

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, D.U. HELD ON 23 APRIL, 2018 AT *Vishranta***

Members present

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 01. Professor A.K. Buragohain, Vice-Chancellor | – Chairperson |
| 02. Professor L.K. Nath, Dean, School of Science and Engineering | – Member |
| 03. Professor S.C. Kakaty, Head, Department of Statistics | – Member |
| 04. Dr. Budhin Gogoi, Principal, Margherita College, Margherita | – Member |
| 05. Dr. (Mrs.) Jyoti Borgohain, Dibrugarh, State Government's nominee | – Member |
| 06. Dr. Dayananda Borgohain, State Government's nominee | – Member |
| 07. Dr. Ruma Bordoloi, Guwahati, Governor's nominee | – Member |
| 08. Dr. Malti, Principal, Kalindi College (Retd.), Delhi, Governor's nominee | – Member |
| 09. Sri Longsing Teron, Diphu, D.U. Court's nominee | – Member |
| 10. Sri Ashim Kr. Dutta, Dibrugarh, D.U. Court's nominee | – Member |
| 11. Professor M.N. Dutta, Registrar | – Secretary |

The Secretary welcomed the Hon'ble Members of the Executive Council and requested the Hon'ble Vice-chancellor to preside over the Special Meeting of the Executive Council. Before taking up the agenda of the meeting, the Chairperson informed the Council that under Section 17(xi) of the Dibrugarh University Act, 1965 (as amended upto date), Professor (Dr.) Sanjay Pratap Singh, 5/53, Viram Khand, Gomti Nagar, Lucknow and Dr. Malti, Principal, Kalindi College (Retd.), C/3-161, Janak Puri, New Delhi have been nominated as a new members on the Executive Council for a period of 5 (five) years in place of Professor D.C. Nath and Dr. Ruma Bordoloi. However, due to certain preoccupations, Professor (Dr.) Sanjay Pratap Singh couldn't attend the meeting.

The Chairperson felicitated Dr. Malti with a token bouquet and a set of traditional Cheleng Sadar. The other Members of the Council also welcomed Dr. Malti as a new Member to the Council.

The Hon'ble Chairperson called the meeting into order at 10.30 A.M. He also explained the context and the urgency of convening the Special Meeting. He requested Professor M.N. Dutta, Secretary of the Council to present the Agenda Items.

Items :

ITEM NO.	A G E N D A
Item 1	To consider discussion and to take appropriate necessary action against Smt. Deepali Phukan, University Engineer in light of the verdict of the Hon'ble Gauhati High Court vide its order No. WP(C) No. 2263/2018, dated 28.03.2018.
Note	<p>The Special Meeting of the Executive Council considered and examined the reply, dated 18.08.2016 of Smt. Deepali Phukan, University Engineer submitted with regard to the Report of the Inquiry Committee related to the earth filling works around the DUIET Hostel buildings, in compliance of the Judgement and Order, dated 28.03.2018 of the Hon'ble Gauhati High Court delivered in WP(C) No. 2263 of 2017 and arrived at a reasoned decision on the same.</p> <p>The Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor apprised the members that an Inquiry Committee was constituted to inquire into allegations that payments were made in the year 2011 for works of "Developing and Raising of Land for the proposed construction of Hostel Building for DUIET (2 Nos.)" without completion of the works. The findings of the said Committee were placed before the 319th Meeting of the Executive Council, D.U. held on 06 May, 2013 and the Council thereupon authorized the Vice Chancellor to consider approval of the charges to be framed on the basis of</p>

