

**ELIZABETH D. GADONG, PETITIONER, VS. JOSEPHINE BUTLIG,
COURT STENOGRAPHER I, MUNICIPAL CIRCUIT TRIAL
COURT-MARGOSATUBIG, ZAMBOANGA DEL SUR, RESPONDENT.**

A.M. No. P-19-4020 [Formerly OCA I.P.I. No. 03-1824-P]. November 28, 2019

Ponente: LAZARO-JAVIER, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/5380e32c6131/>

LAZARO-JAVIER, J.:

Respondent Josephine Butlig, Court Stenographer I, Municipal Circuit Trial Court, Margosatubig, Zamboanga del Sur, is charged with immorality for allegedly engaging in an illicit relation with Leopoldo Gadong, husband of complainant Elizabeth Gadong.

In her Sworn-Complaint[1] dated November 14, 2003 filed before this Court, Elizabeth alleged that on April 22, 2002, around 4 o'clock in the afternoon, her husband Leopoldo arrived home from a weeklong vacation in Iloilo City. He left his cellphone on top of the living room table before going to sleep. Elizabeth's sister Rosamie picked up the cellphone to play a game, but immediately handed it to Elizabeth when she discovered love messages from "Joy," Josephine's nickname.[2]

Elizabeth confronted Leopoldo who could not explain the text messages. She then called Josephine about the issue, but the latter denied sending love messages to Leopoldo. Josephine claimed that someone had borrowed her cellphone and used it to send them. Unconvinced, Elizabeth invited Josephine to meet her at the plaza.[3]

There, around 7 o'clock in the evening, she showed Josephine the text messages. The latter again denied sending them to Leopoldo and said she had been using the phone of her sister-in-law Edida Butlig. Shortly after, Leopoldo arrived. Elizabeth confronted both of them, but the two (2) strongly denied having an affair.[4]

On May 22, 2002, Elizabeth went to the Government Service Insurance System - Pagadian City Branch to follow-up her loan. She looked outside from the third floor of the building and was surprised to see their family van parked near the stairs of Plaza Luz. She also saw a woman wearing a dark blue uniform follow her husband inside the van. She immediately went down the building to follow them but was unable to reach the van on time. Thus, she boarded a tricycle and instructed the driver to follow the van.[5]

When the van parked near Hiker's Palace, Elizabeth told the tricycle driver to stop in front of the building. She then started hitting the side mirror of the van, forcing Leopoldo to open the door. She saw Josephine seated beside her husband. Josephine tried to get out of the vehicle but Leopoldo told her to stay inside. When Elizabeth confronted them, Josephine told her that she rented the van for Php200.00 because she had to go to the Provincial Jail. Later, Josephine changed her alibi and said they were on their way to Macasing to settle the reckless imprudence case that one of her relatives filed against Leopoldo.[6]

On April 3, 2003, Elizabeth called Edida to arrange a meeting at the Cathedral. There, Elizabeth told Edida that Leopoldo and Josephine were having an affair. Edida replied that she, too, was growing suspicious because she has seen Leopoldo go into Josephine's house twice.[7]

On October 28, 2003, around 2 o'clock in the afternoon, somebody informed Elizabeth that Leopoldo and Josephine were together in an apartment unit below the Arro Calibration Center in Pagadian City. Immediately, she and her daughter Ma. Eleosa went to the said place. She knocked on the door and was greeted by Leopoldo. From the doorway, she saw Josephine at the corner of the room, naked and holding her bag to cover her breasts. She rushed inside and pulled Josephine's hair, while Ma. Eleosa took pictures. Josephine, however, grabbed the camera and destroyed it. Leopoldo intervened and told Josephine to wait in the comfort room. Meanwhile, Elizabeth instructed her daughter to call the police.[8]

A few minutes later, policemen arrived and brought Leopoldo and Josephine to the police station. There, Josephine, on bent knees, promised to end her affair with Leopoldo.[9]

In her Comment[10] dated February 12, 2004, Josephine denied the charge. She stated that she came to know Leopoldo sometime in 2001 due to a vehicular accident which involved him and a relative of hers. Leopoldo sought her assistance to reach a settlement. From then on, Leopoldo would frequent the court to see her, to the extent of following her around like an "asong ulol." [11]

Although Leopoldo was persistent in courting her, her conscience dictated that she be faithful to her marital vows. This was known to her co-employees to whom she confided in about her situation. At times, she would even ask them to keep her company to discourage Leopoldo from stalking her. On several occasions, she even reported Leopoldo's stalking to the police station at Margosatubig, Zamboanga del Sur.[12] She denied ever sending love messages to Leopoldo.[13]

