

EBILIO BONGAT, JUANITO RICAFORTE, LUIS VISCA, ANTONIO DE LA PEÑA, HUGO PRESENTE, AMADO CASTRO, BERNARDINO LAMBAN, BENJAMIN BIRBOÑA, BENJAMIN CASUPANG, RUFO SAMSON, AND REYNO REY...*G.R. No. L-41039. April 30, 1985*

Ponente: CUEVAS, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/6140088f3a18/>**CUEVAS, J.:**

This petition for CERTIORARI with preliminary mandatory injunction questions the alleged grave abuse of discretion committed by the Bureau of Labor Relations, Ministry of Labor, in issuing the Order[1] dated June 17, 1975 in BLR Case No. 177, which denied the appeal of petitioners from the REPORT[2] of Med-Arbiter Danilo P. Cruz recommending the certification of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) entered into between the National Association of Workers of the Philippines (NAWOP) and the management of Quality Container Corporation embodying the terms and conditions of employment of the rank-and-file employees of the quality Container Corporation effective for three (3) years from December 2, 1974 to December 31, 1977.

The National Association of Workers of the Philippines (NAWOP for short), respondent herein, was certified by the defunct Court of Industrial Relations (CIR) in an order dated July 15, 1974 in Case No. 4067-MC as the sole and exclusive bargaining agent of the rank-and-file employees of Quality Container Corporation (Company for short), a duly registered and existing domestic corporation with business address at No. 37 Eulogia Drive, Barrio Kangkong, Quezon City.

Bargaining negotiations of the terms and conditions of employment of the rank-and-file employees of the Company ensued thereafter between NAWOP and the management of the Company. A Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) was finally formulated on December 7, 1974 and was subsequently submitted for certification with the Bureau of Labor Relations, Ministry of labor as required by the Labor Code, docketed as BLR Case No. 177, assigned to Med-Arbiter Danilo P. Cruz.

On December 17, 1974, a "Petisyon"[3] allegedly signed by 254 employees of the Company led by petitioners herein, opposed the certification of the CBA, alleging therein, that they were not informed of the contents of the CBA; that they have not approved nor ratified the same; and that they have disaffiliated from NAWOP as of November 12, 1974.

After hearing, the parties were required to submit their respective position papers. Respondent NAWOP filed its memorandum attaching thereto a document entitled "Kapasiyahan ng Pagpapatibay ng Kasunduan"[4] purportedly signed by 319 employees of the company, declaring that they have signed and approve the CBA on November 29, 1974 at Barrio Kangkong, Balintawak, Quezon City. Petitioners assailed the genuineness of the signatures in that "Kapasiyahan" by submitting individual affidavits of 138 employees uniformly stating that the CBA between NAWOP and the Company was entered into over and against affiant's objection and that affiant is one of the signatories in the letter of disaffiliation submitted to NAWOP on November 12, 1974. Respondent NAWOP, on

the other hand, submitted the affidavits of its chapter officers and board members affirming the authenticity of the signatures in the "Kapasiyahan", the same having been solicited by them personally.

After considering all the documentary evidence submitted, Med-Arbiter Danilo P. Cruz rendered a report finding no adequate evidence to support petitioners' contention as to the irregularities surrounding the ratification of the CBA, Arbiter Cruz then recommended the immediate certification of the CBA. Consequently, on June 4, 1975, the Bureau of Labor Relations thru its Officer-In-Charge, George A. Eduvala, acting on the recommendation of its certification division and the report of Med-Arbiter Danilo P. Cruz, certified the CBA entered into between NAWOP and the Company.[5] Meanwhile, petitioners appealed from the report of Med-Arbiter Danilo P. Cruz with the Bureau of Labor Relations which, however, denied the same on June 17, 1975 on the ground that the requirements for certification of a CBA set forth in Section 2, Rule IX, Book IV of the Rules and Regulations Implementing the Labor Code have been complied with.

Hence, this petition for Certiorari with prayer that a writ of preliminary mandatory injunction be issued directing respondent Bureau of Labor Relations to recall the certification dated June 4, 1975 of the CBA between NAWOP and Company. The respondents were required to file their respective comments on the petition which they did. Said Comments were subsequently considered as answers in the resolution of this Court of January 14, 1976. Thereafter the parties were required to file their respective memoranda. After all the parties have filed their respective memoranda, the case was considered submitted for resolution.

Petitioners contend that respondent Bureau of Labor Relations committed grave abuse of discretion when it prematurely certified the CBA instead of conducting a full dress investigation considering the opposition to its certification and an appeal was pending with the Bureau of Labor Relations; in denying the appeal despite the existence of valid grounds; and in ordering that "any issue as to the truth of the contents of the affidavit can best be resolved in civil courts" despite the fact that it is within its jurisdiction to make such an inquiry.

The sole issue to be resolved in the instant case is: whether or not the Bureau of Labor Relations gravely abused its discretion when it certified the CBA entered into between NAWOP and the management of Quality Container Corporation covering the period of three (3) years from December 2, 1974 to December 31, 1977.

As things now stand, considering the lapse of time, and the fact that the three (3) year duration of the CBA had already expired on December 31, 1977, the resolution of the issue aforesaid has now become moot and academic. Moreover, in the light of the prayer of the petition, it would seem that this case is now moot and academic, the writ of mandatory injunction prayed for being already impossible of enforcement, for, there is nothing to recall at this stage. No useful purpose would then be served by passing on the merits of the petition. Any ruling in the instant case could hardly be of any practical or useful purpose in the premises. It is a settled rule that a court will not determine moot question or abstract proposition, nor express an opinion in a case in which no practical relief can be granted.[6]

WHEREFORE, the petition is hereby DISMISSED for being moot and academic. No costs.

SO ORDERED.

Makasiar, (Chairman), Aquino, Abad Santos, and Escolin, JJ., concur.
Concepcion, Jr., on leave.

[1] Page 33, Rollo.

[2] Page 24, Rollo.

[3] Page 11, Rollo.

[4] Page 16, Rollo.

[5] Page 34, Rollo.

[6] Central Azucarera Don Pedro vs. Don Pedro Security Guards Union, 22 SCRA 1053.

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.