	<p>the findings of the Inquiry Committee and directed the Registrar to serve the charge sheet to the University Engineer. Accordingly, charge sheet was served on the University Engineer, D.U. vide No. DU/RG/H.01.04/13/9024, dated 31.05.2013. The reply of the University Engineer, D.U. against the charge sheet notice were placed in the 320th Meeting of the Executive Council, D.U., held on 13th August, 2013. The Members of the Council examined the replies given by Smt. Deepali Phukan, University Engineer against the charges imputed upon her and opined that the University administration should prepare point-wise observations on her responses raised so that a proper decision can be taken by the Council in this regard. The 322nd Meeting of the Executive Council, held on 14th March, 2014 discussed the matter very seriously and found that the replies were not satisfactory. The Executive Council observed that for proper investigation for the irregularities committed, an Inquiry Committee be constituted as per DU Rules comprising members from the technical background and legal background. The Council authorized the Vice Chancellor to constitute the Committee.</p> <p>The Inquiry Committee constituted vide No. DU/RG/H.01.04/14/0863, dtd. 24.12.2014 has conducted the inquiry into the charges leveled against Smt. Phukan and submitted their report. The 330th Meeting of the Executive Council, held on 27 June, 2016 directed to serve notice to Smt. Phukan with a copy of the Inquiry Report giving her an opportunity to show cause as to why the University should not accept the report of the Inquiry Committee instituted by the University to inquire into the alleged charges brought against her. The authority sent a letter under Ref. No. DU/RG/H.01.05/16/1540, dated 05.07.2016 sending her copy of the report of the Inquiry Committee asking her to submit her reply as to why the report submitted by the Inquiry Committee shall not be accepted by the University authority. The 331st Meeting of the Executive Council, held on 27 July, 2016 directed to submit the responses to the charges brought against her by the Inquiry Committees as per letter referred to above within the extended deadline to which the reply was submitted by Smt. Deepali Phukan on 05.08.2016 and 18.08.2016 (amended). The 332nd Meeting of the Executive Council, held on 24.10.2016 examined the report of the Inquiry Committee, the reply, dated 18.08.2016 and other connected documents and was satisfied that the charges were found to be established/proved and that Smt. Deepali Phukan has failed to disprove the charges for which the penalty of 'Removal' was imposed upon Smt. Deepali Phukan under the provision of Article 32(vi)(h) of the DU Employees' Service Conditions Ordinance, 2000 (as amended upto 2007).</p> <p>However, said Smt. Deepali Phukan approached the Hon'ble Gauhati High Court vide WP(C) No. 2263/2017, which was disposed of by Judgment and Order dated 28.03.2018 directing the University to (i) reconsider the reply/representation, dated 18.08.2016 submitted by the writ petitioner as against the Enquiry Report, dated 28.12.2015 to arrive at a reasoned conclusion, and (ii) thereafter proceed with the requirement of the proviso of Article 32(vi) of the Ordinance of 2000.</p> <p>It was also brought to notice that the Hon'ble Court had clarified that by implication of the orders passed, the petitioner stands reinstated in service. It was noticed that the Charged Officer has not reported to the University till date even after disposal of the writ petition preferred by her.</p>
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>The charge sheet, the findings of the Enquiry Committee, the evidence and documents of the enquiry and the reply furnished by the Charged Officer have been duly considered by the Executive Council. The following discussions and conclusions were recorded:</p> <p>Charge No. 1 : The 1st charge primarily against the Charged Officer was that she had dishonestly and without any sanction from the competent authority allotted two numbers of earth filling work related to "development and raising of land for proposed construction of hostel building".</p> <p>The Enquiry Committee had returned a finding that there was no basis for the aforesaid work having been allotted to the two contractors. The absence of the regular and normal procedure of inviting tenders as given in Clause 34(3) of the First Statute of the University, preparation of comparative statements and selection of particular allottee after obtaining due approval was given a go-bye while issuing the work order. The first charge was opined by the Enquiry Committee to have been proved/established.</p> <p>On a consideration of the representation of the Charged Officer against the findings of the</p>

Inquiry Committee, it is noticed that the Charged Officer has contended that after approval of the estimates of the 02 works under reference by the Planning & Construction Board, no further guidelines for execution of the works was issued. It was further contended by Charged Officer that there was no decision of the Planning and Construction Board, D.U. that APWD Code should be followed for contract works. She has also contended that works were carried out on the verbal orders of the Vice Chancellor due to paucity of time to ensure utilization of government funds. She has also contended that earth filling was a "supply work" and not "construction work" and hence she did not resort to tender process.

