DOROTEO, DIOSDADO AND URSULA, ALL SURNAMED LAGCAO, COMPLAINANTS, VS. JUDGE IRENEO LEE GAKO, JR., REGIONAL TRIAL COURT, CEBU CITY, BRANCH 5, RESPONDENT.

A.M. NO. RTJ-04-1840 (FORMERLY OCA I.P.I NO. 02-1534-RTJ). August 02, 2007

Ponente: CORONA, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): https://batas.org/library/196b3a5463f9/

CORONA, J.:

On July 18, 2002, the Office of the Court Administrator (OCA) received the complaint[1] of Doroteo, Diosdado and Ursula Lagcao against respondent Judge Ireneo Lee Gako, Jr. of the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Cebu City, Branch 5.[2]

Complainants are the registered owners of lot no. 1029, a 4,048 sq. m. parcel of land situated in Capitol Hills, Cebu City.[3] They filed an ejectment case against the "settlers" occupying the lot sometime in 1997.[4] The case was filed in the Municipal Trial Court in Cities (MTCC), Cebu City, Branch 1, docketed as civil case no. 38130. In April 1998, the MTCC rendered a decision in favor of complainants, ordering defendant "settlers" to vacate the lot. On appeal to the RTC of Cebu, the decision was affirmed.[5] Hence, in January 1999, the MTCC issued a writ of execution. In February 1999, this was followed by an order for the demolition of certain structures of the "settlers" who refused to leave.

On February 22, 1999, before the demolition order could be enforced, the MTCC suspended its implementation for 120[6] days in deference to a written request of then City Mayor Alvin B. Garcia who cited humanitarian reasons and asked for time to look for a relocation site for the "settlers." The court granted this request.

In the meantime, the "settlers" organized themselves and formed Green Pasture Homeowners Association, Inc. (association), a non-stock corporation.

On June 30, 1999, during the period of deferment of the demolition order, the Sangguniang Panlungsod of Cebu City passed Ordinance No. 1772 entitled "An Ordinance Further Amending Ordinance No. 1656 as amended by Ordinance No. 1684 otherwise known as the 1996 Revised Zoning Ordinance of the City of Cebu, by Incorporating therein a New District called Socialized Housing Sites." This ordinance identified subject lot no. 1029 as included in the "Socialized Housing Sites" pursuant to RA 7279 or the Urban Development and Housing Act of 1992.[7] Subsequently, Ordinance No. 1843 was approved on August 2, 2000 authorizing the expropriation of the lot.[8]

Thereafter, the association filed a complaint for injunction, prohibition and damages with prayer for the issuance of a writ of preliminary injunction in the RTC of Cebu against complainants.[9] It prayed that complainants and the MTCC be enjoined from ejecting its members and demolishing their structures.[10] In a resolution dated March 27, 2000 penned by respondent, the RTC of Cebu granted the writ of preliminary injunction.[11] The complainants' motion for reconsideration was denied in a resolution dated May 22, 2000.[12]

Complainants elevated the matter to the Court of Appeals (CA) via petition for certiorari. The CA, in a decision

dated November 19, 2001, set aside respondent's March 27 and May 22, 2000 resolutions. It held that respondent committed grave abuse of discretion when he issued the writ of preliminary injunction in the absence of a clear legal right of the association.[13] Reconsideration sought by the association was denied.[14] Thereafter, another writ of demolition was issued.[15] However, on February 26, 2002, respondent issued a temporary restraining order (TRO) stopping the demolition scheduled on that day.[16]

Meanwhile, the association filed an amended complaint dated February 18, 2002 alleging a supervening event (i.e., the subsequent sale of the lot to the association) that would make execution of the decision of the MTCC inequitable.[17] It also applied for another writ of preliminary injunction which respondent denied in an order dated March 15, 2002.[18] On March 18, 2002, respondent voluntarily inhibited himself from the case.[19]

Complainants charged respondent with gross ignorance of the law, grave abuse of authority and grave misconduct for issuing a writ of preliminary injunction in his March 27, 2000 resolution and TRO in his February 26, 2002 order. They argue that respondent was aware that the MTCC's judgment was already final and executory as in fact there was already a writ of execution and demolition order yet he still issued a writ of preliminary injunction.[20] Moreover, the TRO issued in his February 26, 2002 order was in brazen defiance of the CA's ruling.

