

How does a Q&A dialogue unfold when an attorney catches a witness lying? Re: Alvin J. Williams, part 4

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 Alvin J. Williams, then-Interim Dean, College of Business, University of Southern Mississippi, taken on June 4, 2008, in the case, *DePree v. University of Southern Mississippi*. (Q. is DePree's attorney's question directed to Williams; A. is Williams' response):

Williams' sworn testimony was that he "follows university policy." When questioned about details of his actual practice, his sworn testimony is that he doesn't follow university policies.

Q. Did Dr. Depree (sic) submit a grievance to you concerning his 2006 evaluation?

A. Yes.

Q. What action did you take on that grievance?

A. As I sit here today, no action has been taken on that.

Q. By you?

A. By me.

Q. ... are you aware of whether or not the faculty handbook requires you to take any action or not with regard to a grievance filed over an evaluation?

A. Yes, there is some action required.

Q. Of you as the dean?

A. That is correct.

Q. I want you to tell us what you were supposed to do?

A. According to section 12.2.5, should the departmental conference fail to result in a resolution or if a faculty member is dissatisfied with the departmental employment decision, the aggrieved party may, within ten days, request in writing that the dean of the college convene the college advisory committee for a formal grievance review on the record.

- Q. Did you convene [the college advisory committee]?
- A. I did not.
- Q. Can you tell us why you did not?
- A. I don't have a particular reason.
- Q. Is it your usual course of conduct to disregard directives contained in the rules and regulations of the university in which you are an interim dean?
- A. It is not. I follow university policy.

Williams' sworn testimony was that he "follows university policy." When questioned about details of his actual practice, his sworn testimony is that he does not follow university policies. He is lying.

Williams just testified that he did not follow university policy with regard to his duty to act on DePree's grievance. If he had reviewed the grievance he would have learned evidence, fully documented from the files at USM, that the accusations being made by the accounting faculty against DePree were false. In other words, Williams would not only have learned that his, DePree's, annual evaluations were inaccurate but that the accusations by mobbers to fire DePree, whom Williams joined, were false.

Williams' purpose was to lie about the facts so as to have testimony that would support firing DePree.

Williams got caught lying, again, as did many of the other USM mobbers. He and they failed, but their disreputable behavior cost USM, that is students and taxpayers, better than \$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.

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

If they 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.