As for the October 28, 2003 incident, Elizabeth lied when she claimed she caught her and Leopoldo in a compromising situation. What truly happened was Leopoldo forcibly took her handbag containing her money and cellphone and deceived her into following him to an apartment unit below the Arro Calibration Center. Inside the apartment unit, Leopoldo made sexual advances on her but she resisted. Leopoldo nevertheless succeeded in tearing the blouse she was wearing. A few minutes later, Elizabeth and Ma. Eleosa arrived and mauled her.[14]

Because of what happened, she filed criminal cases before the City Prosecutor's Office of Pagadian City for robbery against Leopoldo, and for physical injuries and slander against Elizabeth and Ma. Eleosa. The present administrative complaint is Elizabeth's way of pressuring her to withdraw these criminal cases.[15]

In her Reply dated March 24, 2005, Elizabeth maintained that everything she said about respondent was true and that her husband even admitted his illicit affair with respondent.[16]

Josephine was merely using the criminal charges against her and her family as leverage to force her to withdraw the administrative complaint. Further, Josephine's alleged fidelity to her marital vows should not be believed because she had been separated from her husband for years and was reputed in the locality for indulging in dalliances with different men.[17]

Due to the conflicting allegations of the parties, the case was referred to the Executive Judge of the Regional Trial Court for Pagadian City, Zamboanga del Sur for investigation.[18]

First Investigation

During the course of the investigation, Elizabeth testified on the allegations in her Sworn-Complaint.[19] On the other hand, Ma. Eleosa corroborated Elizabeth's allegations regarding the October 28, 2003 incident.[20]

Leopoldo himself also testified. He stated that while driving their family van one day, he met an accident which led to the filing of a case against him for reckless imprudence resulting to homicide. Josephine helped him reach a settlement for the case. Later, he courted her and they entered into a relationship in 2001. From then on, he would

fetch Josephine from work to bring her home.[21]

On October 28, 2003, he and Josephine had a misunderstanding. He noticed that her cellphone was constantly ringing so he grabbed it. He chanced upon some text messages from another man which made him jealous. He then went ahead to the Arro Calibration Center with her phone and handbag to force her to follow him there. They finished their argument in the room he rented. To simmer down his temper, Josephine undressed. Suddenly, someone knocked on the door. When he opened it, his wife and daughter barged in. They saw Josephine naked, frantically trying to cover herself. A quarrel ensued.[22]

For her part, Josephine reiterated the defenses she raised in her Comment.[23] Her co-employees Rizalina Imbing, Jocelyn Palo and Victoria Bayawa testified that Leopoldo had been following Josephine wherever she went. He would even wait for hours in their office just to find an opportunity to accompany her home. Whenever Leopoldo was not able to chance upon Josephine at the courthouse, he would mess up her things on her table, without her consent and unmindful of other people inside the office.[24]

SPO4 Matias Cinco also testified for respondent. He stated that Josephine went to the police station at Margosatubig, Zamboanga del Sur, crying because Leopoldo kept on following her. She was feeling harassed so she sought help from the police. He had no knowledge of any relationship between Josephine and Leopoldo until the latter himself told him about it. He warned Leopoldo to stop harassing Josephine.[25]

First Report and Recommendation

In his Report on the Investigation with the Corresponding Recommendation[26] dated May 10, 2005, Executive Judge Harun B. Ismael submitted the following findings and recommendations:

a.

Elizabeth's accusation that Leopoldo and Josephine were having an illicit affair was not proven by hard evidence;[27]

b.

The October 28, 2003 incident at Arro Calibration Center should be regarded as a natural reaction of a person engrossed with jealousy;[28]

c.

Josephine was a victim of circumstances; she was merely duped by Leopoldo to follow him to the Arro Calibration Center to redeem her handbag and cellphone;[29] and

d.

Although the immorality charge against Josephine should be dismissed for lack of concrete evidence, a reprimand and a fine of five hundred pesos (Php500.00) should nevertheless be imposed against her for committing a disgraceful act.[30]

In a Memorandum dated November 16, 2005,[31] the Office of the Court Administrator (OCA) disagreed with these findings and recommended a reinvestigation. It noted that Judge Ismael dismissed the October 28, 2003 confrontation without delving deeper into the following issues:[32]

a.