In his defense, respondent claimed that he issued the writ of preliminary injunction because there was a Cebu City Ordinance No. 1772 converting complainants' lot no. 1029 into a socialized housing site and making the members of the association program beneficiaries under RA 7279. He granted the writ to prevent the demolition of the structures in the lot so as not to render the main action of the association for injunction, prohibition and damages moot and academic.

The OCA, in its evaluation dated October 29, 2003, stated:

> May the issuance of City Ordinance No. 1772 be considered a supervening event that would justify the suspension or nullification of the execution of a final and executory judgment? It appears so.
>
> In the case of "Ursula Ocdamia Javier, et al. vs. Court of Appeals and Heirs of Luz Javier," (G.R. No. 96086, July 21, 1993), the Supreme Court defined what constitutes supervening event that would justify the suspension or nullification of a final and executory judgment. Said the Court. "[T]he supervening event xxx refers to facts and events transpiring after the judgment or order had become final and executory. These circumstances affect or change the substance of the judgment and render its execution inequitable."
>
> Thus, the passage of City Ordinance No. 1772 and City Ordinance No. 1843 may be categorized as a supervening event that would justify the suspension of the execution of the decision in the ejectment case.
>
> Even granting arguendo that the passage of said ordinances could not be considered as supervening events, it is indubitable that respondent judge acted the way he did in deference to the wisdom of the Sangguniang [Panlungsod] who passed the Ordinances with its avowed purpose of "to provide a socialized housing project for the landless and low-income city residents." This is in fact a Constitutional guarantee under Sec. 9, Article XIII: "The State shall, by law, [undertake xxx a] continuing program of urban land reform and housing which will make available at affordable cost decent housing and basic services to underprivileged and homeless citizens in urban centers and resettlement areas. xxx" As such, it can be said that respondent judge's misapplication of the rule, therefore, was in response to this social justice call.
>
> Be that as it may, we still find respondent judge administratively liable for issuing a TRO in defiance [of] the decision of the Court of Appeals. However, his liability is mitigated in view of the ruling of the Supreme Court in the case of "NHA vs. Reyes" and "Javier vs. Court of Appeals". While respondent may have erred in issuing the TRO, such act would not constitute gross ignorance of the law but mere misapplication thereof in the light of the ruling in the said cases.[21]

Bar review courses, mock exams and a study planner that keeps you on pace - batas.org

While the OCA did not consider respondent's act of issuing a writ of preliminary injunction in his March 27, 2000 resolution as tantamount to gross ignorance of the law, still it found him administratively liable for ignorance of the law when he issued a TRO in his February 26, 2002 order in defiance of the CA's decision. Thus, it recommended that respondent be suspended for two months for ignorance of the law with a warning that a similar offense shall be dealt with more severely.[22]

The findings and evaluation of the OCA are well-taken but we modify the designation of the offense and corresponding penalty.

A patent disregard of simple, elementary and well-known rules constitutes gross ignorance of the law.[23] Judges are expected to exhibit more than just cursory acquaintance with statutes and procedural laws.[24] They must know the laws and apply them properly in all good faith.[25] They are expected to keep abreast of prevailing jurisprudence.[26] To constitute gross ignorance of the law, the acts complained of must not only be contrary to existing law and jurisprudence but should also be motivated by bad faith, fraud, malice or dishonesty.[27]

A preliminary injunction is an order granted at any stage of an action prior to judgment of final order, requiring a party, court, agency, or person to refrain from a particular act or acts.[28] It is a preservative remedy aimed to protect the complainant's substantive rights and interests during the pendency of the principal action.[29] It is proper only when the plaintiff appears to be entitled to the relief demanded in the complaint.[30] Thus, there are two conditions for the issuance of a preliminary injunction: (1) a clear right to be protected exists prima facie and (2) the acts sought to be enjoined are violative of that right.[31] The issuance of a writ of preliminary injunction is addressed to the sound discretion of the court.[32]

