

KAPISANAN NG MGA MANGGA-GAWA SA MANILA RAILROAD COMPANY CREDIT UNION, INC., PETITIONER-APPELLANT, VS. MANILA RAILROAD COMPANY, RESPONDENT-APPELLEE.

G.R. No. L-25316. February 28, 1979

Ponente: FERNANDO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/399ab278bdd2/>

FERNANDO, J.:

In this mandamus petition dismissed by the lower court, petitioner-appellant would seek a reversal of such decision relying on what it considered to be a right granted by Section 62 of Republic Act No. 2023, more specifically the first two paragraphs thereof: "* * * (1) A member of a co-operative may, notwithstanding the provisions of existing laws, execute an agreement in favor of the co-operative authorizing his employer to deduct from the salary or wages payable to him by the employer such amount as may be specified in the agreement and to pay the amount so deducted to the co-operative in satisfaction of any debt or other demand owing from the member to the co-operative. (2) Upon the execution of such agreement the employer shall, if so required by the co-operative by a request in writing and so long as such debt or other demand or any part of it remains unpaid, make the deduction in accordance with the agreement and remit forthwith the amount so deducted to the co-operative." [1]

To show that such reliance is futile, the appealed decision, as quoted in the brief for petitioner-appellant, stated the following: "The petitioner contends that under the above provisions of Rep. Act 2023, the loans granted by credit unions to its members enjoy first priority in the payroll collection from the respondent's employees' wages and salaries. As can be clearly seen, there is nothing in the provision of Rep. Act 2023 hereinabove quoted which provides that obligations of laborers and employees payable to credit unions shall enjoy first priority in the deduction from the employees' wages and salaries. The only effect of Rep. Act 2023 is to compel the employer to deduct from the salaries or wages payable to members of the employees' cooperative credit unions the employees' debts to the union and to pay the same to the credit union. In other words, if Rep. Act 2023 had not been enacted, the employer could not be compelled to act as the collecting agent of the employees' credit union for the employees' debt to his credit union but to contend that the debt of a member of the employees cooperative credit union as having first priority in the matter of deduction, is to write something into the law which does not appear therein. In other words, the mandatory character of Rep. Act 2023 is only to compel the employer to make the deduction of the employees' debt from the latter's salary and turn this over to the employees' credit union but this mandatory character does not convert the credit union's credit into a first priority credit. If the legislative intent in enacting pars. 1 and 2 of Sec. 62 of Rep. Act 2023 were to give first priority in the matter of payments to the obligations of employees in favor of their credit unions, then, the law would have so expressly declared. Thus, the express provisions of the New Civil Code, Arts. 2241, 2242 and 2244 show the legislative intent on preference of credits." [2]

Such an interpretation, as could be expected, found favor with the respondent-appellee, which, in its brief, succinctly pointed out "that there is nothing in said provision from which it could be implied that it gives top

priority to obligations of the nature of that payable to petitioner, and that, therefore, respondent company, in issuing the documents known as Exhibit '3' and Exhibit 'P', which establish the order of priority of payment out of the salaries of the employees of respondent-appellee, did not violate the above-quoted Section 62 of Republic Act 2023. In promulgating Exhibit '3', [and] Exhibit 'P', respondent, in effect, implemented the said provision of law." [3]

This petition being one for mandamus and the provision of law relied upon being clear on its face, it would appear that no favorable action can be taken on this appeal. We affirm.

1. The applicable provision of Republic Act No. 2023, quoted earlier, speaks for itself. There is no ambiguity. As thus worded, it was so applied. Petitioner-appellant cannot therefore raise any valid objection. For the lower court to view it otherwise would have been to alter the law. That cannot be done by the judiciary. That is a function that properly appertains to the legislative branch. As was pointed out in *Gonzaga v. Court of Appeals*: [4] "It has been repeated time and time again that where the statutory norm speaks unequivocally, there is nothing for the courts to do except to apply it. The law, leaving no doubt as to the scope of its operation, must be obeyed. Our decisions have consistently been to that effect." [5]