The Executive Council notices that the Charged officer has admitted that the established procedure in Dibrugarh University is to invite tender of all approved works and allot the works to lowest tenderer based upon the Comparative Statement. There was no question of providing any extra guidelines to execute the work as the University Engineer, D.U. being the leading technical person controlling the Planning and Construction Branch, was well versed in performing similar kinds of works. As per records, the Charged Officer had submitted a representation on 05.08.2016 against the Inquiry report wherein she had also annexed certain documents. As per the said documents, the Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor, D.U. had directed to the University Engineer, D.U. to convene a meeting of the Planning and Construction Board, D.U. for utilization of the Government fund on 06.05.2010 itself. In the absence of such meeting being convened, the delay referred to by the Charged officer was her own creation, which was possibly to create a situation of emergency at the fag end of the fiscal year. It becomes clear from the description of the specification of the item that the items of works include the labour part, *i.e.*, breaking clods, leveling and dressing, etc., and so it is a composite work and not supply work. The Charged Officer in the capacity of the University Engineer, D.U. herself signed the work order. It is thus noticed that the charged officer did not follow the tender process while allotting the two work orders and acting beyond her authority, allotted work without sanction from the appropriate authority. Thus, the Executive Council is of the unanimous opinion that the Charge No. 1 against the Charged Officer stands proved.

Charge No. 2 and 3 : It is noticed that these two charges were considered together by the Inquiry Committee and the Charged Officer has also filed a consolidated reply. The 2 (two) charges taken together are to the effect that work order valuing a cumulative amount of Rs. 33,79,300/- was allotted to 2 contractors without inviting tenders and at the preference of the Charged Officer, violating the due procedure of allotment of contract work. The work related to earth filling work.

The Inquiry Committee had returned a finding that as per evidence of the charged officer, the 2 contractors had informed her that the Vice-Chancellor had asked the 2 contractors to execute the earth filling works and going by their version, she had allotted the earth filling works to the said contractors. The Charged Officer had admitted that the tenders system was not followed, though she contended paucity of time as the reason. The Inquiry Committee has opined that a tender process could have saved considerable amount of public money.

The Charged Officer has contended the planning and construction board had approved the work estimate and that once the Vice-Chancellor selected contractors to execute the earth filling works, she could not object the same. She has also contended that though works orders were sent to the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar regarding the work in issue, they were not sent back asking the University Engineer to invite tender. She has contended that if she is found liable then all members of P&C Board and the Vice-Chancellor would also be equally liable.

The Executive Council notices that the plea of the Charged Officer regarding the Vice-Chancellor in selecting contractor to execute earth filling works is baseless. The Charged Officer admittedly did not follow the tender process and her plea of paucity of time is also baseless since estimate were approved on 08th day of March 2011 and work orders were issued on 21st day of March 2011, leaving enough time for her to call for tenders. The reference to the work order being sent to Vice-Chancellor and Registrar are irrelevant, when the Charged Officer has admitted that the due process was not followed. On a consideration of the entire circumstances, it is concluded that the Charged Officer had acted illegally when she deviated from the established procedure to allot work to 2 contractors without following tender system and thus the Charge Nos. 2 and 3 are found proved.

Charge No. 4 & 5 : These 2 charges have been considered together by the Inquiry Committee.

The charges are that the work order issued by the Charged Officer as supply items is totally illegal and unjustified and the same was done with ulterior motive for wrongful gain of the Charged Officer and to cause wrongful loss to the University. Further, the record of measurement books shows the works were executed as composite item of earth works and not a supply item. The work orders were issued without permission of proper authorities and by exceeding the Charged Officer's jurisdiction.

The Inquiry Committee found that the nature of the works was clearly composite and not supply work and that the measurement books reveal that the work was executed as composite earth filling work. The Charged Officer has admitted the work as composite work and that the work was done haphazardly and there could be some irregularities. The Charged Officer admitted that the full amount quoted as per estimate was entirely paid without ascertaining the volume of work executed by taking profile measurement. The Charged Officer further admitted that estimates were prepared without knowing the exact site of construction. The 2 charges were found to have been proved by the Inquiry committee.