We agree with the OCA that respondent had legal basis in issuing the writ in his March 27, 2000 resolution. It is true that complainants had in their favor a final and executory decision by the MTCC which had become immutable and unalterable.[33] However, one of the exceptions to the principle of immutability of final judgments is the existence of supervening events. Supervening events refer to facts which transpire or new circumstances which develop after the judgment acquires finality, rendering its execution unjust and inequitable.[34]

Respondent considered Ordinance No. 1772 as one such supervening event and we do not think he committed grave abuse of discretion in doing so. The ordinance did include lot no. 1029 as one of its socialized housing sites and indicated the association as potential beneficiaries for being occupants thereof.[35] The implementation of the demolition order would have resulted in the destruction of the structures on the lot built by the members of the association who may become entitled to the lot later on by virtue of the ordinance. An ordinance is presumed valid unless repealed or declared invalid by the courts.[36]

With the foregoing, we cannot say that respondent acted with bias, arbitrariness or prejudice in issuing the writ of preliminary injunction.

> Bias and partiality can never be presumed.... The Court has to be shown acts or conduct of the judge clearly indicative of arbitrariness or prejudice before the latter can be branded the stigma of being biased and partial. Similarly, bad faith or malice cannot be inferred simply because the judgment or order is adverse to a party.... There being absolutely no evidence to the contrary, the presumption that the respondent has regularly performed his duties will prevail.[37]

At worst, it was an error of judgment or a deficiency in prudence and discretion which may be corrected by proper recourse to available judicial remedies.[38] In fact, the CA, in its November 19, 2001 decision, set aside respondent's resolutions after complainants filed a petition questioning it.[39] However,

> [a]s a matter of public policy, not every error or mistake of a judge in the performance of his official duties renders him liable. In the absence of fraud, dishonesty or corruption, the acts of a judge in his official capacity do not always constitute misconduct although said acts may be erroneous.[40]

Respondent's issuance of a TRO in his February 26, 2002 order was a different matter. By this time, there was already a CA decision setting aside the injunctive writ that he had issued. Yet he persisted in issuing a TRO which had the same effect as the writ. This act was clearly an act in defiance of the CA decision. Respondent should have known his place in the judicial hierarchy:

> xxx. Inferior courts must be modest enough to consciously realize the position that they occupy in the interrelation and operation of the integrated judicial system of the nation. Occupying as he does a court much lower in rank than the Court of Appeals, respondent judge owes respect to the latter and should, of necessity, defer to the orders of the higher court. The appellate jurisdiction of a higher court would be rendered meaningless if a lower court may, with impunity, disregard and disobey it.[41]

This utter disrespect for the judgment of a higher court constituted grave abuse of authority.[42]

It appears that this was not respondent's first offense. As the OCA enumerated:

> In Joselito Rallos, et al. vs. Judge Ireneo Gako (A.M. No. RTJ-99-1484-A; 17 March 2000) respondent was held liable for failing to resolve the complainants' Motion to Remove the Administrator, for changing the date of a hearing without notifying the complainants and making it appear in his order that complainants and their counsel were present; and for retaliating against the stenographer who testified against him. For these infractions, he was fined in the amount of P10,000.00.
>
> In Ronaldo B. Zamora vs. Judge Ireneo Gako (RTJ 99-1484; 24 October 2000), respondent took cognizance of an injunction case the subject matter of which are articles seized by the Bureau of Customs and granted the application for issuance of a writ of injunction. He was held guilty of Gross Ignorance of the Law and suspended for three (3) months.[43]

In both cases, he was sternly warned that the commission of similar acts in the future would be dealt with more severely. We will take into consideration the fact that, including this case, we would have found respondent administratively liable three consecutive times.

