

OCA CIRCULAR NO. 33-2004, February 27, 2004

OCA CIRCULAR NO. 33-2004, February 27, 2004

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/400673808e58/>

TO:

THE COURT OF APPEALS, SANDIGANBAYAN, COURT OF TAX APPEALS, REGIONAL TRIAL COURTS, SHARI' A DISTRICT COURTS, METROPOLITAN TRIAL COURTS, MUNICIPAL TRIAL COURTS IN CITIES, MUNICIPAL TRIAL COURTS, MUNICIPAL CIRCUIT TRIAL COURTS, SHARI' A CIRCUIT COURTS, THE OFFICE OF THE STATE PROSECUTOR, PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE AND THE INTEGRATED BAR OF THE PHILIPPINES

SUBJECT:

SUSPENSION FROM THE PRACTICE OF LAW FOR TWO (2); YEARS OF ATTY. EVANGELINE DE SILVA

For the information and guidance of all concerned, quoted hereunder is the Decision of the Court En Bane dated July 29, 2003 in Administrative Case No. 4838 entitled "Emilio Grande vs. Atty. Bvangeline De Silva", to wit:

"Complainant Emilio Grande was the private offended party in Criminal Cases Nos. 96-1346 to 96-1353, filed with the Regional Trial Court of Marikina City , Branch 273, for Estafa and Violation of Batas Pambansa Bilang 22, entitled 'People of the Philippines, Plaintiff versus Sergio Natividad, Accused.' During the proceedings, respondent Atty, Evangeline de Silva, counsel for the accused, tendered "to complainant Check No. 0023638 in the amount; P144,768.00, drawn against her account with the Philippine National Bank, as settlement of the civil aspect of the case against her client. Complainant refused to accept the check, but respondent assured him that the same will be paid upon its presentment to her drawee bank. She manifested that as a lawyer, she would not issue a check which is, not sufficiently funded. Thus, respondent was, prevailed upon by complainant to accept the check. Consequently, he desisted from participating as a complaining witness in the criminal case, which ;led to the dismissal of the same and the release of the accused, Sergio Natividad.

When, complainant deposited the check, the same was returned unpaid, by .the drawee bank for the reason: 'Account Closed,' On June 19,1997, .complainant wrote a letter to respondent demanding that she pay the face value of the check.[1] However, his demand was ignored by respondent; hence, he instituted a criminal complaint against her for Estafa and Violation of Batas Pambansa Bilang 22 with the Office 'of the City Prosecutor of Marikina, which was docketed as I.S. No. 97-1036. On September 22, 1997, the Marikina City Prosecutor filed the, necessary information for violation of Batas Pambansa Bilang 22 against respondent Atty. Evangelista de Silva.[2]

On November 10, 1997, complainant filed the instant administrative complaint for disbarment of respondent for deceit and . violation of the Lawyer's Oath.[3]

In a Resolution dated February 2, 1998 sent to respondent's given address at Carnelo Compound, Newton Avenue, Mayamot, Antipolo City, she was required to comment on the complaint witliin ten (10) days from notice.[4] However, it was returned unserved with the notation "Moved".[5] The Assistant National Secretary

of the IBP submitted the latest address of respondent as 274 M.H. Del Filar Street, PasigCity.[6]

On June 20, 2001, another resolution requiring respondent to comment on the administrative complaint filed against her was served at the aforesaid address. Tins was again returned unserved with the notation: "Refused", Thus,-the-case was referred to the IBP Commission on Bar Discipline (IBF-CBD) for investigation, report and recommendation.[7]

In a Report dated December 6, 2001, Investigating Commissiqner Florimoad C. Rous found respondent guilty of deceit, gross misconduct and violation of the Lawyer's Oath. Thus, he recommended that respondent be suspended torn .the practice of law for two (2) years.

On October-19, 2002, the IBP Board of Governors passed Resolution No. XV-2002-554 which adopted the recommendation of the Investigating Commissioner that respondent be suspended from the.practice of law for two (2) years.

We fully agree with the findings and recommendation of the IBP Board of Governors.

The record shows that respondent prevailed upon complainant to accept her personal 'check by.way of settlement for the civil liability, of .her client; Sergio Natividad, with the assurance that the check will, have sufficient fluids when presented for payment. In doing, so, she deceived complainant into, withdrawing his complaint against her orient in exchange for a check which she drew against a closed account.

