\*\*Title:\*\* Air Material Wing Savings and Loan Association, Inc. vs. National Labor Relations Commission, et al., 303 Phil. 615

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

- 1. In 1980, Luis S. Salas is appointed as "notarial and legal counsel" for Air Material Wing Savings and Loan Association (AMWSLAI).
- 2. On January 23, 1987, Salas's appointment is renewed for three years, effective March 1, 1987, with a provision for termination for cause or necessity.
- 3. January 9, 1990, AMWSLAI issues a reminder of the approaching end of Salas's term.
- 4. Salas lodges a complaint against AMWSLAI for separation pay, benefits, SSS premium refund, damages, payment for notarial services from February 1, 1980, to March 2, 1990, and attorney's fees.
- 5. AMWSLAI moves to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, claiming no employer-employee relationship.
- 6. Salas opposes, presenting evidence of employment relationship. Motion denied; parties required to submit position papers.
- 7. AMWSLAI's motion for reconsideration is denied, and the parties are ordered again to submit position papers. AMWSLAI does not comply.
- 8. November 21, 1991, the labor arbiter dismisses most of Salas's claims but allows compensation for notarial fees from 1987 to 1990 and attorney's fees.
- 9. The National Labor Relations Commission (NLRC) affirms the Arbiter's decision.
- 10. AMWSLAI seeks relief from the Supreme Court on jurisdiction and employment relationship.

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

- 1. Whether Salas can be considered an employee of AMWSLAI.
- 2. Whether the NLRC had jurisdiction over Salas's claims for notarial fees.
- 3. Whether Salas was entitled to notarial fees from 1987 to 1990 under his employment contract.

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

- 1. \*\*Employee Status:\*\*
- \*\*Selection and Engagement: \*\* Salas was selected by AMWSLAI's board.
- \*\*Payment of Wages:\*\* He was paid a monthly retainer's fee.
- \*\*Power of Dismissal:\*\* AMWSLAI reserved the right to terminate his employment.
- \*\*Control over Conduct:\*\* AMWSLAI prescribed specific functions and duties for Salas.
- \*\*Ruling:\*\* Salas was indeed an employee as established by the dominant right of control

and criteria fitting the employer-employee relationship.

# 2. \*\*Jurisdiction over Notarial Fees:\*\*

- Labor arbiters have jurisdiction over monetary claims connected to employment relationships.
- Even though notarial fees typically fall under different jurisdictions, they were deemed an incident of Salas's employment role.
- \*\*Ruling:\*\* NLRC's jurisdiction in this matter was upheld.

### 3. \*\*Entitlement to Notarial Fees:\*\*

- The employment contract did not separately stipulate payment for notarial services.
- Evidence did not substantiate a separate entitlement beyond the monthly compensation.
- \*\*Ruling:\*\* The Supreme Court overturned the award for notarial fees from 1987 to 1990 due to lack of contract stipulation or substantial evidence.

#### \*\*Doctrine:\*\*

- The court reaffirmed the criteria determining an employer-employee relationship: (1) Selection and engagement, (2) Payment of wages, (3) Power of dismissal, and (4) Control of employee's conduct.
- Labor Arbiters have original and exclusive jurisdiction over monetary claims tied to the employment relationship, including consequential tasks like notary services if part of the employment role.

#### \*\*Class Notes:\*\*

- \*\*Elements of Employer-Employee Relationship:\*\* Selection and engagement, payment of wages, power of dismissal, control of conduct.
- \*\*Jurisdiction of Labor Arbiters:\*\* Covers monetary claims tied to the employment relationship (Article 217, Labor Code).
- \*\*Role of Substantial Evidence: \*\* Affirms findings related to factual questions by NLRC.
- \*\*Application of Contracts:\*\* Employment terms must clearly delineate roles and specific compensations.

## \*\*Historical Background:\*\*

- The ruling builds upon and clarifies the application of longstanding doctrines on employeremployee relationships, reinforcing the power and scope of Labor Arbiters as set out in the Labor Code.
- This case highlights the evolving nature of employment roles for professionals within

corporate structures, particularly for in-house legal counsels, reflecting the legal recognition of diverse professional contractual relationships.