

JUDGE JUANITA C. TIENZO, COMPLAINANT, VS. DOMINADOR R. FLORENDO, CLERK II, MUNICIPAL TRIAL COURT OF LUPAO, NUEVA ECIJA, RESPONDENT.

A.M. NO. P-05-1982. August 28, 2007

Ponente: GARCIA, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/678b97460af4/>

GARCIA, J.:

This administrative matter was initiated by a Memorandum[1] dated September 3, 2003 of Judge Juanita C. Tienzo, presiding judge, Municipal Trial Court of Lupao, Nueva Ecija charging respondent Dominador R. Florendo, Clerk II of the same court, with gambling during office hours and conduct unbecoming a government employee.

The report[2] of the Office of the Court Administrator (OCA) on the administrative matter at hand reads as follows:

Judge Tienzo in her memorandum to respondent copy furnished this Office, stated the following:

She had caught respondent [Florendo] playing a game of chance "tong-it" in a hut at the back of the Municipal Building of Lupao despite warning on August 26, 2003.

For repeating the same act the third time she directed respondent to report in the office at 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon and from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. Respondent was also warned to refrain from revealing confidential matters in the office by giving information as to the issuance of a warrant of arrest to those accused of a crime and for relaying fake information to people within the jurisdiction of the Court.

There were three (3) directives issued by this Office to respondent on the following dates, to wit:

- 1st Indorsement dated October 16, 2003 to file Comment within ten (10) days from receipt;
- First (1st) Tracer dated March 11, 2004 for Comment within five (5) days from receipt; and
- Second (2nd) Indorsement dated July 2, 2004 for Comment and to explain failure to comply with the two (2) previous directives.

The registry return receipts for the above three (3) directives indicate that respondent received them, but respondent has never submitted his comment.[3]

On the basis of available records, the OCA recommended that the respondent be adjudged guilty of illegal gambling during office hours and he be meted the penalty of dismissal, but without forfeiture of his retirement benefits and leave credits. Cited to justify the imposition of the recommended penalty is Section 52 (c) (5), Rule IV of the Civil Service Commission Uniform Rules on Administrative Cases, which prescribes the penalty of dismissal upon a public officer for engaging in gambling, where said public officer commits the same offense a third time. The said Rule states:

C. The following are Light Offenses with corresponding penalties:

xxx xxx xxx

5. Gambling prohibited by law

1st Offense - Reprimand;

2nd Offense - Suspension for 1-30 days;

3rd Offense - Dismissal.

While it agrees with the OCA's recommendation as to the respondent's guilt, the Court excepts with respect to the imposable penalty. As it were, the Civil Service Uniform Rules prescribes the penalty of dismissal for gambling for the third offense. When the law speaks of "third offense," the reference is to a third final judgment of guilt after the erring officer has been duly charged with gambling. As it were, respondent was thrice warned to refrain from playing "tong-its" during office hours. The records reveal that, for the first two gambling infractions he appeared to have committed, respondent was not charged formally. What is clear is that he was merely warned. Judge Tienzo appeared to be open to the prospect of reform, and the good judge desisted from taking official action against the respondent, as her Office Memorandum to the respondent discloses.[4] Respondent was formally charged only after the occurrence of the third gambling incident. As such, the penalty of dismissal prescribed under Section 52 (c) (5), Rule IV of the Civil Service Commission Uniform Rules on Administrative Cases cannot strictly apply. For all intents and purposes, this case may be considered as respondent's first gambling offense.

The Court, however, would be trivializing a misconduct if it lets go a recalcitrant court employee with a mere slap on the wrist, like a reprimand. As the Court clearly notes, respondent defied warnings from his superior not to engage anymore in any gambling activity. What is more, respondent did not even have the good sense of apologizing to the complaining judge about the error of his ways. Compounding the matter is his gall of not even submitting a comment to the charge of gambling, after being repeatedly required by the OCA. A fine with warning would be appropriate under the premises.

Time and again, the Court has emphasized the heavy burden and responsibility which court officials and employees are mandated to carry. They are constantly reminded that any impression of impropriety, misdeed or negligence in the performance of official functions must be avoided. The Court will never countenance any conduct, act or omission on the part of all those involved in the administration of justice which would violate the norm of public accountability and diminish the people's faith in the judiciary.[5]

Gambling is a pernicious practice rightfully regarded as the offspring of idleness and the prolific parent of vice and immorality, demoralizing in its association and tendencies, detrimental to the best interests of society, and encouraging wastefulness, thriftlessness, and a belief that a livelihood may be earned by means other than honest industry. To be condemned in itself, gambling has the further effect of causing poverty, dishonesty, fraud, and deceit. Many a man has neglected his business and family, and mortgaged his integrity to follow the fickle Goddess of the cards. Many a woman has wasted her hours and squandered her substance at the gambling board while home and children have been neglected if not altogether forgotten.[6]

A common gambler is a common nuisance, insensible to honor, deaf to pity, bent upon plunder, he is human cormorant, more destructible than the bird of prey itself.[7]

The Court, to be sure, frowns on gambling, as the vice may lead to the more nefarious consequence already all too well-known as graft. The image of a court of justice is necessarily mirrored in the conduct, official or otherwise, of the men and women at its helm. Hence, it becomes the imperative and sacred duty of each and everyone in the court to maintain its good name and standing as a true temple of justice.[8]

Republic Act No. 6713, also known as The Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees, enunciates the State policy of promoting a high standard of ethics and responsibility in the public service. No other office in the government exacts a greater demand for moral righteousness and uprightness from an employee than the judiciary. Consequently, everyone involved in the administration and dispensation of justice, from the lowliest employee to the highest official, is expected to live up to the most exacting standard of honesty, integrity and uprightness.

It would be well for the respondent to remember these tenets, given his apparent proclivity to the detestable vice.

WHEREFORE, respondent Dominador R. Florendo is found GUILTY of gambling during office hours and is hereby FINED in an amount equivalent to his three (3) months basic salary and WARNED against a repetition of such improper conduct.

SO ORDERED.

Puno, C.J., (Chairperson), Sandoval-Gutierrez, Corona, and Azcuna, JJ., concur.

[1] Rollo, p. 1.

[2] Id. at 5-7.

[3] Even up to this time, the respondent has not submitted any comment to the charge against him.

[4] Id. at 1.

[5] Office of the Court Administrator v. Liwanag, A.M. No. MTJ-02-1440, February 28, 2006, 483 SCRA 417.

[6] United States v. Salaveria, 39 Phil. 103 (1918).

[7] Smith v. Wilson, 31 How. Pr [N.Y.] 22 Fed. case No. 13, 128.

[8] Aquino v. Fernandez, A.M. No. P-01-1475, October 17, 2003, 413 SCRA 597.

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.