

# Office of the Court Administrator vs. Judge Lyliha A. Aquino

## Facts:

In February 2008, the “Trial Lawyers of Cagayan” submitted a letter to Chief Justice Reynato S. Puno, accusing Judge Lyliha A. Aquino, Presiding Judge of Branch 4, Regional Trial Court, Tuguegarao City, of corrupt and unethical practices. Allegations included charging exorbitant fees for favorable rulings in annulment, adoption, and other cases, favoritism towards specific lawyers, non-payment of personal debts, selling goods to litigants, and habitual absenteeism. A judicial audit conducted by the Office of the Court Administrator (OCA) in July 2009 investigated these claims, focusing particularly on procedural non-compliance observed in the processing of annulment and adoption cases by Judge Aquino.

The audit discovered that Judge Aquino presided over 41 annulment and nullity decisions, bypassing procedural mandates like the no-collusion investigation report. Similarly, in 26 adoption cases, she failed to adhere strictly to the procedural requirements, such as acquiring affidavits of consent and various study reports. The audit team found instances of judgments rendered without satisfying legal prerequisites or during the absence of complete documentation required by adoption protocol.

Judge Aquino was instructed to comment on these findings. In her October 2010 response, she argued that she directed prosecutors to establish collusion investigations and that document requirements varied per case and could be subject to judicial discretion. However, by August 2012, the OCA concluded her non-compliance with procedural rules, recommending an admonition with a stern warning but not conclusive action on corruption allegations due to insufficient evidence.

## Issues:

1. Did Judge Aquino violate procedural rules concerning annulment and adoption cases?
2. Were the allegations of corruption and unethical behavior substantiated sufficiently for administrative action?

## Court’s Decision:

**\*\*Procedural Violations:\*\***

- The Supreme Court concurred with the OCA’s assessment that Judge Aquino violated procedural rules. The importance of adherence to these procedures, particularly the no-collusion investigation in annulment cases and comprehensive documentation in adoption

proceedings, was underscored by the Court. Despite Judge Aquino's claim of judicial discretion and her acknowledgment of procedural lapses, the Court admonished that such deviations should not replace procedural integrity for expediency.

**\*\*Corruption Allegations:\*\***

- The Court noted the absence of a definitive investigation into corruption charges due to insufficient probing in the initial audit report. Encouraging the OCA to complete a thorough investigation of this aspect within 60 days, the Court focused on procedural issues for immediate disciplinary action.

Ultimately, the Court decided to fine Judge Aquino P10,000 and issued a stern warning that repetitive procedural lapses would invoke more severe penalties. Despite recognizing non-compliance, the Court found no evidence of harm to litigants or malicious intent warranting stringent disciplinary action at this juncture.

**## Doctrine:**

The decision emphasizes that strict compliance with procedural requirements is pivotal to ensuring judicial accountability and justice integrity. Expediency does not justify bypassing mandatory legal procedures—particularly in sensitive matters like annulments and adoptions, which are intricately procedural to protect involved parties' rights and welfare.

**## Class Notes:**

- **\*\*Annulment of Marriage:\*\*** Procedures necessitate no-collusion investigations as a pre-trial requisite to ensure transparency and fairness.
- **\*\*Adoption Cases:\*\*** Comprehensive documentation, including affidavits and study reports, is crucial to protect minor adoptees' welfare.
- **\*\*Judicial Discretion:\*\*** While judges maintain discretion, it must not contravene established procedural mandates.
- **\*\*Administrative Accountability:\*\*** This case reaffirms the judiciary's oversight function and accountability mechanisms when procedural violations occur.

**## Historical Background:**

This case arose in a milieu where the Philippine judiciary was under intense scrutiny to combat corruption and enhance procedural compliance. The period saw concerted efforts by the Court to source administrative reform predicated on transparency, fairness, and procedural rectitude, against a backdrop of widespread public trust issues concerning judicial conduct and effectiveness.