

**SUPERBUILT CEMENT PRODUCTS AND ARTURO TONGSON,
PETITIONERS, VS. COURT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, DAGUPAN
UNITED LABOR UNION, ERNESTO RABANG, PEDRITO RABAS,
ELPIDIO ARZADON, DANIEL...**

G.R. Nos. L-39163-64. November 29, 1974

Ponente: FERNANDO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/3d2ba1e402c5/>

FERNANDO, J.:

Petitioners in this certiorari proceeding, filed on August 26, 1974, would have this Court set aside an order dated November 27, 1973[1], issued by the then Acting Presiding Judge Ansberto Paredes of respondent Court of Industrial Relations, denying their motion to dismiss a complaint against them filed by private respondents[2] on the ground that the matter involved therein, dealing with employer-employee relations, is, under Presidential Decree No. 21, within the original exclusive jurisdiction of the then National Labor Relations Commission. Moreover, there was a previous complaint of a similar nature actually filed, and still pending, with such body. The ground for denying such motion to dismiss was that, as the complaint sought reinstatement with back wages, the respondent court acted in accordance with law. The order now complained of likewise required petitioners to file their answer to such complaint within five days. There was a motion for reconsideration,[3] but it was denied in a resolution of July 16, 1974.[4] It was the view of Judge Paredes that as his previous order was interlocutory in character, an appeal to the respondent Court en banc was not allowable.

This Court, in a resolution of August 30, 1974, required respondents to comment. Such comments were duly forthcoming. As could have been expected, private respondents, in their pleading, did stress that the actuation of respondent Court was in accordance with law and established practice. The comments submitted by the counsel for respondent Court, dated September 12, 1974, Francisco M. delos Reyes, viewed the matter differently, and, it may be said, realistically. Thus: "While we feel that the issues raised in this petition do merit a determination by this Honorable Court, and on the part of respondent Court we maintain our jurisdiction based not only on the applicable provisions of law and on principles laid down by this Honorable Court in various cases, we feel that such issues shall become moot and academic by November 1, 1974. Pursuant to Presidential Decree No. 442, the present Court of Industrial Relations as constituted under existing laws shall be abolished on October 31, 1974. After such time, whatever jurisdiction the law has vested in it shall cease and its functions shall be transferred to the different labor relations machinery created by Presidential Decree 442 otherwise known as the Labor Code, particularly to a new National Labor Relations Commission. Because of these circumstances undersigned respectfully submits that considering the proximity of the effectivity of the Labor Code, the issues raised in this petition, if finally determined, shall become moot and academic." [5]

Such an observation elicits approval. As of November 1, 1974, Presidential Decree No. 442, The New Labor Code of the Philippines, came into force and effect. It is therein explicitly provided: "All cases pending before the Court of Industrial Relations and the National Labor Relations Commission established under Presidential Decree No. 21 at the time of the passage of this Code should be transferred to and processed by the National Labor

Relations Commission created under this Code in accordance with the procedure laid down herein."[6]

WHEREFORE, with the express abolition of respondent Court of Industrial Relations, and in accordance with the above express provision, this petition is dismissed for being moot and academic.

Barredo, Antonio, Fernandez, and Aquino, JJ., concur.

[1] Petition, Annex I.

[2] Private respondents are Dagupan United Labor Union, Ernesto Rabang, Pedrito Babas, Elpidio Arzadon, Daniel dela Cruz, Timoteo Aguin and Dominador Alagao; Maximo Rapin, Dionisio de Vera, Dominador Amit, Rudy Amongol, Demetrio Pacacnot, Roberto Roliojay, Roberto Amit, Cipriano Amongol, Lorenzo Raboy, Santos Amongol, Luis Regua and Ricardo Rondaris.

[3] Ibid, Annex "J".

[4] Ibid, Annex "K".

[5] Comment of September 11, 1974.

[6] Article 338 of the New Labor Code.

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.