

ERRAND BOYS DELIVERY SERVICES, INC AND/OR JEFFREY PAUL JOAQUIN, PETITIONERS, VS. NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS COMMISSION (4TH DIVISION) AND REYNALDO R. LAZARTE, PATRICK MENESES, JAY...

Ponente: DIAMANTE, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/42d6d7dc79c8/>

DIAMANTE, J.:

For resolution is the herein petitioners' "Partial Motion For Reconsideration"[1] (to which a Comment[2] thereto was filed by the private respondents), praying for the partial reconsideration of Our May 9, 2014 Decision[3] (affirming with modification the National Labor Relations Commission's Decision), on grounds that this Court had committed serious and reversible error amounting to grave abuse of discretion when We: (1) failed to apply the appropriate jurisprudence on the instant case because it merely adopted the erroneous conclusions of public respondent; (2) denied the instant Petition without bothering to consider the documentary evidence on Record that would belie private respondents' claim of actual illegal dismissal; (3) deliberately failed to rule on the mathematical error of the computation of backwages awarded to private respondent De Guzman; and, (4) deliberately failed to discuss the assignment of error in the Petition relative to the monetary award supposedly for claims of illegal deduction.[4]

Contrary to the accusations thrown upon this Court by the petitioners, We perceive no conflict with Our pronouncements in affirming the National Labor Relations Commission's (NLRC) Decision which acted in complete accord with law and jurisprudence in deciding the present case. This Court firmly sticks to its stand (that the private respondents were illegally dismissed by the petitioners) as discussed in the now-assailed Decision. The same is more in harmony with prudence, logic, common sense and sound judgment. We have noticed that the reasons advanced by the petitioners against Our findings are mere rehash of those arguments already presented and which have been passed upon and resolved in the Decision sought to be reconsidered. This Court finds no compelling reasons to acquiesce to the whims and caprices of the petitioners and remains unshattered by their groundless defenses (that the private respondents were not illegally dismissed). Thusly, can now safely declare that this particular matter is now put to rest.

Likewise, this Court brushes aside the petitioners' challenge to the computation of monetary awards given by the Labor Arbiter (which was adopted by the NLRC and this Court) in favor of the private respondents. We are not unaware that it was specifically and clearly stated in the LA's Decision[5] that there was a detailed computation on the matter which was attached to its Decision and made the basis for the respective awards extended to the private respondents. Equally observed by this Court was the fact that the LA had fully explained and enumerated therein the foundations for the specific monetary awards given individually to the private respondents.[6] Verily, We find no reason not to adhere to such findings considering that the LA's conclusions were supported by law and jurisprudence. Besides, it is well-settled in jurisprudence that factual findings of administrative or quasi-judicial bodies, which are deemed to have acquired expertise in matters within their respective jurisdictions, are generally accorded not only respect but even finality, and bind this Court when supported by substantial evidence.[7]

WHEREFORE, the present Partial Motion for Reconsideration is hereby DENIED for lack of merit.

SO ORDERED.

[*] [**]Peralta, Jr., and Sadang, JJ., concur.

[***] Also spelled as "Estiamba" and "Estambia" in other pleadings in the Record

[*] Justice Jane Aurora C. Lantion Vice Justice Librea-Leagogo, C. per Office Order No. 160-14-AGT dated April 24, 2014

[**] Justice Eduardo B. Peralta, Jr. Vice Justice Jane Aurora C. Lantion per Office Order No. 182-14-ABR dated May 05, 2014

[1] Rollo, pages 810-822

[2] Id. at 842-850

[3] Id. at 799-807

[4] Motion For Partial Reconsideration, pages 2-3; Rollo, pages 812-813

[5] Labor Arbiter's Decision, page 17; Rollo, page 318

[6] Id. at 17-25; Id. at 318-326

[7] G & M (Phils.), Inc. v. Cruz, 496 Phil. 119

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.