### Title: City Service Corp. Workers Union vs. City Service Corporation

### ### Facts:

The saga begins with the City Service Corporation (CSC), a company providing janitorial and allied services, hiring a group of individuals across different years, notably Juanito Valencia in 1965 and others in 1979, assigning them to the Army and Navy Club. On February 4, 1974, CSC terminated their employment due to accusations of possible theft, as reported by the Army and Navy Club, without a formal investigation or prior clearance from the Secretary of Labor, in violation of prevailing laws.

Challenging their dismissal, the affected individuals lodged an illegal dismissal case against CSC. This legal battle saw its initial victory at the Labor Arbiter's level, where the termination was declared illegal, mandating their reinstatement with backwages. However, upon CSC's appeal, the National Labor Relations Commission (NLRC) maintained the illegal dismissal verdict but opted for compensation through separation pay instead of reinstatement, citing the impracticality of reinstatement due to the time elapsed since their dismissal.

Dissatisfied, the petitioners sought the Supreme Court's intervention, contending the NLRC's refusal to reinstate despite acknowledging the dismissal's illegality. They challenged the basis of this decision, highlighting CSC's ongoing operations and the general availability of janitorial positions, making reinstatement viable.

## ### Issues:

- 1. \*\*Legality of Dismissal\*\*: Whether the petitioners' dismissal without prior clearance from the Secretary of Labor was illegal.
- 2. \*\*Reinstatement vs. Separation Pay\*\*: Whether petitioners are entitled to reinstatement with backwages in lieu of separation pay despite the long duration since their dismissal.

## ### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court delved into the essence of security of tenure, emphasizing its constitutional guarantee and paramount importance. It criticized the NLRC's reliance on speculative reasoning for denying reinstatement, pointing out the lack of evidence on the impracticality of re-employing the petitioners given CSC's ongoing business activities. Acknowledging the potential challenge of direct reinstatement to their original positions due

to the passage of time, the Court nonetheless underscored the feasibility of reassigning them to equivalent positions within CSC's vast operational scope.

The Court, therefore, overturned the NLRC's award of separation pay, ordering CSC to reinstate the petitioners to their janitorial positions or similar roles if the original positions were unavailable, with three years' worth of backwages, setting a clear precedent for the treatment of illegal dismissal cases.

#### ### Doctrine:

This case reinforces the constitutional doctrine of security of tenure, emphasizing that employees unjustly dismissed are entitled to reinstatement without loss of seniority rights and backwages. The speculative nature of employment unavailability, particularly in cases involving ongoing business operations, cannot override the right to reinstatement, with the court affirming the priority of reinstating employees to similar positions if their original positions are no longer available.

## ### Class Notes:

- \*\*Security of Tenure\*\*: Art. II, Sec. 9 of the Philippine Constitution guarantees the security of tenure for workers, underlining its precedence over speculative employment availability.
- \*\*Illegal Dismissal\*\*: Section 280 of the Labor Code mandates reinstatement and backwages for unjustly dismissed employees, emphasizing the rehabilitation of employment rights over financial compensation.
- \*\*Burden of Proof\*\*: Employers bear the burden of proving the impracticality of reinstatement, with courts favoring the restoration of employment in cases of illegal dismissal.

# ### Historical Background:

The case underscores the progressive evolution of labor rights in the Philippines, reflecting the judiciary's active role in upholding constitutional guarantees amidst changing labor relations dynamics. It illustrates the balance between employer's operational discretion and the workers' rights, with the Supreme Court setting a precedent on the preferential option for reinstatement, even after a significant lapse of time since wrongful termination, thus fortifying the legal infrastructure protecting labor rights in the Philippines.