

**How does a Q&A dialogue unfold  
when an attorney catches a witness lying?  
Re: Mary Morgan Anderson, part 1**

Here's one of many examples from our usmnews.net's archives of how a Q&A unfolds when an attorney catches a witness lying.

The following is the actual sworn testimony of Mary Morgan Anderson, then-untenured assistant professor, School of Accountancy, College of Business, University of Southern Mississippi, taken on June 10, 2008, in the case, *DePree v. University of Southern Mississippi*. (Q. is DePree's attorney's question directed to Anderson; A. is Anderson's response).

First consider that in a letter Anderson wrote at the end of August 2007 requesting then-President Martha Saunders to fire DePree, Anderson cited the following reason to fire DePree:

“With limited interaction with Dr. DePree it became evident to me immediately that his [DePree's] reality is based upon his perception rather than the facts of a situation (e.g., his request for a computer.)”

Now for the deposition and sworn testimony of Mary Morgan Anderson:

Q. So did you ever talk to [Joe Morgan, former USM purchasing agent and Anderson's brother] about whether Marc [DePree] has gotten a computer?

A. No, I never did.

Q. Well, he [Joe Morgan] could probably tell you whether or not Marc ever got a computer, couldn't he?

A. I could care less if Marc ever got a computer or not. It was not something I would ask, you know.

Q. In your letter [requesting then-President Martha Saunders to fire DePree] - look at your letter, the second paragraph, the last sentence of that paragraph, and read it for me, please.

A. Okay. The second paragraph, last sentence: “With limited interaction with Dr. DePree it became evident to me immediately that his [DePree's] reality is based upon his perception rather than the facts of a situation (e.g., his request for a computer.)”

Q. Well, did you check into what the facts were surrounding his [DePree's] request for a computer were before you wrote this letter?

A. I didn't check into the facts.

Anderson just testified that she did not have a basis in fact to claim that DePree's "reality is based upon his perception rather than the facts of a situation (e.g., his request for a computer.)". And yet she wrote then-President Saunders recommending to fire DePree without a basis in fact for her "perception rather than the facts of the situation."

Anderson got caught lying. Anderson lied so as to have testimony that would support firing DePree.

Anderson got caught lying as did many of the other USM mobbers. She and they failed to fire DePree, but their disreputable behavior cost USM, that is students and taxpayers, better that \$2,500,000. If students should wonder why tuition continues to rise or taxpayers wonder why their taxes continue to rise without seeing improvement in USM or state services, all they need to do is review the archives at [usmnews.net](http://usmnews.net).

More important than the cost to students and taxpayers is the failure of accountability of Anderson's misconduct. USM's attorneys, including former University counsel Lee P. Gore, witnessed the lies. What should the consequence of such miscreant behavior be?

If they, Anderson and the other mobbers, are not held to account, rest assured, you and others may be subject to the same misconduct. Why shouldn't they treat others the same way? After all, they didn't pay a price for their misconduct.

Keep in mind that Mary Morgan Anderson is still employed at the University of Southern Mississippi. If I were a student, faculty, or administrator at USM, I should be aware of Anderson's tendency to lie and bare false witness.