The Charged Officer in her reply to the enquiry report has contended paucity of time as a reason for ordering the earth work as supply work and that there was alteration of site of construction. She further stated that copy of work orders sent to the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar were not sent back to her. She also contended that the direction of the Vice-Chancellor had to be followed for the sake of University. She also stated that it was not possible to take profile measurement as the area was muddy. She also contended that there was no decision to follow APWD code.

The Executive Council finds that there is no available record regarding alteration of site for construction of hostel building. The Charged Officer has admitted that the work order was issued as composite work but while approving payment it was paid as supply work. The Executive Council is of the opinion that difficulty in profile measurement as cited by the Charged Officer was never informed to the authorities. The act of her releasing payment purely on assumption and faith on the contractor is wholly unacceptable. It is also observed that the practice of following the APWD code was in the Knowledge of the Charged Officer since she had on earlier occasions followed the APWD code and the two work order in issue were also issued taking APWD rates. Thus, charges at Charge Nos. 4 and 5, in the opinion of the Executive Council are proved.

Charge No. 6 & 7 : These two charges have again been considered together by the Inquiry Committee. The charges were to effect that the measurement given by the Charged Officer were not supported by field book / level book and that such book were not enclosed only to cover up the illegal actions as earth filling was not completed as per order. It was further alleged that the undue haste in approving bills submitted by the contractor indicated ulterior motive. It was alleged that the work was not supervised and the work was not completed as required by the work order.

The Inquiry Committee found that work orders were issued on 21.03.2011 and the final bills were prepared and submitted by the Charged Officer on 29.03.2011. The Charged Officer had stated in her evidence that even prior to issuance of work order, the contractor were given verbal order to start the earth filing works since it took 20 to 30 days practically to complete the earth filing works. The Inquiry Committee found the Charged Officer's contention, that no agreement or security deposit was undertaken from the contractor since the work was considered as of supply nature, to be absolutely absurd. The Committee took note of the contention of the Charged Officer that she was unaware of any such books namely Level book and Field book. One of the contractors had also stated that it took about 40 to 45 days to complete the work. It was also noticed by the Inquiry committee that the Charged Officer had not contended that the Vice-Chancellor had issued verbal order in her presence to execute the earth filing works. The contradiction in the evidence of the defense witnesses have also been observed by the Inquiry Committee.

The Charged Officer stated that field books and level books are not supplied by the University authorities. She further contended that since it was supply work, recording of work at the beginning and at completion thus not arise. She further contended that it was a matter of common sense without filling and developing a 6 feet deep area the contractor cannot gather

building materials like bricks, rod, sand, etc.

The Executive Council is of the opinion that the Charged Officer has admitted that the work was executed haphazardly and there were some irregularities in execution of the work and also in approving payment of contractors. Though she referred to counting of trucks and truck measurement, she did not produce any records before the Inquiry Committee. It is further observed that the measurement book issued for works can be used for recording level measurement and by recording the initial level first in the measurement book before earth filling works and thereafter recording measurement during filling works, the filling level could be recorded. Her reference to verbal order of Vice-Chancellor is unsubstantiated. The deviation from the reasonable procedure of measurement has paved way for full payment on certificate of charge official when work remained incomplete. This, in the opinion of the Executive Council was to cause unlawful gain to the contractor and the Charged Officer and to cause wrongful loss to the University. The Charges 6 and 7 in the unanimous opinion of the Executive Council stands proved.

Charge No. 8 : This charge related to the allegation of violation of duty by the Charged Officer when she deliberately failed and neglected to deduct 12.5% shrinkage volume of the earth work from the quantity of earth work in the measurement book even though the work orders referred to such deduction, thereby causing financial loss to the University. The further allegation was that the undue haste in approving the bill without deduction indicated ill motive for wrongful gain to herself and to cause wrongful loss to the University.

The Inquiry Committee has found that there was no dispute that the 12.5% shrinkage volume was not deducted from the final bills and this has also been admitted by the Charged Officer. The Charged Officer has also admitted that due to failure to deduct the shrinkage charge, an excess of Rs. 4,22,412.48/- was paid to the contractor. This charge was held proved.

