

EDELSTAHL DRAINAGE SYSTEMS ASIA, INC. PETITIONER, VS. NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS COMMISSION AND GILBERT C. RAMOS, RESPONDENTS.

Ponente: COSICO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/2c4d9b002f3a/>

COSICO, J.:

This is a petition for certiorari under Rule 65 of the 1997 Rules of Civil Procedure which seeks to annul and set aside the Decision[1] dated July 22, 2005 issued by public respondent National Labor Relations Commission in NLRC NCR 09-07771-02 (CA No. 039490-04), the dispositive portion of which reads:

“WHEREFORE, Our Resolution dated November 20, 2004 is hereby, SET ASIDE and a new one entered ordering respondents to:

1. Immediately reinstate complainant to his position and to pay him full backwages computed from the time he was dismissed on September 17, 2002 up to the time he is actually reinstated and that should reinstatement be no longer possible, pay complainant separation pay computed at one (1) month pay for every year of service, a fraction of six (6) months to be considered as one (1) whole year; and
2. Pay complainant attorney’s fees equivalent to 10% of the total award.

“SO ORDERED.”

The aforequoted decision resolved herein private respondent Gilbert Ramos’ complaint for constructive dismissal and non-payment of wages and commission, with damages and attorney’s fees, against petitioner Edelstahl Drainage Systems Asia, Incorporated.

On June 2, 2006, herein petitioner Edelstahl Drainage Systems Asia, Inc. filed with this Court a motion to dismiss[2] on the basis of the compromise agreement entered into by and between the company and herein private respondent Gilbert Ramos on May 11, 2006. The motion states, among other matters, that through the efforts of mediator Jorge E. Garde, the parties executed a compromise agreement in connection with Civil Case No. 75015-PSG for infringement, which agreement expressly includes the settlement of the instant action and other related cases that they have filed against each other. The portions of the compromise agreement[3] pertinent to the instant suit are as follows –

“Parties agreed to settle the civil aspects of this case and of all criminal cases attached to this case after parties discussed their issues and found out that they just had misunderstanding which ended them into these cases filed and counter filed against each other.

“Parties agreed to settle this case with the following cases:

x x x

3. Labor Case filed by the Defendant against the Plaintiff with docket # NLRC 039490-04 which is currently at the Appellate Court branch _____

x x x

8. Both parties agreed to file desistance to the cases they have filed against each other simultaneously on June 1, 2006.”[4]

It appearing that the compromise agreement was voluntarily reached by the parties through the efforts of mediator Garde, and that the aforequoted stipulations in the agreement applicable to the instant suit are not contrary to law, morals, good customs, public order or public policy, the same is hereby approved.

WHEREFORE, judgment is hereby rendered in accordance with the aforequoted Compromise Agreement. Accordingly, the instant petition for certiorari is hereby DISMISSED.

SO ORDERED.

Sundiam, and Librea-Leagogo, JJ., concur.

[1] Id. at 63.

[2] Rollo, p. 127.

[3] Id. at 129.

[4] Id. at 120-131.

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.