

①

SNDT WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY, MUMBAI – 20. ELECTIONS 2017

APPEALS MADE AGAINST THE VALIDITY OF NOMINATION PAPERS FOR ELECTION OF TEN TEACHERS TO THE SENATE (u/s 28(2)(r) OF M.P.U ACT, 2016) AND THE DECISION OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR THEREON

Sr. No	Name of the Candidate whose nomination has been declared invalid	Category	Reasons for being invalid	Name of the appellant and contentions mentioned in the appeal	Decision of the Vice-Chancellor u/s 10(7) of Uniform Statute No.1 of 2017
1.	Mr. Chandak Sujit Ratanlal	Open	Candidate has not undertaken university Examination related work for atleast five years, as per the documents submitted by him	<p>Mr. Chandak Sujit Ratanlal's appeal dated 28.09.2017</p> <p>"I had submitted my nomination for the elections of Ten Teachers to the Senate of SNDT Women's University, I have been informed that my nomination is invalid and the reason given was that as per the documents submitted by me I have not done examination related work of the University for at least 5 years.</p> <p>I had submitted a certificate issued by the Director, Board of Examinations and Evaluation which certifies my work for the last 6 years. In these six years I have worked for the semester pattern as well as the annual pattern examinations for regular and repeater examinations. However, it seems from the details of the reason given for my invalid, that all this work has been counted only as semester work and not as annual examination work.</p> <p>Honourable Madam I am writing this to make an appeal to you as, per the provisions, to kindly consider my examination work for all the years mentioned in the certificate as both for annual, regular and repeater and for semester examinations. Madam, I appeal to you kindly consider my case and provide relief. "</p> <p>Sujit Ratanlal Chandak Assistant Professor, English Shri M.D.Shha Mahila College of Arts and Commerce, Malad, Mumbai</p>	<p>After the perusal of the contentions of the appellant and nomination form of the candidate and documents attached therewith, as placed before me by the Registrar and the the observations of the Scrutiny Committee in respect of nomination of Mr. Chandak Sujit Ratanlal, it is evident that, the list of University Examinations as mentioned in the certificates of experience issued by the COE / Director, BOEE do not indicate whether those were annual pattern examination as claimed by the appellant. Moreover, the Semester Pattern and Annual Pattern University Examination related work undertaken by a teacher simultaneously can not be claimed separately. The contentions as raised by the appellant therefore do not good. <u>Consequently, the appeal is rejected herewith, and the</u></p>

**SNDT WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY, MUMBAI – 20.
ELECTIONS 2017**

②

**APPEALS MADE AGAINST THE VALIDITY OF NOMINATION PAPERS FOR ELECTION OF TEN TEACHERS TO THE
SENATE (u/s 28(2)(r) OF M.P.U ACT, 2016) AND THE DECISION OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR THEREON**

					<p>nomination of Dr. Chandak Sujit Ratanlal for the election in question as declared INVALID is upheld.</p> <p>Date: 29.09.2017</p> <p align="center"><i>(Signature)</i> (Dr. Shashikala Wanjari) Vice-Chancellor</p>
2.	Dr. Paul Ceena	Women	<p>Candidate has not undertaken university Examination related work for atleast five years, as per the documents submitted by her</p>	<p>Dr. Paul Ceena appeal dated 28.09.2017</p> <p>"I had submitted my nomination for the elections of Ten Teachers to the Senate of SNDT Women's University, I have been informed that my nomination is invalid and the reason given was that as per the documents submitted by me I have not done examination related work of the University for at least 5 years.</p> <p>I was part of the member of subject committee under section 32/5 of the Maharashtra University Act, 1994 for a period ranging from September 2010 to September 2015. Being a member of the committee. I was involved in preparing the panel of paper setters, examiners and moderators. This activity has been duly certified by the Director, Board of Examinations and Evaluation, as part of the examination work. I have also attached documents proving that I was paper setter in the last two semesters. In your directives apart from all the work mentioned there- in, I earnestly believe, that there is a scope for including my 32/5 work as part of examination experience.</p> <p>Honourable Madam I am making an appeal to you to</p>	<p>After the perusal of the contentions of the appellant and the nomination form and the documents attached therewith by the candidate namely, Dr. Paul Ceena, as placed before me by the Registrar, it is evident that, the documents in question do not indicate that, the candidate had actually undertaken the University Examinations related work for at least five years in aggregate. Moreover, the work of preparing the panels of paper-setters, examiners and moderators, etc. as claimed by the appellant in her appeal was a collective responsibility of the then existing Subject Committee for the Board of Studies in the subject concerned,</p>

3

**SNDT WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY, MUMBAI – 20.
ELECTIONS 2017**

**APPEALS MADE AGAINST THE VALIDITY OF NOMINATION PAPERS FOR ELECTION OF TEN TEACHERS TO THE
SENATE (u/s 28(2)(r) OF M.P.U ACT, 2016) AND THE DECISION OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR THEREON**

				<p>kindly hear my plea and consider my case positively.”</p> <p>Regards Dr. Ceena Paul Associate Professor, Economics Shri M.D.Shha Mahila College of Arts and Commerce, Malad,Mumbai</p>	<p>headed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Dean of the concerned Faculty, Chairperson of the Board of Studies, etc. constituted as per the provision of the erstwhile Maharashtra Universities Act, 1994. Hence, an individual member can not claim to have carried out the work. The claim made by the appellant has no locus standi. <u>The appeal is therefore rejected herewith and the nomination of Dr. Ceena Paul for the election is question as declared INVALID is upheld.</u></p> <p>Date:29.09.2017</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(Signature)</i> 29/9/17</p> <p>(Dr. Shashikala Wanjari) Vice-Chancellor</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--