The Charged Officer in her reply has stated that deduction of shrinkage volume was not done due to critical condition of site. She again referred to truck measurement, alleging that since the site was paddy field area neither leveling was done nor materials were stacked.

It is noticed by the Executive Council that during the enquiry, the Charged Officer has contended that shrinkage was not deducted because after 3 years of completion of the work, at the time of opening of the building when the area was found to have shrunk, the contractor had filled up the surface and brought to required level at their own cost. The Charged Officer has changed her stand in her reply to the enquiry report. The fact remains that 12.5% shrinkage volume was not deducted from the final bills, even though the work order has specified so. As admitted by the Charged Officer, bills were passed without requisite deduction and thus the executive council is of the opinion that Charge No. 8 stands proved.

Charge No. 9 : Though Charge Nos. 9 and 10 were taken up together by the Inquiry committee the Executive Council decided to take up the charges individually. The Charge No. 9 was that the Charged Officer failed and neglected to perform duty when she approved the work as final and completed though it was later found that earth work was not done as per measurement in the measurement book and the work was yet to be completed. It was also alleged that by allowing bills to be passed she caused wrongful financial loss to University and wrongful gain for herself.

The Inquiry Committee had opined that the charge Officer conducted herself very casually and perfunctorily in the discharge of her duties.

In her reply to the enquiry report referred to alleged verbal orders of Vice-Chancellor to start earth filing works. She had also referred to other bills and other work order and has alleged malafide against former Vice Chancellor and two officials.

The Executive Council finds that there is no proof of verbal instruction of Vice-Chancellor regarding the works in issue. It is further noticed that the Charged Officer did not, as she could not, deny that work order were issued without following the due process of law that there was lack of supervision and maintenance of measurement records on her part and that bills were approved and passed even without confirming to the standard deduction mentioned in the work orders. It is also noticed that on mere approval of estimates, work order were issued and payments were made in haste, after creating an illusion of paucity of time to utilize Government

	<p>funds. The Executive Council after taking note of the entire evidences on record, the opinion of the enquiry committee and the reply of the Charged Officer to the enquiry report is of the considered opinion that the charge official acted illegally in the entire transactions, from the stage of issuing work order without following tender process to the stage of passing bills without work being completed, including not maintaining records during alleged execution of the earth filing works. The Charge No. 9 stands proved in the unanimous opinion of the Executive Council.</p> <p>Charge No. 10 : This charge alleged violations of Dibrugarh University Financial Rules, 1972. It was alleged that the Charged Officer failed to exercise vigilance in respect of expenditure incurred from the University funds as could be expected of a person of ordinary prudence to exercise in spending his own money.</p> <p>The Inquiry Committee while considering the charge along with Charge No. 9 had observed that there was no doubt that the Charged Officer had failed to maintain discipline, absolute integrity, honesty, sincerity and devotion to her duties.</p> <p>The contention of Charged Officer in her reply to the enquiry report has been perused.</p> <p>The Executive Council, on consideration of the manner in which the work orders were issued and final bills were approved without following the tender process and without maintaining records, is of the opinion that there remains no iota of doubt that the Charged Officer had failed to exercise the vigilance expected of person of ordinary prudence in the entire transactions relating to the two works in issue. She had failed to maintain discipline, sincerity and devotion and her acts don't inspire confidence that she had acted in absolute integrity and honesty. The charge under Charge No. 10 is also opined to be proved by the Executive Council.</p> <p>The Executive Council notices that apart from providing replies charge-wise, the charged Officer had also raised other grounds with regard to the proceedings of the Inquiry. On a perusal it is seen that the Ground Nos. 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 under the caption conclusions are rather vague and have been forwarded only to be rejected since there are no basis for the said grounds. With regard to ground No. 3 the Charged Officer has referred to the absence of evidence of Dr. K.K. Deka, who was the then Vice-Chancellor of the University. The Council opines that the Charged Officer could have well brought in Dr. K.K. Deka as a witness, in case she felt so the need. There are no records of any such requests made by the Charged Officer. The Ground Nos. 4 & 5 are with regard to the evidence of the University Registrar and Assistant University Engineer. The Council opines that the evidence of the Registrar and the Assistant University Engineer has been crucial and there is no illegality in taking their evidence. With regard to Ground No. 6, where the Charged Officer refers to the appointment of a legal practitioner as one of the members of the Inquiry Committee and where she claims that she was not given a legal practitioner as a defence representative, the Council considers the said ground to be irrational. There are no records to show that the Charged Officer had sought for the assistance of a legal practitioner. Since the Presenting Officer on behalf of the disciplinary authority was not a legal practitioner, no prejudice has been caused to the Charged Officer. Her references at Ground Nos. 7 & 8 relating to the list of witnesses and joinder, mis-joinder and non-joinder of parties are also found to be baseless apart from being vague. It is also noticed that the Charged Officer had attempted to mislead by her reference to the case of Aggarwal vs. HSDC (AIR 1991 SC 1221). While the said case referred to a situation where presenting officer was a man trained in law, Charged Officer had tried to project that it related to a presiding officer.</p>
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>The Council discussed the gravity of the offences proved against the charged officer and concluded that since honesty, integrity and devotion to duty of the charged officer was in question, the penalty has to commensurate to the gravity of the offence. It was further noticed that it would not be in the interest of the University to allow the charged officer to continue in her services in the University. On going through the enquiry proceedings, the Council has found that the enquiry has been held according to the Ordinance and orders. The Charged Officer was given opportunity for defence at all stages. The Inquiry Committee had conducted the enquiry keeping in view the principles of natural justice and on completing the enquiry in accordance with rules, the Committee gave ample opportunity to the accused to prove her innocence. During the enquiry, the accused admit to utilizing all opportunities On considering</p>

