

### Title:

The Summary Dismissal Board and The Regional Appellate Board, PNP, Region VI, Iloilo City vs. C/INSP. Lazaro Torcita

### Facts:

The case originated from twelve administrative complaints filed against C/INSP. Lazaro Torcita by Manuel Puey, Jesus Puey, and Alex Edwin del Rosario, ranging from conduct unbecoming of a police officer to grave threats and violation of domicile. These complaints were consolidated into one major complaint for conduct unbecoming of a police officer under RA 6975, based on an incident on April 26, 1994, where Torcita, allegedly inebriated, chased a Mazda pick-up and confronted the occupants at Hacienda Aimee. The Summary Dismissal Board (SDB) of PNP conducted hearings, where various evidences and testimonies were presented by both parties. The SDB found Torcita not guilty of the consolidated charge but found him guilty of simple irregularity in the performance of duty for taking alcoholic drinks while on duty and suspended him for 20 days. Torcita appealed to the Regional Appellate Board, which dismissed the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. He then filed a petition for certiorari in the regional trial court of Iloilo City, which annulled the judgment. The case was brought to the Court of Appeals, which affirmed the regional court's decision. The petitioners then appealed to the Supreme Court on grounds including that "Simple Irregularity in the Performance of Duty" is included in the charge of "Conduct Unbecoming of a Police Officer."

### Issues:

1. Whether the charge of "Simple Irregularity in the Performance of Duty" is necessarily included in the charge of "Conduct Unbecoming of a Police Officer."
2. Whether the decision of the SDB and the Regional Appellate Board had become final and executory.

### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court dismissed the petition, affirming the Court of Appeals' decision. The Court found that C/INSP. Torcita could not be found guilty of an offense for which he was not charged, highlighting the fundamental requirements of due process. The charge of being drunk while on duty was not specified in the initial complaints, making the SDB's judgment invalid for charging Torcita with an offense outside the scope of the original complaints. The Court emphasized that Torcita was deprived of the opportunity to defend himself against the specific charge of simple irregularity for taking alcoholic drinks while on duty.

### Doctrine:

The Supreme Court reiterated the importance of due process in administrative proceedings, specifying that an individual must be charged and informed of the specific charges against them to prepare an adequate defense. The judgment for an offense not included in the original charges is considered void for violating due process principles.

### Class Notes:

- Due Process in Administrative Proceedings: Parties must be notified of specific charges against them to provide an opportunity for defense.
- Coverage of Charges: A party cannot be found guilty of an offense not included in the initial complaints.
- Finality of Administrative Decisions: A decision is not final and executory if it violates due process, particularly if it pertains to an offense for which the party was not charged.

### Historical Background:

This case examines the procedural and substantive requirements of administrative disciplinary proceedings within the Philippine National Police (PNP), highlighting the necessity of adhering to due process standards as mandated by Republic Act No. 6975 (the "Department of the Interior and Local Government Act of 1990"). The case underscores the judiciary's role in reviewing administrative actions to ensure compliance with due process and the protection of individuals' rights within the framework of public service discipline.