

**\*\*Title:\*\***

Cecilia T. Manese, Julietes E. Cruz, and Eufemio Peñano II vs. Jollibee Foods Corporation, et al.

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

Petitioners Manese, Cruz, and Peñano, employees of Jollibee Foods Corporation (JFC), were dismissed following a series of events related to the mishandling of food products:

1. **\*\*Employee Role and Store Opening Assignments:\*\***

- Manese was a First Assistant Store Manager Trainee, Cruz was a Second Assistant Store Manager, and Peñano was an Assistant Store Manager Trainee.
- They were part of the team opening a Jollibee branch at Festival Mall, Alabang.

2. **\*\*Preparation for Store Opening:\*\***

- Cruz requested the delivery of goods for anticipated store opening, which was postponed multiple times.

3. **\*\*Problematic Deliveries and Storage:\*\***

- On December 23, 2000, a delivery of 450 packs of Chickenjoy was made, with the opening rescheduled.
- Cruz thawed the Chickenjoy for the eventual opening, unaware of the subsequent postponement issues.

4. **\*\*Chickenjoy Controversy:\*\***

- Chickenjoy was found stored inappropriately, leading to potential product contamination.
- Attempts to return or dispose of the products were unsuccessful and led to administrative hearings alleging misconduct.

5. **\*\*Dismissals and Labor Complaints:\*\***

- Petitioners Manese, Cruz, and Peñano were dismissed. Cruz later transferred branches and filed for illegal dismissal among other claims.
- The Labor Arbiter found Cruz's dismissal illegal but supported Jollibee in the cases of Manese and Peñano.

6. **\*\*Appeals and Modifications:\*\***

- The NLRC and Court of Appeals mostly upheld Labor Arbiter decisions but with some modifications related to Cruz's dismissal due to procedural grounds.

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

1. **\*\*Jurisdiction and Finality of Decisions:\*\***

- Whether the Court of Appeals exceeded jurisdiction when it reversed the Labor Arbiter's final decision on Cruz's illegal dismissal after Jollibee failed to file a timely appeal.

2. **\*\*Termination Justification and Managerial Trust:\*\***

- Whether dismissals on grounds of loss of trust and confidence were justified for managerial employees Manese and Peñano.

3. **\*\*Factual Errors on Product Safety:\*\***

- Whether petitioners served Chickenjoy beyond safety limits, thereby justifying their dismissal on grounds of jeopardizing public health.

4. **\*\*Monetary Claims Entitlement:\*\***

- Entitlement of petitioner Manese to unpaid salary, sick leave, and cooperative savings.

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

1. **\*\*Resolution of Cruz's Dismissal Case:\*\***

- Held that Cruz's dismissal finding was final and executory due to JFC's failure to appeal.

2. **\*\*Managerial Trust and Confidence:\*\***

- Upheld dismissals of Manese and Peñano based on loss of trust and confidence substantiated by company policy violations in their managerial capacities.

3. **\*\*Public Health and Safety Issue:\*\***

- Affirmed findings of serving Chickenjoy beyond safety limits as credible, reinforcing the conduct was a breach of managerial trust.

4. **\*\*Monetary Claims Settlement:\*\***

- Confirmed Manese's entitlement to earned wages and savings, separating these from any civil issues (e.g., car loan deductions).

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

- **\*Trust and Confidence in Managerial Roles\*:** The standard for terminating managerial employees for loss of trust is lesser than for ordinary employees but must be substantiated with evidence.

- **\*Procedural Due Process\***: Unchallenged tribunal decisions become final and executory.

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

- **\*\*Elements of Managerial Dismissal\*\***: Grounds such as loss of trust require substantial evidence; managerial employees are held to higher standards of fidelity.
- **\*\*Appeals and Finality in Labor Cases\*\***: Failure to appeal leads to finality of decisions within the appellate system as emphasized in procedural laws.
- **\*\*Statutory Interpretation\*\***: Article 282, paragraph (c) of the Labor Code is central in cases involving serious misconduct or willful disobedience.

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

This case highlights the complexities surrounding managerial liability, organizational policies on product handling, and procedural issues in labor dispute resolutions. It reflects the modern employment dynamics in retail and service sectors where brand integrity and food safety are paramount. The case reinforces jurisprudence on managerial trust and procedural nuances in Philippine labor law.