

### Title: Samuel B. Arnado vs. Atty. Homobono A. Adaza

### Facts:

The case originated from a letter sent on March 15, 2013, by Atty. Samuel B. Arnado to the Supreme Court, reporting Atty. Homobono A. Adaza's failure to comply with the Mandatory Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) requirements under Bar Matter No. 850. Arnado noted Adaza's repeated claims of an "MCLE application for exemption under process" in his pleadings from 2009 to 2012, despite the MCLE Office's certification that Adaza had not complied for several compliance periods.

The Court referred the matter to the MCLE Committee, which, through an evaluation report and recommendation by retired Justice Bernardo P. Pardo, revealed Adaza's application for exemption for the first and second compliance periods based on "expertise in law" had been denied on January 14, 2009, and he neither applied for exemption nor complied for the third period.

Adaza, in his compliance and comment, contested the denial of his exemption application and criticized the notification process, while listing his extensive legal accomplishments as justification for his exemption request. He was also critical of the delay in communication regarding his exemption status.

The Office of the Bar Confidant (OBC), in its report and recommendations, reiterated Adaza's failures to comply or properly seek exemption and his baseless representations of an ongoing reconsideration process. The OBC recommended declaring Adaza a delinquent member of the IBP and suspending him from the practice of law for six months.

### Issues:

1. Whether Atty. Homobono A. Adaza is administratively liable for failing to comply with the MCLE requirements.
2. Whether Atty. Adaza's numerous achievements and contributions to the legal profession exempt him from the MCLE requirements under Bar Matter No. 850.
3. The appropriateness of the sanctions for failure to comply with the MCLE requirements.

### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court held Atty. Adaza administratively liable for his failure to comply with the MCLE requirements. The Court underscored the importance of the MCLE in ensuring lawyers maintain the ethics of the profession and keep abreast with law and jurisprudence. The Court found Adaza's efforts for exemption based on "expertise in law" lacking

compelling evidence and noted his negligence in following up on his exemption status. Despite Adaza's claims of significant legal achievements, the Court ruled these did not exempt him from MCLE compliance.

The Court criticized both the respondent for his delayed compliance and the MCLE Office's delay in notifying the denial of his exemption request. Concluding that Adaza's actions exhibited a disregard for the directives of the MCLE Office, the Court declared him a delinquent member of the IBP, suspended him from practice for six months or until he fully complied with the MCLE requirements, and ordered him to pay the necessary fees.

### ### Doctrine:

This case reaffirms the principle that all practicing members of the Philippine Bar are mandated to comply with the MCLE requirements under Bar Matter No. 850, without exception based on personal achievements or contributions to the legal profession. Additionally, it stresses the administrative responsibility of lawyers to follow up on their compliance or exemption status and the duty of the MCLE Office to promptly communicate its actions to concerned parties.

### ### Class Notes:

- Non-compliance with the MCLE requirements can result in being declared a delinquent member of the IBP and suspension from the practice of law.
- Claims of legal expertise and significant contributions to the legal profession do not exempt lawyers from fulfilling the MCLE requirements.
- Lawyers are expected to be proactive in ensuring their compliance with MCLE requirements and should not assume exemptions will be granted without adequate justification.
- The decision illustrates the balance between administrative accountability of legal professionals and the administrative responsibilities of legal education bodies.

### ### Historical Background:

The establishment of MCLE requirements reflects the legal profession's recognition of the need for continuous education for lawyers. Bar Matter No. 850 underscores the principle that legal education does not end upon passing the bar examination but is a lifelong process crucial for the effective practice of law and adherence to professional ethics. This case highlights the consequences of disregarding this professional obligation and the judiciary's role in enforcing compliance.