Title: Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas vs. Commission on Audit: A Case Analysis on the Computation of Government Dividends

#### Facts:

The case originates from a dispute between the Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (BSP) and the Commission on Audit (COA) regarding the proper computation of the dividends due from the BSP to the National Government for the periods 2003 to 2006, extending towards 2007 onwards. The contention arose from the BSP's computation of its net earnings, from which it deducted reserves for bad and doubtful accounts as per Section 43 of Republic Act No. 7653 (New Central Bank Act). The COA countered this computation, citing Section 2(d) of Republic Act No. 7656, which prohibits such deductions from net earnings by governmentowned or controlled corporations. The COA issued a series of Audit Observation Memoranda (AOMs) asserting that the BSP had understated its dividends by P7.147 billion due to such deductions. The BSP disputed the COA's interpretation, leading to a formal decision by the COA in March 2010 affirming its stance and denying the BSP's motion for reconsideration in January 2011. Subsequently, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was executed between BSP, COA, and the Department of Finance in January 2011, settling the amount of payable dividends for 2003 to 2006. Despite this MOA, the COA continued to assert that for years 2007 onwards, the BSP may not deduct reserves from its net earnings. The BSP challenged this continued stance, leading to the present petition before the Supreme Court.

## Issues:

- 1. Whether the COA committed grave abuse of discretion in asserting that the BSP cannot deduct reserves from its net earnings for the computation of dividends to the National Government.
- 2. Whether Section 2(d) of RA 7656 (requiring full remittance of net earnings by GOCCs) implicitly repealed Section 43 of RA 7653 (allowing BSP to establish reserves).

### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court found merit in BSP's petition, declaring that the COA committed grave abuse of discretion. The Court held that COA's general ruling for the years 2007 onwards, based on its interpretation that RA 7656 impliedly repealed Section 43 of RA 7653, was void for exceeding its jurisdiction. Significantly, the Court also determined that BSP is not covered by RA 7656, affirming the BSP's independence and reinforcing its unique fiscal management needs which necessitate the deduction of reserves.

## Doctrine:

The Philippine Supreme Court established that the Commission on Audit cannot unilaterally interpret and apply laws in a manner that creates binding precedents on future fiscal management, especially when dealing with the unique fiscal and operational circumstances of the Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas. It also clarified that an implied repeal between two pieces of legislation requires a clear and manifest intent from the legislature, which was absent between RA 7656 and RA 7653.

## Class Notes:

- 1. Doctrine of Implied Repeal: Implied repeal necessitates a clear showing of intent by the legislature to repeal an existing law, which is not favored and must be proven unequivocally.
- 2. Finality of Administrative Decisions: Administrative decisions, even when final, do not create legal precedents and are subject to judicial review, particularly for jurisdictional excesses or grave abuse of discretion.
- 3. Scope of COA Authority: The Commission on Audit has extensive auditing powers, but its interpretations do not establish binding precedents and must align with established jurisprudence and statutory interpretations.

# Historical Background:

The conflict between the Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas and the Commission on Audit represents a crucial examination on the balance of fiscal autonomy and accountability among government entities and instrumentalities. Highlighting the unique role of the BSP as the country's central monetary authority, this case underscores the necessity to accommodate specialized financial management practices within the statutory framework, especially in the context of evolving legislative amendments and economic policies.