

PILLSBURY MINDANAO FLOUR MILLING COMPANY, INC., AND DONALD MORAZA, PETITIONERS, VS. FELIX MURILLO AND THE WORK-MEN'S COMPENSATION COMMISSION, RESPONDENTS.

G.R. No. L-32300. January 31, 1978

Ponente: TEEHANKEE, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/30bfe3ed727d/>

TEEHANKEE, J.:

The five workmen compensation cases at bar are jointly disposed of in this consolidated decision by virtue of established and controlling jurisprudence and principles that are decisive in the determination of the issues.

In L-32300, respondent commission upon review of the referee's award in favor of claimant-respondent Felix Murillo reaffirmed the same in substance (with modifications) and ordered petitioner-employer to pay P2,230.80 as disability compensation (for claimant's ailment of pulmonary emphysema and cor pulmonale, which caused his separation from work, brought about by repeated attacks of bronchial asthma contracted in the course of his employment as mechanic of petitioner), P615.00 as reimbursement for medical expenses, P284.58 as 10% attorney's fees and P34.00 for administrative fees. The commission found that petitioner failed to interpose a seasonable controversion and found that the ailments were contracted in the course of claimant's employment and were therefore by law presumed to be caused or aggravated by such employment.

In L-42824, respondent commission reversed the referee's award in favor of claimant-petitioner Dionisio R. Soriano granting him P6,000.00 as disability compensation (for claimant's ailment diagnosed as "rheumatoid arthritis, left and right knees and ankle joints, recurrent" as a result of which claimant stopped working and was optionally retired on November 30, 1973 after having served as public school teacher since October 18, 1945), P300.00 as 5% attorney's fees and P61.00-administrative fee. The referee found that claimant's disabling disease "was caused by the nature of his employment" but the commission reversed on the long-rejected theory that it was not shown that claimant's ailment "has a causal relation to the nature of his work."

In L-43211, (as in the preceding case L-42824) respondent commission reversed the referee's award in favor of claimant petitioner Pedro Hortizuela granting him P5,030.44 as disability compensation (for bronchial asthma; bronchiectasis, caused or aggravated by the presence of a great quantity of unavoidable chalk dust, as a result of which claimant obtained optional retirement after 24 years of service as a classroom teacher), P251.52 as 5% attorney's fees and P51.00 administrative fee. The commission reversed on the basis of its bare belief that "the equivalent of benefits obtained in cases of compulsory retirement was the reason for claimant's [optional] retirement from service."

In L-43872, respondent commission reversed the referee's award granting claimant-petitioner Aquilino R. Maico P2,803.60 as reimbursement of medical expenses (duly supported by receipts) for his ailment of psoriasis and P29.00-administrative fee. The commission reversed on the ground that there was no showing of disability although it is admitted that claimant went on sick leave during his period of confinement in the hospital. Claimant

further asserts non-controversion of his claim.

In L-44849 (as in L-42824 and L-43211), respondent commission reversed the referee's award in favor of claimant-petitioner Perpetua F. Yap granting her disability compensation of P6,000.00 (for her ailment of "hypertensive vascular disease and diabetes mellitus, chronic" which caused her collapse and loss of consciousness while conducting classes on October 22, 1973 and she was brought to the Cebu Medical Center and advised to stop working, whereafter she retired through optional retirement on February 8, 1974 at age 63 after having served as public school teacher since October 20, 1947), 5% attorney's fees of P300.00 and P61.00 administrative fee. The commission reversed on the vague ground that "there is no showing that claimant was ever confined in a hospital because of her alleged hypertension."

The Court affirms the commission's modified affirmance of the award in favor of claimant in L-32300 and sets aside the commission's reversal of the referees' awards in the four other cases (L-42824, L-43211, L-43872 and L-44849) on the basis of established and controlling jurisprudence on the presumption of compensability of disabling ailments or death that supervene during the course of employment.

As the Court said in sustaining the claim of compensability of death from bangungot (which resulted in massive myocardial infarction) in *Talip vs. Workmen's Compensation Commission*[1] "assuming that the deceased employee's illness which caused his death may be ruled out as an occupational disease or that the causal link between the nature of his employment and his ailment has been insufficiently shown, nevertheless it is to be presumed as mandated by section 44 of the Workmen's Compensation Act that the employee's illness which supervened during his employment, either arose out of, or at least was aggravated by, said employment; and with this legal presumption, the burden of proof shifts to the employer and the employee is relieved of the burden to show causation. Respondent employer has failed to discharge the burden of disproving the claim by substantial evidence and the Referee's Award must therefore be maintained. Contrary to the commission's gratuitous conclusion that the death was not compensable (for alleged want of a preliminary link between the deceased's work and his death contrary to the legal presumption), its very finding that the deceased had no history of cardiac ailments strengthens the presumption that his fatal heart attack during his employment was work-connected or aggravated and therefore compensable."

