### Title:

Avida Land Corporation vs. Atty. Al C. Argosino [793 Phil. 210 (2016)]

#### Facts:

Avida Land Corporation (formerly Laguna Properties Holdings, Inc.) and Rodman Construction & Development Corporation (Rodman) entered into a Contract to Sell for a property in Laguna. Rodman defaulted payments after taking possession, prompting Avida to rescind the contract and demand vacation of the property. Rodman refused, leading Avida to file an unlawful detainer suit. Concurrently, Rodman filed a separate complaint with the Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board (HLURB), resulting in the dismissal of Avida's detainer suit due to jurisdiction issues.

The HLURB arbiter ruled against Rodman who appealed to the HLURB Board. The Board's decision, later finalized due to lack of appeal, mandated Rodman to clear outstanding balances or face contract rescission subject to certain refunds and compensations. Efforts for amicable settlement failed, pushing Avida to file a motion for writs of execution and possession.

Atty. Al C. Argosino, counsel for Rodman, persistently filed oppositions and pleadings, questioned arbiters' impartiality, and invoked process technicalities that caused significant delays to executing the final judgment. The HLURB and subsequent arbiters issued orders favoring execution, but Argosino's continued legal maneuvering prolonged proceedings until an administrative complaint was lodged against him.

The Integrated Bar of the Philippines (IBP) adopted its Investigating Commissioner's findings of Argosino's misconduct, endorsing a penalty of reprimand with a warning, but no party sought reconsideration or further petitioning to this approach.

### Issues:

- 1. Whether Atty. Al C. Argosino committed professional misconduct by filing numerous pleadings that resulted in delaying the execution of the final judgment.
- 2. The appropriateness of the penalty recommended by the IBP.

# Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court found Atty. Argosino guilty of professional misconduct, ruling that his deliberate acts to delay the case, including the misuse of court processes and disobedience to legal orders, undermined the administration of justice. The defense that he was merely representing his client's interest was deemed untenable, as his tactics went beyond fair

advocacy to an abuse of legal procedures.

Regarding the penalty, the Court held that a mere reprimand, as recommended by the IBP, was not commensurate to the seriousness of the transgression. Instead, the Court cited comparable cases and guidelines for lawyer sanctions to justify a more stringent punishment. Atty. Argosino was suspended from the practice of law for one year and was sternly warned against repeating similar conduct.

### Doctrine:

Professional misconduct by a lawyer that hampers the speedy and efficient administration of justice, such as undue case delay, impeding judgment execution, and court process misuse, constitutes a violation of both the Code of Professional Responsibility and the Lawyer's Oath. In these violations, suspension from the practice of law is an appropriate sanction.

### Class Notes:

Key concepts central to this case include the following:

- The Lawyer's Oath requires lawyers to conduct with honesty, promote justice, and not delay any person's cause for malice or money.
- Canon 12 and Rule 12.04 of the Code of Professional Responsibility underscore a lawyer's duty to assist in the speedy administration of justice and prohibit unduly delaying a case or misusing court processes.
- Rule 10.03 mandates that a lawyer observe procedural rules and not misuse them to thwart justice.
- The importance of a proportionate sanction for violations of professional ethical standards.

## Historical Background:

This case illustrates the balance between zealous representation and professional ethical constraints within Philippine legal practice. It shows the court actively policing the legal profession to maintain integrity and highlights the jurisprudent shift towards more severe penalties for ethical misconduct to ensure accountability and justice system efficiency.