

### Title: The Law Firm of Chavez Miranda and Aseoche v. Atty. Josejina C. Fria, 716 Phil. 105 (2013)

### Facts:

On July 31, 2006, an Information was filed against Atty. Josejina C. Fria, the Branch Clerk of Court of the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Muntinlupa City, Branch 203, charging her with Open Disobedience under Article 231 of the Revised Penal Code.

- \*\*Timeline and Initial Court Proceedings:\*\*

- \*\*July 29, 2005:\*\* The RTC of Muntinlupa City, Branch 203, rendered a judgment in favor of the plaintiff in Civil Case No. 03-110 despite the defendant's appeal.
- \*\*February 2, 2006:\*\* The judgment became final and executory after the denial of the defendant's motion for reconsideration.
- \*\*April 4, 2006:\*\* The Law Firm followed up for the issuance of a writ of execution.
- \*\*April 18, 2006:\*\* The presiding judge ordered that he would sign and issue the writ himself.
- \*\*June 13, 2006:\*\* Atty. Fria in her Counter-Affidavit claimed lack of authority to issue the writ as the draft writ was directed to Branch Sheriff Jaime Felicen who was on leave.
- \*\*July 31, 2006:\*\* The prosecutor recommended indicting Atty. Fria for Open Disobedience, and an Information was filed before the Metropolitan Trial Court (MTC) of Muntinlupa City.

- \*\*MTC Proceedings:\*\*

- \*\*September 4, 2006:\*\* Atty. Fria filed a Motion for Determination of Probable Cause.
- \*\*January 25, 2007:\*\* The MTC dismissed Criminal Case No. 46400 due to lack of probable cause, concluding that elements for Open Disobedience were not met.
- \*\*July 13, 2007:\*\* The Law Firm's motion for reconsideration was denied, and the Law Firm filed a petition for certiorari before the RTC.

- \*\*RTC Rulings:\*\*

- \*\*January 8, 2008:\*\* The RTC upheld the MTC's dismissal of the case, ruling there was no grave abuse of discretion.
- \*\*May 16, 2008:\*\* The RTC denied the Law Firm's motion for reconsideration, leading the Law Firm to file a petition for review on certiorari with the Supreme Court.

### Issues:

1. Whether the RTC erred in sustaining the MTC's dismissal of the case against Atty. Fria

for lack of probable cause.

2. Determination of the existence of probable cause in relation to the elements of the crime of Open Disobedience under Article 231 of the Revised Penal Code.

3. The retroactive impact of the Supreme Court's decree in the case of Reyes v. Balde II, declaring the RTC of Muntinlupa City, Branch 203, as without jurisdiction over Civil Case No. 03-110.

### ### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court denied the petition of The Law Firm, affirming the RTC's dismissal of the criminal case for lack of probable cause.

- **First Issue:** The Supreme Court found no grave abuse of discretion by the MTC in dismissing the case. The evidence on record clearly established the absence of the essential elements of the crime of Open Disobedience.

- **Second Issue:**

- **First Element:** The offender being a judicial or executive officer was not contested.

- **Second Element:** The court reiterated the requirement that the judgment, decision, or order must be from a superior authority acting within the scope of its jurisdiction. Since the Supreme Court had nullified all proceedings in Civil Case No. 03-110 due to Branch 203's lack of jurisdiction, this element was considered absent.

- **Third Element:** There was no legally enforceable order for Atty. Fria to disobey, given the nullification of the case from its inception. Hence, this element was also lacking.

- **Third Issue:** The Supreme Court established that the nullification of the civil case due to jurisdictional issues was retroactive, meaning Atty. Fria could not be held liable for Open Disobedience as there was no valid order to disobey.

### ### Doctrine:

1. **Clear Establishment of Probable Cause:** A judge may immediately dismiss a criminal case if the evidence on record clearly fails to establish probable cause (Section 5(a), Revised Rules of Criminal Procedure).

2. **Jurisdictional Requirement in Open Disobedience:** A superior authority's order, judgment, or decision must be within the scope of its jurisdiction to fulfill the elements of Open Disobedience under Article 231 of the Revised Penal Code.

3. **Retroactivity of Jurisdictional Nullifications:** A declaration of lack of jurisdiction by a higher court nullifies all orders and decisions made within the scope of the said jurisdiction

from inception.

### ### Class Notes:

- **Elements of Open Disobedience (Article 231, RPC):**
  1. **Offender is a judicial or executive officer.** (Clearly established)
  2. **The existence of an order, judgment, or decision by a superior authority within its jurisdiction and with all legal formalities.** (Not met as the order was from a court without jurisdiction)
  3. **The offender's willful and unlawful refusal to execute said order, judgment, or decision.** (Not met as void jurisdiction nullified the order)
  
- **Key Concepts:**
  - Probable cause in criminal cases.
  - The legal definition and elements of Open Disobedience.
  - Jurisdiction and its nullifying effects on judicial orders.
  - The principle of judicial discretion in dismissing cases due to clear lack of probable cause.

### ### Historical Background:

The case takes place within the intricate structure of the Philippine judicial system's handling of civil procedure. It highlights procedural safeguards against wrongful prosecution, emphasizing judicial discretion in the identification of probable cause and the strict requirements for criminal charges under the Revised Penal Code. The specific nullification of jurisdiction serves to reconfirm the layered complexity of jurisdictional authority and due process in the Philippine legal context.