

**DAVID T. GADIT, COMPLAINANT, VS. ATTYS. JOSE C. FELICIANO, SR.,
JEROME V. PARAS & DONATO M. GUEVARA, RESPONDENTS.**

Adm. Case No. 1222. February 27, 1976

Ponente: BARREDO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/3cb512448379/>

BARREDO, J.:

Complaint for disbarment against respondents Attys. Jose C. Feliciano, Sr., Jerome V. Paras and Donato M. Guevara for alleged deceitful and irregular actuations in connection with an ejectment case filed by respondent Paras in behalf of his co-respondent Feliciano with the other respondent Hon. Donato Guevara, judge of the City Court of Manila.

The complaint is a sequel of a judgment by default rendered by Judge Guevara against complainant ordering him to vacate the premises of respondent Feliciano. Allegedly, complainant was not served with summons because respondents Feliciano and Paras gave the wrong address in the complaint. It is also charged that the complaint for ejectment filed by respondent Paras was not verified, and in spite of said defect, Judge Guevara gave due course thereto. Thirdly, it is claimed that respondent Paras had taken P600 cash from the drawer of complainant in the course of or during the execution of the judgment complained of. Respondents denied all the charges in their answer.

The report, dated December 29, 1975, of the Solicitor General to whom the case has been referred for investigation is limited to the original complaint filed by petitioner Gadit whose supplemental complaint which relates to respondent Paras alone and wherein the acts complained of are different will be the subject of a subsequent report as soon as the investigation thereof is completed.

After a review of the record, We find the recommendation of the Solicitor General that this case be dismissed to be in order. It is clear from the evidence that there was no improper, much less deceitful, intention in Atty. Paras and Atty. Feliciano's indicating in the complaint the address of complainant to be 2248-A San Anton, Sampaloc, instead of 2248 in the same street, for in fact the service of summons and the decision was made in the place of residence of said defendant to persons not denied to be living with him.

Anent the alleged irregularity that the complaint of Atty. Feliciano for ejectment against petitioner and pre-pared and filed with Judge Guevara was not verified in violation of Section 1 of Rule 70, it can be said that respondent Paras should have been more careful in the preparation of his pleading; but since it does not appear that complainant was substantially prejudiced thereby, the facts alleged in the complaint having been duly proven at the trial ex-parte after the defendant was declared in default and it is not claimed that those facts are materially false, such defect was merely formal – it did not affect the validity and efficiency of the pleading, much less the jurisdiction of the court, (*Oshita vs. Republic*, 19 SCRA 700, 702-4) and should be raised in the proceeding itself, not in the appellate court or in an administrative complaint for the first time, (*Phil. Mfg. Co. and Gov't. vs. Cabangis*, 49 Phil. 107, 112-113) there is no ground for taking any disciplinary action against any of herein respondents.

The Solicitor General has found that the charge of unauthorized taking of P600 levelled against Atty. Paras has not been proven. We agree with this finding.

In view of all the foregoing, this case is dismissed. No prima facie case having been shown against Judge Guevara, there is no need to refer his case for investigation by any other official.

Fernando (Chairman), Antonio, Aquino, and Concepcion, Jr., JJ., concur.

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.