

**Title:** Triple Eight Integrated Services, Inc. vs. National Labor Relations Commission, et al., G.R. No. 131093

**Facts:**

1. **Recruitment and Employment Contract:**

- August 1992: Erlinda Osdana was recruited by Triple Eight Integrated Services, Inc. (Triple Eight) for employment with Gulf Catering Company (GCC) in Saudi Arabia.
- Original Contract: Osdana was to work as a “Food Server” for 36 months at a salary of SR550.
- Placement Fees: Paid PHP 11,950 for placement, no receipts were issued.
- Medical Exam: Conducted by a POEA-accredited clinic, Osdana was found fit for employment.
- Revised Contract: Signed another contract approved by the POEA, employed as a waitress for 12 months at \$280/month.

2. **Employment in Saudi Arabia:**

- **Work Conditions:** Osdana claimed she did dishwashing and janitorial tasks, contrary to the job designation, and worked 12-hour shifts without overtime pay.
- **Health Issues:** Suffered numbness and pain in arms, leading to periods of unpaid confinement.
- **Reassignment and Hospitalization:** Continued to work under harsh conditions, diagnosed with Bilateral Carpal Tunnel Syndrome, underwent two surgeries, was not assigned work in between despite being able and willing.
- **Dismissal:** Dismissed on April 29, 1994, allegedly due to illness without any separation pay or compensation for unpaid wages.

3. **Filing of Complaint:**

- **Action:** Upon return to the Philippines, Osdana filed a complaint before the POEA for unpaid and underpaid salaries, salaries for the unexpired portion of the contract, moral and exemplary damages, attorney’s fees, and administrative sanctions against Triple Eight.

4. **NLRC Proceedings:**

- **Transfer:** Case transferred to NLRC Arbitration Branch pursuant to Republic Act No. 8042.
- **Labor Arbiter Decision (August 20, 1996):** In favor of Osdana, ordered Triple Eight to pay:
  - \$2,499 for unexpired portion of contract

- \$1,076 for unpaid and differential salaries
- PHP 50,000 moral damages
- PHP 20,000 exemplary damages
- 10% attorney's fees

5. **Appeal and Certiorari:**

- **NLRC Decision (March 11, 1997):** Affirmed the Labor Arbiter's decision.
- **Motion for Reconsideration:** Denied on April 28, 1997.
- **Supreme Court Petition:** Alleged grave abuse of discretion by the NLRC and Labor Arbiter.

**Issues:**

1. Did the Labor Arbiter and NLRC gravely abuse their discretion in ruling in favor of Osdana without a factual or legal basis?
2. Was Triple Eight solely liable for Osdana's claims despite the joint and several liability with GCC?
3. Was the award for salaries for the unexpired portion of the contract proper?

**Court's Decision:**

1. **Factual and Legal Basis of Ruling:**

- **Sufficient Evidence:** Both the Labor Arbiter and NLRC based their decisions on substantial evidence presented by Osdana. Triple Eight's failure to file a comprehensive position paper or provide substantial evidence to counter Osdana's claims justified the decision in her favor.
- **Employer's Burden of Proof:** Triple Eight failed to prove that Osdana's dismissal was for a just cause and in accordance with due process requirements, thereby upholding the illegality of the dismissal.

2. **Sole Liability of Triple Eight:**

- **Jurisdiction:** Since Triple Eight did not include GCC as a co-respondent, administrative and judicial bodies determined the liability solely on Triple Eight. However, this does not preclude Triple Eight from seeking reimbursement or contribution from GCC through separate proceedings.

3. **Award for Salaries (Reduced):**

- **Modification:** Based on Republic Act No. 8042, the award for the unexpired portion was modified:

- Original Award: \$2,499
- Modified Amount: \$1,260 (corresponding to 4.5 months of the renewed contract)
- **\*\*Unpaid Salaries and Differentials:\*\*** Affirmed as \$1,076 due to no payment during designated periods when Osdana worked or was willing to work.
- **\*\*Moral and Exemplary Damages:\*\*** Reduced to PHP 30,000 and PHP 10,000 respectively, acknowledging the employer's oppressive actions.
- **\*\*Attorney's Fees:\*\*** Affirmed with 10% of the total monetary award.

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

- **\*\*Burden of Proof in Termination:\*\*** Employers must substantiate claims of valid dismissal with substantial evidence. When doubts exist, they should be resolved in favor of the employee.
- **\*\*Certificate by Competent Public Health Authority:\*\*** Termination for health reasons requires certification from a competent health authority confirming that the ailment cannot be cured within six months.
- **\*\*Public Policy on Labor Protection:\*\*** Employment disputes involving overseas workers are subject to Philippine labor laws and protective public policy.

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

- **\*\*Elements of Illegal Dismissal:\*\***
  1. Absence of just or authorized cause.
  2. Lack of due process in dismissal.
- **\*\*Substantial Evidence:\*\*** Relevant evidence a reasonable mind accepts as adequate.
- **\*\*Certification Requirement (Art. 284, Labor Code):\*\*** Certification by competent health authority is mandatory to terminate employment due to illness.
- **\*\*Fairness and Public Policy:\*\*** Protective labor policy ensures disputes involving Filipino overseas workers adhere to Philippine standards.

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

The case is notable within the context of labor protection for Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs). It underscores the abuses faced by OFWs and the importance of adhering to local labor laws irrespective of the employment venue. The decision exemplifies the Philippine Supreme Court's commitment to safeguarding the rights and welfare of OFWs abroad and reasserts the jurisdiction of Philippine labor standards over employment contracts perfected within its territory. This ruling reinforces protective measures laid out in the Migrant Workers and Overseas Filipinos Act of 1995 (R.A. No. 8042).