

### Title: Amparo Bueno vs. Atty. Ramon A. Rañeses (Disbarment Case)

### Facts:

Amparo Bueno, the complainant, initiated a disbarment complaint against Atty. Ramon A. Rañeses on March 3, 1993, with the Integrated Bar of the Philippines-Commission on Bar Discipline (IBP-CBD), which was led through investigations by Commissioners Agustinus V. Gonzaga, Victoria Gonzalez-de los Reyes, and finally, Rico A. Limpingco, who recommended Rañeses's disbarment in September 2008. The IBP Board of Governors approved this recommendation in December 2008, which was then transmitted to the Supreme Court in August 2009.

Bueno had hired Rañeses for representation in Civil Case No. 777, paying him a retainer and additional fees per hearing. Rañeses prepared and filed necessary documents and attended some hearings, though occasionally absent or late. Disturbingly, Bueno claimed Rañeses solicited P10,000 to allegedly bribe the judge of the case, leading Bueno to sell personal belongings to comply. Additional money was requested and provided in the same vein. Bueno later discovered Rañeses's failure to respond to significant court directions, realizing too late that the case had been adversely decided without her knowledge. Separately, Rañeses attempted a similar solicitation from Bueno's aunt for a different case.

Rañeses did not respond to the complaint or attend mandated hearings, leading to his default. Despite motions to delay proceedings and claims of not receiving case documents — contradicted by postal receipts — Rañeses failed to participate meaningfully in the investigation.

### Issues:

1. Whether Atty. Rañeses was negligent in his legal representation.
2. Whether Rañeses solicited money under the pretense of bribing judicial officers.

### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court supported the IBP's findings but opted for disbarment, contrary to the IBP Board's suggestion of indefinite suspension. It concluded Rañeses violated professional and ethical standards by failing to serve with competence and diligence, soliciting bribes, and disrespecting both the judiciary and the disciplinary process. The Court emphasized Rañeses's actions tarnished the integrity of the legal profession and the judiciary, meriting

disbarment to protect public trust and judicial integrity.

### ### Doctrine:

This case reiterates several key doctrines of legal ethics and professional responsibility:

- **Competence and Diligence:** As per Canon 18 of the Code of Professional Responsibility, lawyers must serve their clients competently and diligently, failing which may lead to liability.
- **Integrity and Public Trust:** Soliciting bribes and engaging in deceit undermines the integrity and public trust of the legal profession.

### ### Class Notes:

1. **Canon 18:** A lawyer must serve with competence and diligence.
  - Rule 18.02: A lawyer must not handle legal matters without preparation.
  - Rule 18.03: A lawyer must not neglect a legal matter, with negligence rendering them liable.
2. **Solicitation of Bribes:** Soliciting bribes is antithetical to the integrity and responsibility expected of legal practitioners, leading to severe sanctions including disbarment.

### ### Historical Background:

This case underscores the persistent challenge of maintaining ethical integrity within the legal profession, addressing the severe consequences of violating professional and ethical standards. It highlights the judiciary's commitment to addressing misconduct and preserving public trust in the legal system.

—