

### Title: Philippine Charter Insurance Corporation vs. Explorer Maritime Co., Ltd., et al.

### Facts:

The Philippine Charter Insurance Corporation (PCIC) filed a complaint against the respondents, including Explorer Maritime Co., Ltd. (as the owner of the vessel M/V “Explorer”), Wallem Philippines Shipping, Inc. (the ship agent), Asian Terminals, Inc. (the arrastre operator), and Foremost International Port Services, Inc. (the broker), seeking to recover P342,605.50 for a lost or damaged shipment. This case, filed on March 22, 1995, was docketed as Civil Case No. 95-73340 at the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Manila, Branch 37. A similar case involving the vessel M/V “Taygetus” was filed and docketed as Civil Case No. 95-73341 at Branch 38.

Despite the respondents filing answers with counterclaims, continuous delays, including PCIC’s filing of an amended complaint and a series of motions, plagued the progression of Civil Case No. 95-73340. Notably, PCIC filed a Motion to Disclose to compel Wallem Philippines to reveal the “Unknown Owner” of M/V “Explorer,” which was mistakenly filed under the wrong branch. After nearly five years of inactivity, the respondents moved to dismiss the case for lack of prosecution, leading the RTC to dismiss the complaint on February 14, 2001. PCIC’s subsequent Motion for Reconsideration, attributing the delay to the erroneously filed Motion to Disclose, was denied.

PCIC appealed to the Court of Appeals, which upheld the RTC’s decision on July 20, 2006. The Supreme Court ultimately denied PCIC’s Petition for Review, affirming the appellate court’s decision and emphasizing the consequences of procedural negligence.

### Issues:

1. Did PCIC fail to prosecute its action against the respondents for an unreasonable length of time?
2. Was PCIC’s failure to move the case forward due to an excusable mistake, particularly the erroneous filing of the Motion to Disclose?
3. Should the case be dismissed for failure to prosecute even without proof of the plaintiff’s lack of interest or prejudice to the defendants?

### Court’s Decision:

The Supreme Court, in addressing each issue, concluded that PCIC indeed failed to prosecute its case against the respondents for an unreasonable length of time, establishing nearly three years of inactivity as unjustifiable. The Court refuted PCIC’s claim of excusable

negligence, pointing out that procedural errors and a lack of diligent follow-up led to the dismissal. The Court emphasized that the dismissal for failure to prosecute does not require proof of the plaintiff's lack of interest or prejudice to the defendants, citing the potential impairment of defenses due to prolonged delays.

### ### Doctrine:

This case reiterated the doctrine that a plaintiff's failure to prosecute their action without justifiable cause within a reasonable period allows for the dismissal of the complaint, even absent any proof of the plaintiff's disinterest or any prejudice to the defendant.

### ### Class Notes:

- **Failure to Prosecute:** This refers to the plaintiff's lack of action or diligence in moving a case forward, leading to potential dismissal for inactivity.
- **Rule 17, Section 3 of the Rules of Court:** Provides grounds for dismissal due to the plaintiff's fault, including failure to prosecute for an unreasonable length of time.
- **Rule 18, Section 1 of the Rules of Court:** Stipulates the plaintiff's duty to prompt the setting of the case for pre-trial after the last pleading has been served and filed.

In essence, procedural diligence is paramount in legal proceedings. Plaintiffs must actively pursue their claims within reasonable timelines and ensure compliance with court rules and orders to avoid dismissal of their cases.

### ### Historical Background:

The procedural journey of this case illustrates the complexities and potential consequences of litigation management within the Philippine legal system. It serves as a cautionary tale for litigants regarding procedural accuracy, the importance of timely prosecution, and the reliance on legal counsel to navigate the intricacies of judicial processes effectively.