It is clear that the breach of trust committed by respondent in issuing a bouncing check amounted to deceit and constituted a violation of her oath, for which she should be accordingly penalized,[8] Such an act constitutes gross misconduct and the penalties for such malfeasance is prescribed by Rule 138, Section 27 of the Rules of Court, to wit:

SEC. 27. Disbarment and suspension of attorneys by Supreme Court, grounds therefore. — A member of the bar may be disbarred or suspended from his office as attorney by the Supreme Court for any deceit, malpractice or ether gross misconduct in such office, grossly immoral conduct or by reason of his conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude, or for any violation of the oath which he is required to take before the admission to practice, or for a willful disobedience appearing as attorney for a party , without authority to do so.

The nature of the office of art attorney requires that a lawyer shall be a person of good moral character. Since this qualification is a condition precedent to a license to enter upon the practice of law, the maintenance thereof is equally essential during the continuance of the practice and the exercise of the privilege. Gross misconduct which puts the lawyer's moral character in serious doubt may render her unfit to continue hi the practice of law.[9]

The loss of moral character of ; a lawyer for any reason whatsoever; shall warrant her suspension or disbarment,[10] because it is important that members of the legal brotherhood must conform to the highest standard of moratilty.[11] Any wrongdoing which indicates moral unfitness for the profession, whether it be professional or, non-professional, justifies disciplinary action. Thus, a lawyer may be disciplined for evading payment of a debt validly incurred. Such conduct is unbecoming and does not speak well of a member of .the bar, for a; lawyer's professional and persona! conduct must at all times be kept beyond reproach and above suspicion.[12]

Moreover, the attitude of respondent .in deliberately refusing to accept the notices served on her betrays" a deplorably willful character, or disposition which stains the nobility of the legal profession.[13] Her conduct not only underscores her utter lack of respect-for-authority; it, also brings to. the fore a darker and more sinister character flaw in. her psyche, which renders highly questionable her. moral .fitness to continue in the .practice of law a defiance for law; and order which is at the very core of her profession.

Such defiance is anathema to those who seek a career in the administration of justice because obedience to the

dictates of the law and justice is demanded of every lawyer. How else would respondent even endeavor to serve justice and uphold the law when she disdains to follow even simple directives? Indeed, the first and foremost command of the Code of Professional Responsibility could not be any clearer:

CANON 1. A LAWYER SHALL UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION OBEY THE LAWS OF THE LAND AND PROMOTE RESPECT FOR LEGAL PROCESSES.

Needless to state, respondent's persistent refusal to comply with lawful orders directed at her with not even an explanation for doing so is contumacious conduct which merits no compassion. The duty of a lawyer is to uphold the integrity and dignity of the legal profession at all times. She can only do this by faithfully performing her duties to society, to the bar, to the courts and to her clients.[14] We can not tolerate any misconduct that tends to besmirch the fair aarae of ah honorable profession.

WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing, respondent A' EVANGELINE DE SILVA is SUSPENDED from the practice of law for a period of Two (2) Years, effective upon receipt hereof. Let copies of this Decision be entered in her record as attorney and be furnished the Integrated Bar of the Philippines and all courts in the country for their information and guidance.

SOORDERED."

In, a resolution dated 13 January 2004 in this administrative case, the Court Resolved to consider as SERVED the copy of the Decision of 29 July 2003 sent to respondent-.at her given address at 274 M.K. del Filar Street, 1600 Pasig City, under Registry No. 18378 which copy was returned unserved with the notation "RTS-moved" on the envelope.

__27__ February 2004.

PRESBITERO J. VELASCO, JR.

Court Administrator

[1] Rollo,p.4

[2] Id., pp. 5-6.

[3] Id., pp. 1-3.

[4] Id., p. 7.

[5] Id., p. 16.

[6] Id., p. 21.

[7] Id., p. 27.

[8] Cesar A Espiritu. Atty.; Juaa Cabredo IV, A.M. No. 5831, 13 January 2003 .

[9] Balinon v. De Leon, 94 Phil. 277 [1954].

[10] Royong v. Oblena, 117 Phil. 865 [1963]; In re De los Angeles, 106 Phil. 1 [1959]; Mortel v. Aspiras, 100 Phil. 586 [1956].

[11] Pangan v. Ramos, 194 Phil., 1 [1981].

[12] Constantino v. Saludages AM. No. 2029; 7 December 1993, 228 SCRA 233.

[13] Sencio v. Calvadores, A.M. No. 5841, 20 January 2003

[14] Reyes v. Javier, A. C. No. 5574, 2 February 2002.

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.