Indifference or defiance to the orders or resolutions of higher tribunals may be punished with dismissal, suspension or fine as warranted by the circumstances.[44] The penalty of suspension recommended by OCA can no longer be imposed considering that respondent retired from the judiciary on September 20, 2006. Having previously warned him, we deem it fair and reasonable to impose on him a fine of P20,000 which is the maximum amount that a division can impose.[45]

Respondent's retirement from office did not render the present administrative case moot and academic. Neither does it free him from liability. Complainants filed the case on July 18, 2002, before respondent retired from office. As such, the Court retains the authority to pursue the administrative complaint against him. Cessation from office because of retirement does not warrant the dismissal of the administrative complaint filed against him while he was still in the service.[46] Hence, the imposed fine shall be deducted from the proceeds of his retirement benefits.

All members of the bench are enjoined to behave at all times as to promote public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.[47] Respondent's act of issuing a TRO in blatant defiance of a higher court's decision failed to live up to such high standards of judicial conduct.[48]

WHEREFORE, Judge Ireneo Lee Gako, Jr. of the Regional Trial Court of Cebu City, Branch 5, is hereby found

GUILTY of grave abuse of authority for defying a decision of a higher court. He is ordered to pay a FINE in the amount of Twenty Thousand Pesos (P20,000), to be deducted from his retirement benefits.

Let this resolution be attached to the personal files of respondent.

SO ORDERED.

Puno, C.J., (Chairperson), Sandoval-Gutierrez, Azcuna, and Garcia, JJ., concur.

[1] Dated February 28, 2002.

[2] Respondent Judge retired on September 20, 2006 per RTC Personnel Division, Office of Administrative Services of the OCA.

[3] With Transfer Certificate of Title No. 129306; rollo, p. 2.

[4] Docketed as Civil Case No. R-38130; id., p. 69.

[5] Id., p. 36.

[6] The first extension was for 90 days and a second one was for 30 days; id., p. 37.

[7] Entitled "An Act to Provide for a Comprehensive and Continuing Urban Development and Housing Program, Establish the Mechanism for its Implementation, and for other purposes"; id., pp. 53-54.

[8] Entitled "An Ordinance Authorizing the City Mayor of Cebu City to Institute Expropriation Proceedings against Mrs. Crispina vda. De Lagcao, Owner of Lot No. 1029 Located at Green Valley, Capitol Site, Cebu City, to Acquire the Same for Public Use or Purpose"; id., pp. 60-62.

[9] Docketed as Civil Case No. CEB-24141; id., p. 68.

[10] Id., p. 12.

[11] Id., p. 24.

[12] Id., p. 29.

[13] Docketed as CA-G.R. SP No. 59684 and penned by Associate Justice Godardo A. Jacinto (retired) and concurred in by Associate Justices Eloy R. Bello, Jr. (retired) and Josefina Guevara-Salonga of the Sixth Division of the Court of Appeals; id., pp. 36-42.

[14] On November 15, 2002; id., p. 78.

[15] Id., p. 45.

[16] Id., p. 43.

[17] Id., pp. 66-67. The association, in its amended complaint, alleged the following as supervening events:

> 21. On January 15, 2002, the Tallano Estate, represented by its Judicial Administrator, Prince Julian Morden Tallano, who was appointed by the then Court of First Instance of Branch 28, Pasay City, now Regional Trial Court, Branch 111, Pasay City, in Land Registration Case/Civil Case No. 3957-P, a case in rem, which declared the Tallano Estate as the owner of all the lands covered by Original Certificate of Title No. T-01-4, which embraces Lot 1029 subject-matter of this case, as affirmed, and confirmed by the Court of Land Registration in Land Registration Case No. 475, thru its Decree No. 297 on October 3, 1904 in favor of Prince Lacan Acuna Tagean Tallano and as affirmed by the Cadastral Court on March 14, 1914 approving Plan II-69

Bar review courses, mock exams and a study planner that keeps you on pace - batas.org