	<p>the circumstances and the facts and upon applying the mind in a judicious mind, the Executive Council have no hesitation in holding Smt. Deepali Phukan guilty of the charges leveled against her based on all connected documents including the replies furnished by the Charged Officer. Therefore, the Executive Council is of the opinion that she having committed the offences that she was charged with, appropriate punishment in terms of the offences are to be imposed.</p>
Decision	<p>Resolution No. 1</p> <p>Resolved that the Charged Officer stands reinstated as per clarification given in the order of the Hon'ble Court. Further resolved that the method and manner of regularizing the period of her absence from duty shall be considered at the time of passing final orders on the Departmental Proceeding.</p> <p>Resolution No. 2</p> <p>Resolved that, upon a thorough consideration of the charges imputed, the evidence led, the report of the Inquiry Committee and the reply thereto furnished by the Charged Officer, the Executive Council is of the unanimous conclusion that all the charges imputed against the Charged Officer are proved and accordingly, appropriate penalty is to be imposed upon her.</p>
Discussion	<p>The Executive Council while considering the gravity of the offences and the quantum of punishment was of the opinion that if the guilty person with such dishonest mentality is not punished keeping in view the palpable misconduct of not following the established procedure causing financial loss to the University then it may have an adverse effect on other persons and system of working in the University. It was further a consensus view that her retention in service would not be in the interest of the University. Therefore, the Executive Council unanimously agreed that the penalty of removal from service would suffice the cause.</p>
Decision	<p>Resolution No. 3</p> <p>Resolved that the Executive Council proposes to impose the penalty of 'Removal' from service upon the Charged Officer as per Article 32(vi)(h) of the Ordinance of 2000 (as amended upto May, 2007). The Registrar of the University is to accordingly arrange for compliance of the provisions of Proviso to Article 32(vi) of the Ordinance of 2000 (as amended upto May, 2007), so as to convey the proposal of the Council to impose the penalty of 'Removal' from service upon the Charged Officer, to the Charged Officer, requiring her to submit her response to such proposal giving her not less than three weeks time from the date of receipt of the notice.</p>
Item 2	<p>To consider recommendation of the Special Meeting of the Finance Committee, Dibrugarh University held on 07.04.2018 for revision of the wages of Skilled and Semi-Skilled Grade-III and Grade-IV Employees of the University.</p>
Note	<p>The 337th Meeting of the Executive Council, Dibrugarh University held on 29.01.2018, vide Resolution No. 43, suggested to place the matter of enhancing the remuneration of the fixed pay of the Contractual, Casual and Daily Wage Basis employees of the University before the Finance Committee of the University. Accordingly, a Committee was constituted vide Notification No. DU/RG/G.01.01/18/2621 dated 29.03.2018 to examine the matter and the report of the said Committee was submitted before the Special Meeting of the Finance Committee held on 07.04.2018. The Council discussed the matter and decided to accept the recommendations of the Special Meeting of the Finance Committee. The Council discussed the financial involvement and also as regards the requirement of funds for giving effect the enhancement of remuneration of the fixed pay to the Contractual, Casual and Daily Wage Basis employees of the University. The Council suggested to revise fee structure of the University to meet the additional expenditures to be incurred to meet the purpose.</p> <p>The following resolutions were adopted :</p>

