

Special Report Series

'Oh Yes, Wait a Minute Mr. Postman'

Former CoB Dean in Hot Water Once Again

PART 9

In light of former CoB dean Harold Doty's litigation history, USMNEWS.net reporters periodically check the courts near where Doty lives and works. Recent documents [obtained from](#) the Smith County, Texas Court Clerk, indicate that Doty is once again likely headed back to court, this time in his capacity as [dean of business](#) at the University of Texas - Tyler. These documents indicate that former UT-T business student advisor, Karen St. John, is suing UT-T based on [actions largely taken](#) by Doty vis-à-vis St. John's employment. This is Part 9 in this series.

On January 13, 2011, St. John sent an email to Vorsas, to tell him that she wanted to appeal her termination decision. She heard no more from Defendant until she received Vorsas's letter dated March 2, 2011, addressed to her home address in Whitehouse, Texas, informing St. John that her failure to provide the required information for the appeal hearing, "constitutes a waiver of your opportunity for an appeal hearing". The same day she received that letter delivered by FedEx, March 3, 2011, another letter arrived dated February 11, 2011, giving her notice of the appeal hearing to be held on March 14, 2011 and listing the requirements thereto, but did not require a signature to show that she had received it. The February 11th letter had been intentionally misdirected by Defendant and was sent to St. John's previous address in Troup, Texas, despite the fact that St. John had moved and updated her current address the previous year. All other correspondence from the University, previously and

As the previous installment in this series indicates, St. John was forced by UT-Tyler officials to sign a termination letter in late December-2010. This installment picks up the story on 13-Jan-2011, when St. John informed Joe Vorsas, UT-Tyler's human resources director, that she desired to appeal her termination. Vorsas remained silent on the matter, at least until a letter from him dated 2-March-2011 was received by St. John (via FedEx) on 3-March-2011, informing her that she had failed to provide the requisite information to be granted an appeal hearing. That same day, 3-March-2011, St. John also received a letter from UT-Tyler informing her that an appeal hearing had been set for 14-March-2011.



Joe Vorsas

That second letter, again received on 3-March-2011, was dated 11-Feb-2011. That second letter also provided stipulations for being granted an appeal hearing, one of which was a written response from St. John containing information related to her situation – information that the letter dated 11-Feb-2011 informed St. John was due by 28-Feb-2011 (see insert below). Of course, having received this due date only on 3-March-2011, St. John had apparently forfeited her right to an appeal.

subsequent to this February 11th letter, had been properly addressed and received at her current residence. St. John found the misdirected letter on her porch on March 3rd and has no idea whether FedEx redirected it or a former neighbor from Troup dropped it off. The letter contained the sections of Defendant's Handbook relevant to the appeal and hearing of a dismissal. Section 3(c) Procedure for Appeal allows the employee and the University "at least five (5) working days prior to the time set for the hearing" to exchange the required information regarding witnesses and evidence which would be presented at the hearing. The letter further set February 28, 2011 at noon as the deadline to provide the requested information to the University. Since St. John did not even receive that February letter with those requirements until March 3, 2011, due to an address error on the University's part, it was impossible for her to respond by a deadline that had passed before her receipt of the notice.

Why did St. John not receive the appeal instructions in a timely manner? The answer to that question, as indicated by St. John's legal complaint (see two inserts above), is very interesting. The letter dated 2-March-2011, informing St. John that she had missed her appeal deadline, was sent to her then-*actual* home address in Whitehouse, Texas. She received this letter on 3-March-2011. The earlier letter, dated 11-Feb-2011 and containing the appeal hearing prerequisites, was sent to St. John's *old* home address in Troup, Texas. Thus, when UT-Tyler administrators set out in Feb-2011 to inform St.

John how to qualify for an appeals hearing, they used her *old* address in correspondence. Later, when UT-Tyler administrators desired to inform St. John that she had missed her appeal hearing requirements window, they used her *current* address in correspondence. If this sounds a bit “fishy,” USMNEWS.net sources say it should. St. John’s legal complaint points out that, after moving from Whitehouse to Troup, UT-Tyler was notified and St. John’s address was changed at that time. As proof of this notification, correspondence from UT-Tyler to St. John, both before 11-Feb-2011 and after 11-Feb-2011, had been sent to her Whitehouse address. Thus, St. John contends that the 11-Feb-2011 letter was “intentionally misdirected” by UT-Tyler officials.

To make matters even more mysterious, when the 11-Feb-2011 letter finally arrived in Whitehouse on 3-March-2011, it was simply left on St. John’s porch. Even as late as the date of St. John’s lawsuit, she did not know how the letter arrived in Whitehouse. The complaint inserted above even speculates that the letter was brought to her home in Whitehouse by a former neighbor in Troup. If that is the case, St. John appears to have been fortunate to have ever even received the letter. Finally, it is worth noting that the *infamous* 11-Feb-2011 letter contained sections of the UT-Tyler employee handbook used by UT-Tyler administrators to prevent St. John from getting an appeal hearing. Sources are quick to point out the irony, given UT-Tyler’s penchant for ignoring St. John’s earlier invocations of that very same handbook in attempting to stop the bullying that she was being subjected to by Doty, Vorsas, Mary Fischer, Tammy Cowart and Kerri Keech. Sources also point out that with an installment like this one, USMNEWS.net readers are witnesses to the anatomy of a mobbing campaign, complete with all of its intricacies and deviousness.

Stay tuned to USMNEWS.net for part 10 in this series.