Josephine did not seek help from nor report to the police the alleged snatching by Leopoldo of her cellphone and handbag;

b.

Despite Leopoldo's alleged sexual advances on Josephine on October 28, 2003, Josephine charged Leopoldo with robbery only, sans attempted rape, acts of lasciviousness, or forcible abduction;

c.

Judge Ismael failed to exert earnest efforts to compel the attendance of the wife and son of the apartment owner who were present during the October 28, 2003 incident to provide an unbiased version of the facts and accurately shed light on the incident;

d.

In one of her affidavits, Josephine admitted that the reckless imprudence case against Leopoldo was already settled in 2001. But during the investigation, witnesses testified that the two (2) were still seen together in 2002 and 2003; and

e.

Judge Ismael failed to reconcile his recommendation with his findings. He recommended the dismissal of the complaint for lack of concrete evidence and that respondent be absolved from the charges, yet recommended that respondent be reprimanded and be fined Php500.00 for committing a disgraceful act. He failed to specify which act of respondent he found disgraceful.

Following the recommendation of the OCA, the Court issued a Resolution dated January 25, 2006 remanding the case to Judge Ismael for further investigation. But in view of Judge Ismael's retirement on June 6, 2006, the case was referred to the new Executive Judge, Rolando L. Goan.[33]

Second Investigation

On February 5, 2015, during the second round of investigation, Elizabeth, Leopoldo, and Ma. Eleosa took the witness stand once again to identify their Judicial Affidavits.[34] But in a surprising turn of events, Elizabeth's position shifted. She portrayed herself as a jealous wife who mistakenly thought her husband Leopoldo was having an affair with Josephine.

Elizabeth's Judicial Affidavit was replete with recantations. On the alleged amorous text messages from Josephine which were stored in Leopoldo's cellphone, Elizabeth testified:

Q: Why did you file that Administrative Complaint against her?

A:

I filed the Administrative case against the respondent because I got jealous with my husband when my sister Rosamie C. Dacalos referred to me the text messages from the cellphone of my husband which I mistakenly

thought were amorous text messages coming from respondent.

Q: Why did you get jealous after reading those text messages?

A:

Being a wife and a mother, I naturally felt jealous as I thought then that my husband had betrayed me and our daughter. It was only later that I learned that indeed my husband and respondent were texting each other but the sole reason was due to the case filed against my husband for Reckless Imprudence Resulting to Homicide wherein the victim happened to be the relative of the respondent.

xxxx

Q:

You mean to say that only because they were texting each other that you got jealous and immediately concluded that they were having an illicit affair despite the fact that respondent was only trying to help your husband in that case wherein the victim was the relative of the respondent?

A: Yes, sir.[35]

On the May 24, 2002 incident:

Q: What happened when you were there?

A:

xxx I later on saw my husband enter the driver's side of the van and he was followed by a woman who entered the passenger side.

Q: What did you feel when you saw this?

A:

I again felt so jealous. I likewise felt exhilarated as I thought I now have proof that my husband is indeed philandering with another woman.

xxxx

Q:

Did you observe anything unusual between respondent and your husband while they were seated inside the van?

A:

None Sir. They were actually seated in such a way that respondent was a paying passenger to the driver, who was then my husband.

Q: But what did you feel when you saw them inside the van?

A:

Although it is not unusual for me to see my husband ferrying women-passengers who are seated on the front seat of our van, at that time I was consumed by jealousy and I felt enraged.[36]

Finally, on the October 28, 2003 incident at the Arro Calibration Center:

Q: Okay on October 28, 2003, do you remember where you were?

A: Yes, sir.

Q:

I and my daughter, Maria Eleosa Faith was informed by some friends that the bag of a certain girl was taken by my husband. I was very surprised about it. Later on, I learned that this girl is actually the respondent, Josephine Butlig. I also learned that since there was an important personal belongings inside the bag, she chased my husband until such time that they reached Arro Calibration Center.

Q: Was there something that happened?

A:

I heard from the surrounding that they have an arguments there when we reached there Josephine Butlig crying because of her bag that my husband refused to return.

Q:

Was the bag retrieved by Josephine Butlig from the possession of your husband?

A: Yes sir upon our arrival he turned over the bag.

Q: What happened next?

A: As a wife, I got angry to my husband and to the respondent.

Q: What is the action if any by Josephine Butlig against your husband?

A:

She got angry also but during that time it is my honest belief that they have an illicit relation as a consequence thereof all these incidents was due to the instant of my husband.

