

### Title:

\*\*Salvador H. Laurel vs. Hon. Aniano A. Desierto\*\*

### Facts:

Salvador H. Laurel, the former Vice-President of the Philippines, was appointed Chair of the National Centennial Commission (NCC), a body reconstituted to prepare for the 1998 Centennial celebrations of Philippine Independence. The Commission's composition notably included members from the executive, legislative, and judiciary branches of the government, as specified by Executive Order No. 128. Laurel's capacity as Chair positioned him under scrutiny regarding his status as a public officer and, consequently, within the purview of the Ombudsman's jurisdiction.

Laurel challenged this classification, bringing the matter before the Philippine Supreme Court through a petition that sought to reconsider a prior decision affirming his status as a public officer. He raised concerns over the constitutional implications of involving members of the Cabinet, Senate, House of Representatives, and Supreme Court in the NCC, arguing that such involvement could contravene constitutional restrictions against holding any other office. Additionally, he contested his status on the basis of estoppel, claiming that official acts and designations by high-ranking officials could have led to a reasonable belief that NCC membership did not constitute a public office.

### Procedural Posture:

Laurel's move towards reconsideration followed the Supreme Court's initial decision which had declared him a public officer. He also requested a referral of the case to the Court En Banc for a broader review, invoking significant constitutional questions and purported inconsistencies with prior doctrines. The Supreme Court deliberated on the motion for reconsideration and referral based on the arguments presented and the legal precedents cited.

### Issues:

1. Whether Laurel, as Chair of the NCC, should be considered a public officer subject to the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman.
2. The constitutional implications of involving members of different branches of government in the NCC.
3. Whether estoppel could apply given the actions of various high-ranking officials in designating members to the NCC.
4. If the case warranted referral to the Court En Banc for modification or reversal of

established doctrines.

### ### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court denied the motion for reconsideration and referral to the Court En Banc. The Court clarified that the principal issue was Laurel's status as a public officer and pronounced that potential constitutional concerns about the NCC's composition did not detract from Laurel's public officer status. It rejected the estoppel argument, emphasizing that governmental actions, especially in the exercise of sovereign powers, cannot be subdued by estoppel against the government. Furthermore, the Court distinguished the present case from previous rulings (e.g., **Macalino vs. Sandiganbayan**) and maintained that previous designations of officials to the NCC did not establish doctrinal principles that would necessitate a reevaluation by the Court En Banc.

### ### Doctrine:

- **Public Office Jurisdiction:** The decision reiterates that individuals occupying positions with responsibilities toward the public, including roles within bodies like the NCC, can be classified as public officers, thus falling within the ombudsman's jurisdiction.
- **Estoppel and Government:** The principle of estoppel does not operate against the government in the execution of its sovereign functions.
- **Constitutional Provision on Public Office Doctrine:** A body's composition, even if involving constitutional officials, does not automatically exempt its chairperson from being considered a public officer.

### ### Class Notes:

- **Public Officer Criteria:** The case exemplifies criteria for determining public officer status, emphasizing duties towards the public and oversight by government bodies such as the Ombudsman.
- **Estoppel Limitations:** Government actions, particularly those involving sovereign powers, are not subject to estoppel against the government, highlighting the protective measures toward governance integrity.
- **Role of Supreme Court in Doctrinal Changes:** Decisions or designations made by the Supreme Court, outside formal judgments in cases, do not constitute binding legal doctrines capable of requiring En Banc review for modifications.

### ### Historical Background:

This case occurred in the context of preparatory efforts for the Philippine Centennial celebrations, highlighting the complexities of governance and legal interpretations in public

administration. It also touches on the evolving understanding of public office in the context of modern governmental functions.