Title: Re: Order Dated 21 December 2006 Issued by Judge Bonifacio Sanz Maceda, Regional Trial Court, Las Piñas City, Branch 275, Suspending Loida M. Genabe, Legal Researcher

Facts:

1. **Incident and Initial Memo:**

- On 20 November 2006, Atty. Jonna M. Escabarte issued an Inter-Office Memorandum to Loida M. Genabe for neglecting her duty by attending a seminar on 16-17 November 2006 without completing an assigned task. This task involved summarizing facts in Criminal Case Nos. 03-0059 to 03-0063.

2. **Explanation by Genabe:**

- On 22 November 2006, Genabe explained she couldn't complete the task due to a lack of transcript of stenographic notes and requested humane consideration.

3. **Staff Meeting and Alleged Disrespect:**

- On 29 November 2006, during a staff meeting, Genabe displayed disrespectful behavior towards the court staff, including Atty. Escabarte.

4. **Show Cause Order:**

- Judge Maceda issued a show-cause order on 30 November 2006 to Genabe for contempt, conduct unbecoming, neglect of duty, and misconduct, which Genabe denied in her answer on 11 December 2006, also counter-claiming selective disciplinary practices by Judge Maceda.

5. **Investigation and Suspension:**

- A fact-finding investigation was conducted on 11 December 2006 without Genabe. Later, on 21 December 2006, Judge Maceda issued an order suspending Genabe for 30 days for neglect of duty, with immediate effect.

6. **Salary Withholding:**

- Judge Maceda requested the withholding of Genabe's salary for the suspension period from 21 December 2006 to 20 January 2007.

7. **Complaint and Subsequent Procedures:**

- The matter was elevated to the Office of the Court Administrator (OCA) and subsequently manifested in several court resolutions. Genabe resumed work on 22 January 2007 and was

formally charged with additional offenses which were later referred back for OCA recommendations.

Issues:

- 1. **Genabe's Liability:**
- a. Simple neglect of duty.
- b. Contempt, conduct unbecoming, and misconduct.
- 2. **Judge Maceda's Authority:**
- a. Violation of process under A.M. No. 03-8-02-SC and collateral issues regarding unauthorized disciplinary actions.

Court's Decision:

- 1. **Genabe's Liabilities:**
- **Simple Neglect of Duty:** The court found Genabe guilty of simple neglect of duty. She was given three days to summarize testimonies but only completed one of three tasks, despite having ample time. As a first offense, the appropriate penalty was suspension without pay for one month and one day.
- **Additional Charges:** The evidence for contempt, conduct unbecoming, and misconduct was insufficient. As administrative proceedings require substantial evidence, there was no basis for penalizing Genabe for these charges.
- 2. **Judge Maceda's Violation:**
- **Unauthorized Suspension:** Judge Maceda improperly applied Circular No. 30-91 instead of utilizing the guidelines under A.M. No. 03-8-02-SC, which limit an executive judge's authority to conducting inquiries and recommending actions to the Supreme Court. His direct suspension and withholding of salary were beyond his delegated authority.
- **Penalty Imposed:** Judge Maceda was found guilty of violation and fined P12,000, with stern warnings against future similar conduct.

Doctrine:

- **Simple Neglect of Duty:** Defined as failure to give attention to a task, signifying carelessness or indifference. It's a less grave offense under civil service law, carrying a penalty of suspension for one month and one day to six months for the first offense.
- **Judicial Authority Limits:** Executive judges are limited to conducting inquiries and

recommending actions to the Supreme Court for all types of administrative offenses involving court employees. They cannot independently impose penalties.

Class Notes:

- 1. **Simple Neglect of Duty:**
- Defined in CSC Memorandum Circular No. 19, series of 1999.
- 1st Offense: Suspension of 1 month and 1 day to 6 months.
- 2. **Judicial Oversight Limits:**
- **A.M. No. 03-8-02-SC, Section 1, Chapter VIII: **
- Limits executive judges to conducting inquiries and providing recommendations to OCA.
- Violation considered a less serious charge under Section 9, Rule 140 of Rules of Court.
- **Penalty for Violation (Section 11, Rule 140):**
- Suspension from office or fine of P10,000 to P20,000.

Historical Background:

- **Circular No. 30-91 Implementation:**
- Established initial guidelines for disciplining court employees for light offenses.
- **Transition to A.M. No. 03-8-02-SC:**
- Updated in 2004 to refine executive judges' disciplinary powers, focusing on detailed procedural safeguards and centralized decision-making via the Supreme Court.
- **Administrative Accountability:**
- The case reflects procedural evolution in the judiciary's administrative disciplinary process, emphasizing judicial propriety and adherence to updated guidelines to uphold due process in administrative actions.