Q:

Were there other occasions wherein you saw them meeting each other to confirm your suspicion that they were having illicit relations?

A: None, sir. I only saw them in those instances I mentioned earlier.

Q:

In all those occasions you have stated, can you prove that they have really an illicit relationship?

A:

I really cannot confirm it, sir. This time sir I now realize that I got mistaken with my allegations because I was only enraged and blinded by my jealousy as a wife.[37]

Leopoldo and Ma. Eleosa corroborated this new narrative.[38]

Meanwhile, Josephine maintained her defense of denial which was corroborated by her witness Gerardo Dumaldal.[39]

Second Report and Recommendation

In his Report[40] dated March 3, 2015, Judge Goan recommended that Josephine be absolved of liability[41] since Elizabeth herself and her witnesses recanted their testimonies.[42] Judge Goan even noticed that the parties treated each other with politeness, bordering on friendship.[43] As Elizabeth admitted, she was merely enraged and blinded by jealousy when she filed her Sworn-Complaint. She mistakenly believed that Leopoldo and Josephine were having an affair.[44]

Even without the recantation of Elizabeth and her witnesses, the complaint would still have failed because their testimonies were self-serving. It was simply a case of a family which stood united against Josephine to protect Leopoldo from the criminal case she had filed against him.[45]

Too, there was no proof that Josephine had been living immorally to the extent of dragging down the image of the Judiciary. On the contrary, Josephine's co-workers never complained about her conduct and even testified in her favor. In the absence of proof that Josephine engaged in immoral conduct, Judge Goan recommended that the administrative complaint be dismissed.[46]

Memorandum of the OCA

In its Memorandum dated November 4, 2015,[47] the OCA recommended:

1.

The instant administrative case be re-docketed as a regular administrative matter;

2.

The charge of immorality against respondent Court Stenographer Josephine M. Butlig, Municipal Circuit Trial Court, Margosatubig, Zamboanga del Sur, be DISMISSED for insufficiency of evidence; and

3.

Respondent Josephine M. Butlig be found GUILTY of conduct unbecoming a public employee for her indecorous and scandalous involvement in an incident that occurred on 28 October 2003 outside the court but during office hours and be FINED in the amount of Ten Thousand Pesos (Php 10,000.00), and

ADMONISHED to be more circumspect in her personal affairs, with a STERN WARNING that the repetition of any similar act will merit a more severe sanction.[48]

It agreed with Judge Goan that the charge of immorality must be dismissed because of Elizabeth, Leopoldo, and Ma. Eleosa's recantation. It found no substantial evidence that Josephine entered into an immoral sexual relation with Leopoldo.[49]

The OCA, nevertheless, opined that Josephine should not be completely exonerated from disciplinary action. For records revealed that the October 28, 2003 incident had indeed transpired. On that Tuesday, around 2 o'clock in the afternoon, during office hours, Josephine voluntarily followed Leopoldo to an apartment below the Arro Calibration Center in Pagadian City and was later found without her blouse in a room with Leopoldo. Elizabeth and Ma. Eleosa arrived and quarreled with Josephine. A few minutes later, policemen also arrived at the scene. The parties were brought to the police station and the incident was blotted.[50]

Josephine's disgraceful involvement in the incident tainted the image of the Judiciary and constituted conduct unbecoming of a public employee. Thus, the OCA recommended that she be fined in the amount of Php10,000.00 and admonished to behave with decorum and circumspection even in the conduct of her personal affairs.[51]

Threshold Issue

May respondent be sanctioned for immorality despite the recantation of complainant and her witnesses?

Ruling

We answer in the affirmative.

Court personnel must be free from any whiff of impropriety, not only with respect to their duties in the judicial branch but also to their behavior outside the court as private individuals. There is no dichotomy of morality; a court employee is also judged by his or her private morals. These exacting standards of morality and decency have been strictly adhered to and laid down by the Court to those in the service of the judiciary.[52]

Here, Elizabeth's Sworn-Complaint essentially alleged that Josephine had maintained an affair with her husband Leopoldo. Indubitably, such charge, if proven, constitutes immorality that warrant disciplinary action. Thus, in *Banaag v. Espeleta*,^[53] respondent court interpreter therein was found guilty of immorality for engaging in an amorous relationship with a married man. Similarly, in *Sealana-Abbu v. Laurenciana-Hurafio*,^[54] the Court suspended two (2) court stenographers who were engaged in an illicit relationship.