> of the entire archipelago in favor of his son, Prince Julian Macleod Tallano, SOLD said Lot 1029 for a valuable consideration to Green Pasture Homeowners Association, Inc., a domestic Association organized and registered in accordance with the laws of the Philippine, plaintiff herein, with post office address at Green Valley, Capitol Site, Cebu City, represented therein by its President, Justino M. Timagos, an original copy of which sale is hereto attached as Annex "I" of the original copy of this amended complaint, and plain copies thereof on the duplicate copies of this petition;
>
> 22. A xeroxed copy of the decision dated February 4, 1972 entry of judgment showing that said decision became final on April 4, 1972, writs of execution, oath of office as Judicial Administrator, letters of administration, orders, and certificate of Finality dated November 12, 2001 in said LRC/Civil Case No. 3957-P are complied as Annex "J" of this amended complaint; these legal documents and this case came to plaintiffs' knowledge only in November 2001.

[18] Id., p. 69.

[19] Id., p. 70. He stated in his Order:

> "The Presiding Judge has serious doubts on the [association's] claim that the lot in question belongs to the Tallano Estate and that the latter sold it to them. Thus, the Presiding Judge's opinion appears prejudicial to the [association's] theory, so his voluntary inhibition would serve the ends of justice."

[20] Id., p. 5.

[21] Id., p. 79.

[22] Id., p. 80.

[23] Rivera v. Mirasol, A.M. No. RTJ-04-1885, 14 July 2004, 434 SCRA 315, 320, citing Aurillo, Jr. v. Francisco, A.M. No. RTJ-93-1097, 12 August 1994, 235 SCRA 283, 289.

[24] Boiser v. Aguirre, Jr., A.M. No. RTJ-04-1886, 16 May 2005, 458 SCRA 430, 438.

[25] Id.

[26] Id., p. 439, citing Office of the Court Administrator v. Judge Lorenzo B. Veneracion, A.M. No. RTJ-99-1432, 21 June 2000, 334 SCRA 145.

[27] Spouses de Guzman v. Judge Pamintuan, 452 Phil. 963, 971 (2003).

[28] Philippine National Bank v. RJ Ventures Realty & Development Corporation, G.R. No. 164548, 27 September 2006, 503 SCRA 639, 658-659.

[29] Id.

[30] Metropolitan Manila Development Authority v. Trackworks Rail Transit Advertising, Vending and Promotions, Inc., G.R. No. 167514, 25 October 2005, 474 SCRA 331, 337.

[31] Id.

[32] Valley Trading Co., Inc. v. Court of First Instance of Isabela, Br. II, G.R. No. 49529, 31 March 1989, 171 SCRA 501, 507.

[33] Sacdalan v. Court of Appeals, G.R. No. 128967, 20 May 2004, 428 SCRA 586, 599.

[34] Natalia Realty, Inc. v. Court of Appeals, G.R. No. 126462, 12 November 2002, 391 SCRA 370, 387.

[35] Rollo, p. 56.

[36] Tuzon v. Court of Appeals, G.R. No. 90107, 21 August 1992, 212 SCRA 739, 747.

[37] Equitable PCI Bank, Inc. v. Laviña, A.M. No. RTJ-06-2001, 16 August 2006, 499 SCRA 8, citations omitted.

[38] Supra note 27.

[39] The relevant portion of the CA decision states:

> A clinical analysis of relevant facts on record leads the Court to the conclusion that [association's] right to the main relief demanded in their complaint is far from certain, and is in fact dubious, if absurd. As admitted by [the association], the MTCC judgment in Civil Case No. R-38130 had acquired final and executory character. It was then the ministerial duty of the trial court (MTCC) to issue a writ of execution in favor of [complainants], in respect of which it cannot be enjoined by the lower court (RTC). The only exception where execution of a final judgment may be refused or enjoined is when supervening events have occurred subsequent to the judgment which bring about a material change in the situation of the parties as would make such execution inequitable or no longer justified. Decisional law makes reference to them as cases of special and exceptional nature where execution may be suspended in the higher interest of justice. xxx
>
> It is our view that the passage by the [Sangguniang Panlungsod] of Cebu City on June 30, 1999 of City Ordinance No. 1772 which included Lot 1029 among the lots declared therein as socialized housing [site] does not constitute a supervening event that would justify nonexecution of the final and executory MTCC judgment. To be sure, there is no change whatsoever in the situation of the parties. The said ordinance did not divest petitioners of their ownership of the lot and neither did it vest ownership thereof in the City and much less, in herein [association] as occupants of the lot. Significantly, RA 7279 on the authority of which the ordinance was enacted and which authorizes local government units to identify lands for socialized housing and resettlement areas (Sec. 8), provides for various modes of acquisition of the properties involved, which include, among others, negotiated purchase and expropriation (Sec. 10). In the case at bar, there is no pretense on the part of [association] that steps to acquire Lot 1029 have been undertaken by the City Government of Cebu. In short, [complainants] are still owners in fee simple of subject lot and [the association members] have remained de facto occupants thereof, without any colorable, lawful or equitable right thereto. In fact, [they] have been declared by final judgment as mere squatters of the lot. [Complainants] are therefore correct in maintaining that [association members] who have been declared by final judgment as squatters of the lot have no clear right that merits the protection of the courts through a writ of preliminary injunction. A fortiori, [complainants'] act of seeking enforcement of a final judgment and that of the trial court in performing its ministerial duty to execute its final judgment cannot be characterized as violative of [the association's] right which has been shown to be inexistent.
>
> It is therefore abundantly clear to the Court that [the association's] right to the relief prayed for in their complaint is highly doubtful, for which reason, the lower court's grant of the assailed writ of preliminary injunction even in the absence of a clear legal right thereto constitutes grave abuse of discretion. (Rollo, pp. 39-41.)

[40] Universal Motors Corporation v. Rojas, Sr., A.M. No. RTJ-03-1814, 26 May 2005, 459 SCRA 14, 25.

[41] Villaflor v. Amatong, A.M. No. MTJ-00-1333, 12 November 2000, 344 SCRA 570, 580.

[42] Id., p. 582.

[43] Rollo, p. 75.

Respondent Judge has other pending administrative cases, to wit:

A.M. No. 07-5-18-SC Re: Report on the Inquiry on the Alleged Irregularity in the [RTC], Branch 5, Cebu City, Relative to Petitions for Voluntary Confinement and Rehabilitation of Drug Dependents. An inquiry was

conducted on the alleged irregularity in said court in connection with the petitions for voluntary confinement and rehabilitation of drug dependents. In a memorandum dated May 2, 2007, the OCA recommended, among others, that: 1) the matter be treated as an administrative complaint against respondent Judge and others; 2) the release of the retirement benefits of respondent Judge be held in abeyance until the resolution of this matter and 3) respondent Judge be required to explain why he favorably acted on the 518 petitions for voluntary confinement and rehabilitation of drug dependents from 1998 to 2006 over which his court has no jurisdiction and despite the absence of raffle.

In a report dated April 4, 2006 in A.M. OCA IPI No. 05-2207-RTJ (City of Cebu v. Judge Ireneo Lee Gako), the OCA recommended the suspension of respondent Judge for six months for grave misconduct as well as the imposition of a fine upon him in the amount of P11,000 for undue delay in deciding a case. In another report dated May 29, 2006, the OCA recommended the dismissal from the service and disbarment of respondent Judge for grave misconduct and knowingly rendering an unjust judgment.

[44] Sison v. Caoibes, Jr., A.M. No. RTJ-03-1771, 27 May 2004, 429 SCRA 258, 268, citations omitted; Lumapas v. Tamin, A.M. No. RTJ-99-1519, 26 June 2003, 405 SCRA 30, 38, citing Guerrero v. Deray, A.M. No. MTJ-02-1466, 10 December 2002, 393 SCRA 591.

[45] A.M. No. 99-12-08-SC.

