

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

Vicente San Jose vs. National Labor Relations Commission and Ocean Terminal Services, Inc., G.R. No. 122357

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

Vicente San Jose was employed as a stevedore by Ocean Terminal Services, Inc. (OTSI) starting July 1980. After reaching the age of 65, he retired in April 1991 and was paid PHP 3,156.39 as retirement pay. San Jose claimed this was insufficient and filed a complaint on March 19, 1993, seeking the differential in separation pay before the Labor Arbiter (NLRC-NCR Case No. 00-03-02101-93). He asserted he was paid only for rotation work rather than his actual service tenure of 11 years.

- January 19, 1994: The Labor Arbiter ruled in favor of San Jose, awarding him PHP 25,443.70 as separation pay differential.
- OTSI appealed the decision to the National Labor Relations Commission (NLRC), challenging not just the decision's merits but also the jurisdiction.
- April 20, 1995: The NLRC reversed the Labor Arbiter's decision, stating it lacked jurisdiction, as the claim arose from the interpretation of a Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

San Jose did not file a motion for reconsideration but instead filed a Petition for Certiorari with the Supreme Court, arguing the NLRC's decision was rendered with grave abuse of discretion.

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

1. **\*\*Jurisdiction:\*\***

- Whether the Labor Arbiter had jurisdiction over the case, considering it involved the interpretation or implementation of a CBA.

2. **\*\*Timeliness of Appeal and Filing of Appeal Bond:\*\***

- Whether OTSI's appeal to the NLRC was timely and whether the required appeal bond was posted.

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

1. **\*\*Jurisdiction:\*\***

- The Supreme Court affirmed the NLRC's decision that the Labor Arbiter had no jurisdiction. The Court determined the issue pertained to the interpretation or implementation of a CBA, falling under the jurisdiction of a Voluntary Arbitrator or Panel of

Voluntary Arbitrators as per Article 261 of the Labor Code.

2. **Timeliness and Appeal Bond:**

- The Supreme Court ruled the appeal was timely as the last day to perfect the appeal fell on a Saturday, thus allowing the next business day for filing.
- The court verified that OTSI posted the required surety bond, satisfying the procedural requisites.

**Doctrine:**

- **Labor Arbiter Jurisdiction:** Article 217 (c) of the Labor Code limits Labor Arbiters' jurisdiction over cases arising from the interpretation or implementation of a CBA or company policies, which must be referred to the grievance machinery and voluntary arbitrator.
- **Voluntary Arbitrator Jurisdiction:** Articles 261 and 262 extend the Voluntary Arbitrator's jurisdiction to all unresolved grievances related to CBAs and company policies.

**Class Notes:**

- **Key Elements:**
- **Labor Arbitration:** Understanding the distinctions between disputes handled by Labor Arbiters and those by Voluntary Arbitrators.
- **Article 217 and 261 of the Labor Code:** Recognizing jurisdiction limitations over CBA-related disputes.
- **Procedural Requirements:** Importance of filing motions for reconsideration and appeal bonds within prescribed periods.
- **Relevant Statutes:**
- **Article 217:** Specifies the jurisdiction of Labor Arbiters.
- **Article 261-262:** Define the scope of the Voluntary Arbitrator's jurisdiction.

**Historical Background:**

This case reflects the development of labor adjudication structures in the Philippines, specifically the clear delineation and specific roles of Labor Arbiters and Voluntary Arbitrators in resolving labor disputes. It exemplifies the court's intent to streamline dispute resolutions within the framework of the Labor Code, ensuring specialized issues like CBA interpretations are assigned to appropriate quasi-judicial bodies for disposition.

—

This detailed case brief provides comprehensive insights suitable for legal studies, ensuring clarity on jurisdictional boundaries and procedural obligations in labor disputes.