The required quantum of proof to sustain a finding of guilt in administrative disciplinary proceedings is substantial evidence or such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion.^[55] Here, the Court finds that evidence on record satisfies this requirement despite the recantation of complainant Elizabeth and her witnesses.

Mere desistance or recantation by the complainant does not necessarily result in the dismissal of an administrative complaint against any member or employee of the Judiciary. Administrative actions cannot depend on the will or pleasure of the complainant who may, for reasons of his or her own, condone what may be detestable under our Code of Conduct and most especially our laws. Otherwise, the efforts of this Court in improving the delivery of justice would be put to naught by private arrangements between parties to disciplinary proceedings.^[56]

A recantation, like any other testimony, is subject to the test of credibility. Although findings on credibility of witnesses are generally entitled to great weight, the Court will not shy away from re-examining such findings when cogent reasons call for it,^[57] as here.

A perusal of Elizabeth's Judicial Affidavit allows us to filter with ease which narrations were sincere and which were concocted:

First. Elizabeth claimed that the text messages from Josephine which she read on Leopoldo's cellphone were not amorous at all; Leopoldo and Josephine were merely arranging a settlement for the reckless imprudence case that Josephine's relatives filed against Leopoldo. There would have been a world of a difference, however, between the tenor of an amorous text message and an assistance for settlement. So much so that the Court is not convinced that Elizabeth would have mistaken one for the other.

Second. Elizabeth claimed that the exchange of text messages between Leopoldo and Josephine and their subsequent meet-up on May 24, 2002 were actually for purposes of settling the reckless imprudence case against Leopoldo. The Court finds this hard to believe since Josephine herself admitted the case was already settled as early as 2001.[58]

Finally. Elizabeth testified that she misinterpreted the incident at the Arro Calibration Center; Josephine was merely duped into following Leopoldo into the apartment and the two (2) were not having an affair. But between her allegations in her Sworn-Complaint dated November 14, 2003 and her initial testimony on the one hand, and those in her Judicial Affidavit on the other, the former deserves more weight and credit. Not only was Elizabeth's recantation done twelve (12) years after the alleged incident making it doubtful, her Sworn-Complaint and her earlier testimony conform with human nature and experience.

The Court, therefore, rejects Elizabeth's recantation and finds the allegations in her Sworn-Complaint dated November 14, 2003, as supported by her testimony and those of her witnesses during the first investigation, more credible.

But even if the Court disregards the testimony of Elizabeth, the admissions of Leopoldo and Josephine are independently sufficient to establish Josephine's guilt.

During the initial investigation, Leopoldo admitted to courting Josephine after the latter helped him reach a settlement for the reckless imprudence case against him. According to Leopoldo, they started their relationship in 2001 and from then on, he would fetch Josephine from work and brought her home.

On October 28, 2003, he and Josephine had a misunderstanding. He noticed that her cellphone was constantly ringing and he got jealous when he chanced upon some text messages thereon from another man. He then went ahead to the Arro Calibration Center with Josephine's phone and handbag to force her to follow him there. They finished their argument in the room he rented. Then, to simmer down his temper, Josephine undressed. Suddenly, someone came knocking at the door. When he opened it, his wife and daughter barged in. They saw Josephine naked and frantically trying to cover herself. A quarrel instantly followed.[59]

Josephine did not deny being in contact with Leopoldo, albeit they were merely trying to reach a settlement for a reckless imprudence case against the latter. And while Josephine admitted that Leopoldo had been courting her, she denied having ever entered into an illicit relationship with him.

As for the October 28, 2003 incident, she essentially admitted that when Leopoldo opened the door to the room, Elizabeth and Ma. Eleosa saw her without a blouse. She countered, though, that she merely wanted to recover her handbag and cellphone from Leopoldo but got duped into following Leopoldo inside the apartment in the process.

We are not convinced.

To begin with, evidence to be believed must not only proceed from the mouth of a credible witness but must be credible in itself, such as the common experience and observation of mankind can approve as probable under the

circumstances.[60]

Here, Josephine's claim that she had been texting Leopoldo to help the latter reach a settlement for a reckless imprudence case deserves scant consideration. For Josephine herself admitted that said case had already been settled as early as 2001.[61] Yet, as Elizabeth discovered, the two (2) remained in contact and had in fact been meeting up in 2002 and 2003. Josephine was lying through her teeth on May 22, 2002 when she told Elizabeth that they were on their way to see her relatives in Macasing for the settlement. If it were true, Josephine had no reason to lie about renting the van for Php200.00 to go to the provincial jail.

