

### Title:

Dr. Teresita Lee vs. Atty. Amador L. Simando: A Case of Professional Misconduct and Conflict of Interest

### Facts:

This case concerns a Petition for Disbarment against Atty. Amador L. Simando, initiated by Dr. Teresita Lee, due to alleged violations of the Code of Judicial Ethics of Lawyers. The relationship between Dr. Lee and Atty. Simando commenced in November 2004, with Atty. Simando serving as Dr. Lee's legal counsel until January 8, 2008. During their professional engagement, Atty. Simando solicited financial assistance on behalf of another client, Felicito M. Mejorado, promising repayment plus interests through postdated checks and offering himself as a co-maker to the loan agreements. Dr. Lee, persuaded by Atty. Simando's guarantees, disbursed funds totaling Php1,400,000.00 to Mejorado.

Upon Mejorado's failure to meet his obligations, Dr. Lee sought Atty. Simando's assistance in pursuing legal action. Atty. Simando's recommendation to settle the matter without resorting to legal proceedings resulted in no restitution being made. This led Dr. Lee to terminate her contractual relationship with Atty. Simando and seek representation from a new lawyer, who formally demanded Atty. Simando to fulfill his obligations as a co-maker, a demand Atty. Simando denied citing a purported novation.

The dispute elevated to a Petition for Disbarment filed on July 21, 2009, with the Integrated Bar of the Philippines-Commission on Bar Discipline (IBP-CBD), which proceeded through the disciplinary process, including failure of both parties to attend a mandatory conference, leading to a requirement for submission of position papers.

### Issues:

1. Whether Atty. Simando violated the Code of Professional Responsibility by engaging in a conflict of interest.
2. Whether Atty. Simando failed in his duty of undivided fidelity and loyalty to his client.
3. Whether Atty. Simando disclosed confidential information acquired during his professional relationship with Dr. Lee.
4. Determination of responsibility as a co-maker in the loan agreements with Mejorado.

### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court reversed the IBP Board of Governors' ruling that dismissed the case against Atty. Simando. The Court found Atty. Simando guilty of representing conflicting

interests, failing to maintain loyalty to Dr. Lee, and disclosing confidential information acquired during their professional relationship. The Court emphasized that representation of conflicting interests is applicable even in non-professional capacities and highlighted Atty. Simando's failure to safeguard his client's interests. As a result, Atty. Simando was suspended from the practice of law for six months, with a warning of more severe penalties for similar future offenses.

### ### Doctrine:

This case reiterates the principle that lawyers must not represent conflicting interests and must uphold their duty of loyalty and confidentiality towards their clients. This encompasses avoiding any representation or action that may be adverse to the interests of a former or current client.

### ### Class Notes:

- Conflict of Interest: Representation of conflicting interests, even in unrelated cases, is prohibited if it may compromise the lawyer's loyalty to either client.
- Duty of Loyalty: Lawyers owe an undivided duty of loyalty to their clients and must not engage in actions contrary to their clients' interests.
- Confidentiality: Lawyers are bound to protect confidential information acquired during their professional relationship with their clients.
- Prohibition against double-dealing: Lawyers must avoid any situation that invites suspicion of unfaithfulness or double-dealing in their professional duties.

### ### Historical Background:

The case exemplifies issues of ethical conduct within the legal profession in the Philippines, focusing on conflict of interest, confidentiality, and the fiduciary responsibility of lawyers to their clients. The decision underscores the Supreme Court's commitment to upholding ethical standards and integrity within the legal profession, serving as a cautionary tale to legal practitioners about the paramount importance of their duties to clients and the legal system.