

**\*\*Title:\*\*** Toledo et al. v. Office of the Ombudsman, Gabriel, and Bareng

**\*\*Facts:\*\***

A group of officers from Barangay Suyo (30-A), Laoag City, including petitioners Toledo, Agcaoli, Munsayac, Sebastian, Palting, Gaspar, Galang, and Adina, were accused of falsifying Barangay Resolution No. 10. The complainants, Gabriel and Bareng, alleged that Resolution No. 10, which purportedly revoked certain fees under the barangay's revenue code, was a falsified document. This led to various administrative and criminal complaints, sparking a series of legal motions and appeals.

1. Gabriel initially filed administrative complaints for grave misconduct relating to misappropriation of funds and later for falsification of Resolution No. 10.
2. The Office of the Ombudsman found the petitioners liable for grave misconduct and ordered their dismissal.
3. The petitioners filed a motion for reconsideration presenting evidence including council session minutes that discussed Resolution No. 10.
4. Their motion was denied, prompting a petition for certiorari to the Court of Appeals (CA), which was dismissed for procedural errors.
5. The petitioners filed a Motion for Reconsideration to the CA but were again denied.
6. Petitioners escalated the issue to the Supreme Court via a Petition for Review on Certiorari.

**\*\*Issues:\*\***

1. Whether the Court of Appeals properly dismissed the Petition for Certiorari because it was the wrong mode of appeal.
2. Whether the petitioners are administratively liable for grave misconduct for alleged falsification of Resolution No. 10.

**\*\*Court's Decision:\*\***

1. **\*\*On the Procedural Issue:\*\***
  - **\*\*Proper Mode of Appeal:\*\*** The Supreme Court agreed that the appropriate method to appeal the Ombudsman's decision was under Rule 43 of the Revised Rules of Court. Nonetheless, the Supreme Court decided to overlook the procedural error considering the significant implications of the case and substantial justice, paralleling the precedent in *Tanenglian v. Lorenzo*.
2. **\*\*On Administrative Liability for Grave Misconduct:\*\***

- **Resolution No. 10 Not Falsified:** The Supreme Court found that the Ombudsman indeed committed grave abuse of discretion by not considering the totality of evidence and focusing only on Gabriel's and Bareng's submissions. The crucial evidence ignored included council session minutes and testimonies confirming the deliberation on revoking the quarry and fishing gadget fees.
- **Legitimate Deliberations:** The Court acknowledged that discussions and deliberations among the barangay council members took place concerning the subject matter of Resolution No. 10 during several sessions. The preparation and certification of the resolution followed parliamentary norms.
- **Overturing Decision:** Consequently, the petitioners were found not guilty of grave misconduct. The Court underscored the absence of wrongful intent or unlawful behavior by the petitioners in enacting Resolution No. 10.

**Doctrine:**

1. **Substantial Justice:** The Court reaffirmed prioritizing substantial justice over strict procedural adherence, particularly in cases with significant public interest or severe implications for the parties involved.
2. **Proper Procedure in Appeals:** Decisions of the Ombudsman in administrative cases should be appealed under Rule 43; however, exceptional cases may warrant a flexible approach on procedural deficiencies.
3. **Grave Misconduct:** As defined by case law, to be administratively liable for grave misconduct, there must be a clear intent to violate the law or a flagrant disregard of established rules connected to public office duties.

**Class Notes:**

- **Grave Misconduct:** Defined by corruption, clear intent to violate the law, or flagrant disregard of established rules.
- **Rule 43 Appeals:** Used for decisions of administrative bodies; violations can be overlooked in the interest of substantial justice.
- **Falsification Standards:** Under Article 171 of the Revised Penal Code, acts constituting falsification by a public officer must be clear and evident.
- **Judicial Flexibility:** Supreme Court's discretion to relax procedural rules in pursuit of substantial justice, especially when rigid application results in unjust outcomes.

**Historical Background:**

This case underscores the Philippine judiciary's adaptability in procedures to ensure fair administration of justice. The Supreme Court's approach emphasizes balancing legal rigidity

with practical justice, a stance reflecting the evolution of legal principles in response to real-world complexities faced by public officers. This judgment builds on past precedents to foster an understanding that procedural technicalities should not override the pursuit of substantive justice.