

### Title: Reyes vs. Nieva (2017): A Case of Professional Misconduct and Sexual Harassment in the Legal Profession

### Facts:

Carrie-Anne Shaleen Carlyle S. Reyes (“complainant”) worked as an Administrative Aide at the Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines (CAAP) since October 2004. In January 2009, she was reassigned under Atty. Ramon F. Nieva (“respondent”), the CAAP Acting Board Secretary. She alleged that the respondent engaged in inappropriate conduct, including watching pornographic material during office hours and making unwelcome physical and sexual advances towards her. These events culminated on April 2, 2009, when the respondent allegedly attempted to sexually harass the complainant in his office. Following these incidents, the complainant was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder and major depression. The respondent denied all allegations, attributing the accusations to office politics.

After the complaint was filed with the CAAP’s Committee on Decorum and Investigation (CODI), it was dismissed due to a supposed lack of basis. The complainant then escalated the issue to the Integrated Bar of the Philippines (IBP), which initially recommended the dismissal of the complaint but later reversed its decision and recommended a 3-month suspension for the respondent. This decision was again reversed in a subsequent review, resulting in the dismissal of the complaint. The case was then brought before the Supreme Court of the Philippines for final resolution.

### Issues:

1. Whether the respondent violated the Code of Professional Responsibility (CPR) by engaging in unlawful, dishonest, immoral, or deceitful conduct.
2. Whether watching pornographic materials in the workplace constitutes unprofessional behavior indicative of moral turpitude.
3. Whether the actions attributed to the respondent meet the standard for sexual harassment.

### Court’s Decision:

The Supreme Court reversed the IBP findings and ruled that the respondent violated the CPR. It held that the respondent’s actions, including watching pornographic materials during office hours and making unwelcome advances toward the complainant, amounted to sexual harassment and dishonest, immoral, or deceitful conduct. The Court highlighted the importance of moral character for lawyers and determined that the respondent’s behavior

fell short of the ethical standards expected. Consequently, the respondent was suspended from the practice of law for two years.

### ### Doctrine:

The case reiterates the doctrine that lawyers must uphold not only a high standard of legal proficiency but also of morality, honesty, integrity, and fair dealing. It underscores the principle that maintaining good moral character is a continuing requirement for the practice of law, with any misconduct reflecting adversely on the lawyer's fitness to practice being subject to disciplinary action.

### ### Class Notes:

- **Moral Character in Legal Profession:** Lawyers are required to maintain high standards of morality both in their professional and personal lives. Any deviation can lead to disciplinary measures, including suspension or disbarment.
- **Sexual Harassment:** Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute violations when they create an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment.
- **Watching Pornographic Materials:** The habitual viewing of pornography in the workplace is considered unprofessional behavior and an act of moral turpitude.
- **Remedies for Misconduct:** Victims of misconduct by members of the legal profession have several avenues for redress, including filing complaints with the IBP and, if necessary, elevating cases to the Supreme Court.

### ### Historical Background:

This case highlights the legal profession's intolerance for unprofessional behavior and misconduct among its members. It reiterates the principle that holding a position in the legal profession demands adherence to the highest standards of moral conduct and the responsibility of lawyers to the public, the justice system, and their profession.