

**ROSEMARY P. BERNADEZ, COMPLAINANT, VS. RICKY V. MONTEJAR,
PROCESS SERVER, RTC, BRANCH 64, GUIHULNGAN, NEGROS
ORIENTAL, RESPONDENT.**

A.M. No. P-00-1420. March 07, 2002

Ponente: YNARES-SANTIAGO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/8412a3356c67/>

YNARES-SANTIAGO, J.:

Sometime in June 1997, complainant Rosemary P. Bernadez, acting as attorney-in-fact of her father, Felimon Palomares, mortgaged a parcel of land covered by Original Certificate of Title No. FV-14575 to secure a loan obtained from the Rural Bank of Guihulngan (Negros Oriental), Inc.

Subsequently, complainant received notice from respondent Ricky V. Montejar, process server of the Regional Trial Court of Guihulngan, Negros Oriental, Branch 64, that the mortgage had been extrajudicially foreclosed in Extra-Judicial Foreclosure Case No. EX-98-005-G, and that the aforesaid parcel of land will be sold at public auction to the highest bidder on October 28, 1998.[1]

On October 15, 1998, complainant filed an administrative complaint against respondent Montejar for violation of Section 3 (e) of R.A. No. 3019, otherwise known as the Anti-Graft and Corrupt Practices Act, and Usurpation of Authority or Official Functions, as defined and punished under Article 177 of the Revised Penal Code, Gross Misconduct and Conduct Prejudicial to the Best Interest of the Service.[2] Complainant averred that respondent failed to comply with the requirement of publication of notice of the extrajudicial foreclosure of mortgage; and that respondent had no authority to issue the notice of foreclosure since he was only a process server and not a sheriff.

Respondent submitted a Counter-Affidavit,[3] wherein he alleged that he extra-judicially foreclosed the mortgage pursuant to Office Order No. 002-98 dated February 23, 1998,[4] issued by Presiding Judge Felix G. Gaudial, Jr., directing him to perform the duties and responsibilities of Sheriff IV of the office until a regular Sheriff IV is appointed. Respondent further argued that the amount of the unpaid loan was only P30,118.17, inclusive of interest, which exempted it from the requirements of publication of notice pursuant to Section 6, paragraph 3 of the Rural Banks Act of 1992 (R.A. 7353). Respondent also contended that he has not given unwarranted benefits, advantage or preference to the mortgagee bank, has never acted in bad faith, and has never displayed partiality to the said bank in effecting the extra-judicial foreclosure sale of the subject property.

It appears that the scheduled auction sale on October 28, 1998 was not held because complainant caused the payment of the loan to the mortgagee bank, causing the latter to withdraw application for extrajudicial foreclosure.

On December 9, 1998, complainant filed another administrative complaint charging respondent Montejar with Grave Dishonesty, Violation of the provisions of R.A. No. 6713 otherwise known as the Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards of Government Officers and Employees, Usurpation of Judicial Function and Gross Misbehavior.[5] She alleged that respondent received the amount of P100.00 as sheriff's fee for service of

summons in Civil Case No. 98-004-L, as evidenced by a handwritten receipt which he dated “1-21-98,”[6] despite the fact that said fees were paid upon the filing of the complaint. This shows that respondent assumed the functions of a deputy sheriff even prior to the issuance of Office Order No. 002-98 on February 23, 1998.

Previously, complainant filed on November 3, 1998 with the Deputy Ombudsman for Visayas a complaint against respondent for violation of franking privileges under P.D. No. 26 when the latter served his counter-affidavit enclosed in an envelope bearing “Free Postage”.[7] The complaint was referred to the Office of the Court Administrator who recommended that respondent be ordered to pay a fine of One Thousand Pesos (P1,000.00) for violating Section 113 of Article III, Chapter V of the National Accounting and Auditing Manual and P.D. No. 26.

We have consistently held that the nature of work of those connected with an office charged with the dispensation of justice, from the presiding judge to the lowest clerk, requires them to serve with the highest degree of efficiency and responsibility, in order to maintain public confidence in the judiciary.[8] Since the administration of justice is a sacred task, the persons involved in it ought to live up to the strictest standard of honesty, integrity and uprightness.[9]

In *OCA v. Sheriff IV Julius G. Cabe*,[10] the Court held that it will never countenance such 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 or even just tend to diminish the faith of the people in the Judiciary.[11]

Under Section 6, paragraph 3 of R.A. 7353, otherwise known as the “Rural Banks Act of 1992,” the foreclosure of real estate mortgages covering loans granted by rural banks shall be exempt from the requirement of publication where the total amount of the loan, excluding interests, does not exceed P100,000.00. Hence, complainant’s contention that respondent should be held accountable for the lack of publication of the foreclosure sale is untenable. Anent his authority to act as sheriff, it appears that respondent was duly authorized to perform the functions of sheriff by Judge Felix G. Gaudiel, Jr.

However, respondent should be held liable for issuing a handwritten receipt for payment of sheriff’s fees for service of summons in Civil Case No. 98-004-L. Section 113, Article III, Chapter V of the National Accounting and Auditing Manual clearly provides that “no payment of any nature shall be received by a collecting officer without immediately issuing an official receipt in acknowledgment thereof.”

Likewise, respondent violated Presidential Decree No. 26 when he sent his counter-affidavit to complainant enclosed in an envelope intended for free postage. The franking privilege provided for by PD 26 extends only to judges and refers to official communications and papers directly connected with the conduct of judicial proceedings.

In view of the foregoing, we find the recommendation of the Court Administrator for the payment of P1,000.00 fine reasonable.

ACCORDINGLY, respondent is ordered to pay a FINE in the amount of One Thousand Pesos (P1,000.00) for violating Section 113, Article III, Chapter V of the National Accounting and Auditing Manual and Presidential Decree No. 26. A repetition of the same or similar acts will be dealt with more severely.

SO ORDERED.

Davide, Jr., C.J., (Chairman), Puno, and Kapunan, JJ., concur.

[1] Rollo, p. 7.

- [2] Ibid., pp. 1-4.
- [3] Id., p. 12.
- [4] Id., p. 14.
- [5] Id., p. 36.
- [6] Id., p. 44.
- [7] Id., p. 35; Annex A of Sworn Letter-Complaint dated December 9, 1998.
- [8] Reyes-Domingo v. Morales, 342 SCRA 6, 16 [2000].
- [9] Anonymous v. Geverola, 279 SCRA 279 [1997].
- [10] A.M. No. P-96-1185, 26 June 2000.
- [11] Citing Mendoza v. Mabutas, 223 SCRA 411 [1993].

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.