of P.U. Calendars, the P.F. is to be deducted @ 10% whereas the Office of the EPF deducts the P.F. @ 12%. The Colleges are following the provisions of the P.U. Calendar. Till the deduction of 12% is allowed, the College teachers would not get the pension. This matter should be got examined. If deems fit, he could propose a resolution to this effect.

34. Professor Jatinder Grover pointed out that seats are vacant in certain departments of the University, including UILS and Department of Physical Education, and the P.U. Campus Students' Council is requesting them to fill up those vacant seats.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, while endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Professor Jatinder Grover, said that owing to problem being faced by the students for getting visa for Canada, several students, who had appeared in the entrance tests, are approaching the University for the purpose of seeking admission. If desired, he would provide a copy of representation of the students.

Dr. Jagtar Singh pointed out that the D.U.I. had received requests from such students.

It was informed that since the examinations for the odd semesters are approaching, they could not extend the last date for admission.

The Vice Chancellor said that the requests of the students would be considered on case to case basis.

35. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that a person was appointed in S.D. College, Sector 32, Chandigarh, having M.Phil. qualification with the condition that he would qualify the U.G.C. NET within a period of two years. However, the person qualified the U.G.C. NET and obtained Ph.D. degree in the year 2019. He pleaded that the appointment of the concerned teacher should be approved.

36. Professor Devinder Singh pointed out that the Librarian is one of the important components of the University, but for the last two years, the charge is being given either to D.U.I. or Director, Research & Development. He requested that an independent Librarian should be appointed in the A.C. Joshi Library, so that the work of the library does not suffer.
37. Professor Devinder Singh said that they always request the Chairperson and the Supervisor of the concerned candidate to provide the list of examiners for evaluation of Ph.D. thesis with the certification that none of the examiners is related to the candidate. Could they disclose the names of the examiners to the candidate to know whether anyone of them is related to him/her? He had also sent a communication to the Controller of Examinations in this regard.
38. Professor Devinder Singh said that the colloquium, Science Congress and Social Science Congress, has been fully established. During the tenure of Professor Renu Vig, as D.U.I., a circular was issued that for all the 11 faculties, an international summit should be organized, which was also conducted by the Faculty of Medical Sciences. He pleaded that an international summit should be conducted for all the faculties. The firms/Companies with which the Universities have international MoUs, should be invited for the international summit.

Y.P. Verma
Registrar

Confirmed

Renu Vig
VICE-CHANCELLOR