[46] Supra note 23, at 321, citing Cabarloc v. Cabusora, A.M. No. MTJ-00-1256, 15 December 2000, 348 SCRA 217, 226.

[47] Supra note 40, citing Rivera v. Mirasol, supra.

[48] Incidentally, the Court en banc came up with resolution A.M. No. 02-9-02-SC "Re: Automatic Conversion of Some Administrative Cases Against Justices of the Court of Appeals and the Sandiganbayan; Judges of Regular and Special Courts; and Court Officials Who are Lawyers as Disciplinary Proceedings Against Them Both as Such Officials and as Members of the Philippine Bar." The resolution stated:

> Some administrative cases against Justices of the Court of Appeals and the Sandiganbayan; judges of regular and special courts; and the court officials who are lawyers are based on grounds which are likewise grounds for the disciplinary action of members of the Bar for violation of the Lawyer's Oath, the Code of Professional Responsibility, and the Canons of Professional Ethics, or for such other forms of breaches of conduct that have been traditionally recognized as grounds for the discipline of lawyers.
>
> In any of the foregoing instances, the administrative case shall also be considered a disciplinary action against the respondent justice, judge or court official concerned as a member of the Bar. The respondent may forthwith be required to comment on the complaint and show cause why he should not also be suspended, disbarred or otherwise disciplinary sanctioned as a member of the Bar. Judgment in both respects may be incorporated in one decision or resolution.

Under A.M. No. 02-9-02-SC dated September 17, 2002 which took effect on October 1, 2002, an administrative case against a court official who is a lawyer, based on grounds which are likewise grounds for the disciplinary action against members of the Bar, shall be considered as disciplinary proceedings against such official both as a court official and as a member of the Bar. (Maddela v. Dallong-Galicinao, A.C. No. 6491, 31 January 2005, 450 SCRA 19, 25) However, the complaint was filed before the OCA on July 18, 2002, or before the said resolution took effect. (Office of the Court Administrator v. Morante, A.M. No. P-02-1555, 16 April 2004, 428 SCRA 1, 36) Furthermore, the resolution provides that it shall apply to administrative cases already filed where the respondents have not yet been required to comment on the complaints. (Heck v. Santos, A.M. No. RTJ-01-1657, 23 February 2004, 423 SCRA 329, 341) Thus, it cannot be applied here since respondent Judge was required to submit his

Bar review courses, mock exams and a study planner that keeps you on pace - batas.org

comment on August 2, 2002. (Rollo, p. 47)

ABOUT BATAS.ORG

Study smarter at BATAS.org

The Philippine bar review and law-school companion built around how your brain actually remembers.

The complete Philippine law library - free for everyone.

More than 100,000 Supreme Court decisions, Republic Acts, and executive issuances - full-text searchable, browsable by category and year, and always free. No paywall, no login. This PDF came from it.

Audio case-brief lectures.

Any decision becomes a podcast-style lecture - facts, issues, ruling, and doctrine - with read-along highlighting and a hands-free presentation mode. Study while commuting, working out, or resting your eyes.

Bar review built on the science of memory.

Complete, sequenced courses for all eight bar subjects, narrated like podcasts and reinforced with retrieval practice and spaced review - the study techniques with the strongest evidence behind them.

The full law-school curriculum.

One subscription unlocks the entire J.D. curriculum - every subject, every lesson, with your progress tracked down to the paragraph so you can pick up exactly where you left off, on any device.

Mock exams that tell you where you stand.

Timed multiple-choice exams graded instantly, with per-subject score breakdowns and focus suggestions that point you at your weakest topics first.

A study planner that keeps you on pace.

Set your schedule and BATAS tells you every day whether you are on track for bar day - and exactly which lesson to take next.

Start free at https://batas.org

The law library is free forever - and your first lesson is one click away.

The text of this document is an official public record and remains in the public domain. Formatting, presentation, and compilation © 2026 batas.org.

Downloaded free from the batas.org Law Library. Share it freely - the library is free for every law student, bar reviewee, and practitioner.