<p>Decision</p>	<p>Resolution No. 4</p> <p>Resolved that as recommended by the Special Meeting of the Finance Committee held on 07.04.2018, the wages of Skilled and Semi-Skilled Grade-III and Grade-IV Employees of the University be revised as follows w.e.f. 01.04.2018 in light of the Govt. Notification issued vide No. ACL.43/2004/56 dated 04.01.2016.</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;"></th> <th style="text-align: right; width: 20%;">Existing salary</th> <th style="text-align: right; width: 20%;">Recommended salary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Skilled (ITI certificate holder or equivalent) / Clerk :</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Rs. 8,000/- p.m.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Rs. 11,100/- p.m.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Semi skilled :</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Rs. 6,000/- p.m.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Rs. 8,700/- p.m.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Resolution No. 3</p> <p>Resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to constitute a Committee to work out for revision of the reasonable fee structure of the University.</p>		Existing salary	Recommended salary	1. Skilled (ITI certificate holder or equivalent) / Clerk :	Rs. 8,000/- p.m.	Rs. 11,100/- p.m.	2. Semi skilled :	Rs. 6,000/- p.m.	Rs. 8,700/- p.m.
	Existing salary	Recommended salary								
1. Skilled (ITI certificate holder or equivalent) / Clerk :	Rs. 8,000/- p.m.	Rs. 11,100/- p.m.								
2. Semi skilled :	Rs. 6,000/- p.m.	Rs. 8,700/- p.m.								
<p>Item 3</p> <p>Note</p>	<p>To consider discussion for filling up the post of Registrar, Dibrugarh University.</p> <p>As Professor M.N. Dutta, Registrar, D.U. is going to attain the age of 60 (sixty) years on 24.07.2018, the process for filling up the post of Registrar has to be initiated immediately. Accordingly, the University shall make necessary arrangement to advertise the post as per its relevant rules without delay. As per Article 29 (a) of the Dibrugarh University Act, 1965 (as amended up to date), a senior Professor of the University has also to be nominated as the Member Secretary of the Selection Committee constituted for selecting a suitable person to the post of Registrar.</p> <p>The Chairperson requested the members of the Council to suggest their opinion to nominate a senior Professor of the University as the Member Secretary for the purpose. He proposed to nominate Professor L.K. Nath, Dean, School of Science and Engineering as the Member-Secretary of the Selection Committee for the post of Registrar. The Council unanimously agreed with the Chairperson.</p> <p>The Council discussed the matter briefly and suggested to proceed as per rule.</p>									
<p>Decision</p>	<p>Resolution No. 5</p> <p>Resolved that appropriate necessary measures be initiated immediately to advertise the post of the Registrar, Dibrugarh University to be vacated by Professor M.N. Dutta.</p> <p>Resolved further that Professor L.K. Nath, Dean, School of Science and Engineering be nominated as Member-Secretary of the Selection Committee constituted for selecting a suitable person to the post of Registrar as per rules.</p>									

As there was no other matter for discussion, the meeting ended with a Vote of Thanks to and from the Chair.


(M.N. Dutta)
 Registrar
 and
 Secretary, Executive Council
 Dibrugarh University

Sd/-
A.K. Buragohain
 Vice-Chancellor
 and
 Chairperson, Executive Council
 Dibrugarh University