More, it is indeed quite peculiar, if not contrary to common experience, that Josephine did not bother seeking police assistance when Leopoldo allegedly snatched her handbag and cellphone. For a woman who claimed having been stalked and forcibly undressed by a rejected suitor, it is uncanny that Josephine charged Leopoldo with robbery only, not for any attempt to violate her honor.

From these circumstances, the Court is convinced that Josephine and Leopoldo had an illicit affair. Josephine is, therefore, and indeed, guilty of immorality.

Under Civil Service Commission (CSC) Resolution No. 991936 dated August 31, 1999, otherwise known the Revised Uniform Rules on Administrative Cases in the CSC which is applicable at the time the offense was committed, disgraceful and immoral conduct merits a penalty of suspension for six (6) months and one (1) day to one (1) year for the first offense.[62] Thus, in *Elape v. Elape*,[63] Process Server Alberto R. Elape was suspended for six (6) months and one (1) day for maintaining an illicit relationship. In *Banaag v. Espeleta*,[64] respondent court interpreter therein would have been suspended for six (6) months and one (1) day for immorality had she not peremptorily resigned from her post.

So must it be.

ACCORDINGLY, premises considered, Josephine Butlig is found GUILTY of immorality and SUSPENDED for six (6) months and one (1) day without pay with STERN WARNING that commission of the same or similar offenses shall be dealt with more severely.

SO ORDERED.

Peralta, C.J., (Chairperson), Reyes, J., Jr., and Inting,[*] JJ., concur.
Caguioa, J., on official leave.

[*] Additional member per Special Order No. 2726 dated October 25, 2019.

[1] Rollo, p. 5.

[2] Id. at 224.

[3] Id.

[4] Id.

[5] Id. at 224-225.

[6] Id. at 225.

[7] Id. at 224.

[8] Id. at 225.

[9] Id.

[10] Id. at 17.

[11] Report of Judge Goan dated March 3, 2015, p. 4; Unnumbered Rollo page.

[12] Id.

[13] Id. at 5.

[14] Id. at 4.

[15] Id. at 4-5.

[16] Id. at 5.

[17] Id.

[18] Rollo, p. 59.

[19] Id. at 224-225.

[20] Id. at 226.

[21] Id.

[22] Id. at 226-227.

[23] Id. at 227-228.

[24] Id. at 229.

[25] Id.

[26] Id. at 222.

[27] Id. at 230.

[28] Id.

[29] Id. at 232.

[30] Id. at 233.

[31] Memorandum of the Office of Court Administrator dated November 4, 2015, p. 5; Unnumbered Rollo page.

[32] Id. at 5-6.

[33] Id. at 6.

[34] Report of Judge Goan dated March 3, 2015, p. 24; Unnumbered Rollo page.

[35] Id. at 25-26.

[36] Id. at 27-28.

[37] Id. at 29-30.

[38] Id. at 30.

[39] Id.

- [40] Unnumbered Rollo page.
- [41] Report of Judge Goan dated March 3, 2015, p. 31; Unnumbered Rollo page.
- [42] Id. at 30-31.
- [43] Id. at 30.
- [44] Id.
- [45] Id. at 31.
- [46] Id.
- [47] Unnumbered rollo page.
- [48] Memorandum of the Office of Court Administrator dated November 4, 2015, pp. 11-12; Unnumbered Rollo page.
- [49] Id. at 10.
- [50] Id. at 11.
- [51] Id.
- [52] *Marquez v. Clores-Ramos*, 391 Phil. 1, 12 (2000).
- [53] A.M. No. P-11-3011, December 16, 2011.
- [54] 558 Phil. 24, 34 (2007).
- [55] *Babante-Caples v. Caples*, 649 Phil. 1, 5-6 (2010).
- [56] *Bayaca v. Judge Ramos*, 597 Phil. 86, 96 (2009).
- [57] *People v. Bensurto*, 802 Phil. 766, 774-775 (2016).
- [58] Memorandum of the Office of Court Administrator dated November 4, 2015, p. 5; Unnumbered Rollo page.
- [59] Rollo, pp. 226-227.
- [60] *People v. Mon*, G.R. No. 235778, November 21, 2018.
- [61] Memorandum of the Office of Court Administrator dated November 4, 2015, p. 5; Unnumbered Rollo page.
- [62] *Supra* note 55.
- [63] 574 Phil. 550, 555 (2008).
- [64] *Supra* note 53.

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.