In L-32300, the commission correctly rejected therein petitioner-employer's insistence on its right to a hearing thus: "for an employer to assert his right to a hearing in compensation claim, he should first establish his right to controvert the right to the compensation of the party concerned within 14 days from the date of disability or within 10 days from knowledge of the accident or sickness. Records reveal that respondents' Employer's Report of Accident or Sickness dated October 12, 1966 wherein they first made known their intention to controvert was filed only on October 17, 1966; and that the illness which disabled the claimant on August 28, 1966 and because of which he was laid off from work by the respondents on November 1, 1966 was known to Engineer Celedonio Atanacio, maintenance superintendent of the respondents on August 29, 1966. Undoubtedly, the period from August 29, 1966 to the date of controversion on October 17, 1966 (when respondents' Employer's Report of Accident or Sickness was received in the Workmen's Compensation Unit, Regional Office No. XI, Cagayan de Oro City) is beyond the reglementary period of 10 or 14 days prescribed in the aforequoted Section 45 of the Act. That being so, and there being no evidence whatsoever that respondents filed a petition for reinstatement of their right to controvert, it becomes inevitable that they should be deemed to have renounced or waived their right to interpose any defenses under the Act and, consequently, to be heard in relation thereto." It has long been established since *Victorias Milling Co., Inc. vs. Compensation Commissioner*[2] in an unbroken line of cases that "having renounced by operation of law the right to contest the employee's right to compensation [by failure to file a timely controversion within the statutory period], the [employer] is deemed also to have waived the right to

interpose said defenses, and hence, there is nothing it can legally prove in relation thereto."

In the three cases involving the three public school teachers who optionally retired because of their disabling ailments (L-42824, L-43211 and L-44849), suffice it to state once again with reference to the commission's contention that such optional retirement was but a voluntary retirement that did not arise from disability, that as stressed by the Court in *Gomez vs. Workmen's Compensation Commission*[3] which is fully applicable to the said teachers-claimants, *mutatis mutandis*, "Pursuant to Memorandum Circular No. 133 issued by the Office of the President 'All optional applications for optional retirement under Commonwealth Act No. 180, as amended by Rep. Act No. 1616 and No. 4968, shall not be recommended for approval unless funds are available in the bureau or office concerned for the payment of applicant's retirement gratuity over and above the fund requirements of its programmed projects and activities and provided any of the following circumstances or conditions are present: (1) x x x; (2) The employee-applicant is below 65 years of age and is physically incapacitated to render further efficient service.' The fact that the application of petitioner for retirement at the age of 63 was duly approved by the Government Service Insurance System is a clear indication that at the time her application was approved she was below 65 years of age and she was physically incapacitated to render further efficient service."

In the case for reimbursement of medical expenses, (L- 43872) the factual finding that claimant was disabled by his ailment and confined at two hospitals at Tacloban City is duly supported by substantial evidence and cannot properly be raised herein. The medical expenses incurred by claimant are not disputed by respondent Bureau and the award for reimbursement thereof was therefore properly made and should be reinstated.

ACCORDINGLY, judgment is rendered in L-32300 affirming the commission's decision in favor of respondent-claimant Felix Murillo.

In L-42824, L-43211, L-43872 and L-44849, judgment is rendered setting aside the commission's reversals of the referees' awards and reinstating the awards or decisions of the referees in favor of the claimants Dionisio Soriano, Pedro Hortizuela, Aquilino R. Maico and Perpetua F. Yap respectively.

In L-42824, L-43211 and L-44849, furthermore, the award of 5% attorneys' fees is increased to 10%, i.e. P600.00, P503.04 and P600.00, respectively, as provided by the Workmen's Compensation Act and Rules, the cases having been elevated for review by this Court.

SO ORDERED.

Makasiar, Muñoz Palma, Fernandez, and Guerrero, JJ., concur.

[1] 71 SCRA 218, 220 (1976); emphasis furnished.

[2] 101 Phil. 1208 (1957); notes in brackets supplied.

[3] 75 SCRA 395, 399 (1977), per Martin, J.; emphasis supplied.

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.