2. Clearly, then, mandamus does not lie. Petitioner-appellant was unable to show a clear legal right. The very law on which he would base his action fails to supply any basis for this petition. A more rigorous analysis would have prevented him from instituting a suit of this character. In *J. R. S. Business Corporation v. Montesa*, [6] this Court held: "Mandamus is the proper remedy if it could be shown that there was neglect on the part of a tribunal in the performance of an act, which specifically the law enjoins as a duty or an unlawful exclusion of a party from the use and enjoyment of a right to which he is entitled." [7] The opinion continued in this wise: "According to former Chief Justice Moran, 'only specific legal rights may be enforced by mandamus if they are clear and certain. If the legal rights of the petitioner are not well defined, clear, and certain, the petition must be dismissed. In support of the above view, *Viuda de Hijos de Crispulo Zamora v. Wright* was cited. As was there categorically stated: 'This court has held that it is fundamental that the duties to be enforced by mandamus must be those which are clear and enjoined by law or by reason of official station, and that petitioner must have a clear, legal right to the thing demanded and that it must be the legal duty of the defendant to perform the required act.' As expressed by the then Justice Recto in a subsequent opinion: 'It is well established that only specific legal rights are enforceable by mandamus, that the right sought to be enforced must be certain and clear, and that the writ not issue in cases where the right is doubtful.' To the same effect is the formulation of such doctrine by former Justice Barrera: 'Stated otherwise, the writ never issues in doubtful cases. It neither confers powers nor imposes duties. It is simply a command to exercise a power already possessed and to perform a duty already imposed.'" [8] So it has been since then. [9] The latest reported case, *Province of Pangasinan v. Reparations Commission*, [10] this Court speaking through Justice Concepcion Jr., reiterated such a well-settled doctrine: "It has also been held that it is essential to the issuance of the writ of mandamus that the plaintiff should have a clear legal right to the thing demanded, and it must be the imperative duty of the defendant to perform the act required. It never issues in doubtful cases." [11]

WHEREFORE, the appealed decision is affirmed. No pronouncement as to costs.

Barredo, Antonio, Concepcion, Jr., Santos, and Abad Santos, JJ., concur.
Aquino, J., did not take part.

[1] Section 62 of Republic Act No. 2023 (1957).

[2] Brief for the Petitioner-Appellant, 7-8.

[3] Brief for the Respondent-Appellee, 4-5.

[4] L-27455, June 28, 1973, 51 SCRA 381.

[5] Ibid, 385. The following cases were cited: *People v. Mapa*, L-22301, Aug. 30, 1967, 20 SCRA 1164; *Pacific Oxygen & Acetylene Co. v. Central Bank*, L-21881, March 1, 1968, 22 SCRA 917; *Dequito v. Lopez*, L-27757, March 28, 1968, 22 SCRA 1352; *Padilla v. City of Pasay*, L-24039, June 29, 1968, 23 SCRA 1349; *Garcia v. Vasquez*, L-26808, March 28, 1969, 27 SCRA 505; *La Perla Cigar and Cigarette Factory v. Capapas*, L-27948 & 28001-11, July 31, 1969, 28 SCRA 1085; *Mobil Oil Phil. Inc. v. Dio-cares*, L-26371, Sept. 30, 1969, 29 SCRA 656; *Luzon Surety Co., Inc. v. De Garcia*, L-25659, Oct. 31, 1969, 30 SCRA 111; *Vda. de Macabenta v. Davao Stevedore Ter-minal Co.*, L-27489, April 30, 1970, 32 SCRA 553; *Republic Flour Mills, Inc. v. Commissioner of Customs*, L-28463, May 31, 1971, 39 SCRA 269; *Maritime Co. of the Phil. v. Reparations Commission*, L-29203, July 26, 1971, 40 SCRA 70; *Allied Brokerage Corp. v. Commissioner of Customs* L-27641, Aug 31 1971, 40 SCRA 555.

[6] L-23783, April 25, 1968, 23 SCRA 190.

[7] Ibid, 197.

[8] Ibid, 197-198. The citation from former Chief Justice Moran is found in *Comments on the Rules of Court*, 1963 ed., at 172; the *Crispulo Zamora* decision is reported in 53 Phil. 613, 621 (1929); the citation from Justice Recto is found in *Sanson v. Barrios*, reported in 63 Phil. 198, 202 (1936); and that from Justice Barrera, from *Alzate v. Aldana*, in 118 Phil. 221, 225 (1963).

[9] Cf. *Valdez v. Gutierrez*, L-25819, May 22, 1968, 23 SCRA 661; *Lemi v. Valencia*, L-20768, Nov. 29, 1968, 26 SCRA 203; *Commissioner of Immigration v. Go Tieng*, L-22581, May 21, 1969, 28 SCRA 237; *Vda. de Serra v. Salas*, L-27150, Nov. 28, 1969, 30 SCRA 541; *Del Rosario v. Subido*, L-30091, Jan. 30, 1970, 31 SCRA 382; *Yuvienco v. Canonoy*, L-23352, June 30, 1971, 39 SCRA 597; *Enriquez Jr. v. Bidin*, L-29620, Oct. 12, 1972, 47 SCRA 183; *Orencia v. Enrile*, L-28997, Feb. 22, 1974, 55 SCRA 580; *Isada v. Bocar*, L-33535, Jan. 17, 1975, 62 SCRA 37; *Garcia v. Faculty Admission Committee*, L-40779, Nov. 28, 1975, 68 SCRA 277; *Ocampo v. Subido*, L-28344, Aug. 27, 1976, 72 SCRA 443.

[10] L-27448, November 29, 1977, 80 SCRA 376.

[11] Ibid, 380. *Gonzales v. Board of Pharmacy*, 20 Phil. 367, was cited.

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.