

JUDGE AMANTE PURISIMA, COMPLAINANT, VS. ROGELIO ABELLO, PROCESS SERVER, RESPONDENT.

Adm. Mat. No. P-2448. June 29, 1981

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/925e0e3579f3/>

Respondent is a process server in the Office of the Sheriff in the City of Manila. On June 10, 1980, respondent received a notice setting for pre-trial on June 30, 1980 in Civil Case No. 128607 entitled "Insurance Company of North America vs. Allied Banking Corporation," for service upon the plaintiff's counsel, together with other court processes.

The above-mentioned notice was somehow inserted in a folder containing respondent's personal papers and not in the folder marked "For Service" where court processes were usually kept by him. All other court processes assigned to the respondent that day were duly served except that notice which was placed in his personal file.

On July 8, 1980 while respondent was sorting his personal file, he discovered the above-mentioned notice of pre-trial. Upon discovering the notice among his personal papers, he immediately went to see the plaintiff's counsel, Atty. Rodolfo C. Adajar, to apologize to him. The counsel did not believe that the giving of the notice of pre-trial would be of any use to him so the respondent left said notice to the counsel's secretary with a word of apology to be conveyed to her boss.

Judge Amante Purisima, the presiding judge of the Court of First Instance, Branch VII to whose sala the case earlier mentioned was assigned, issued an order on July 22, 1980 requiring respondent to show cause why he should not be cited for contempt of court for failure to effect service of the notice of the pre-trial.

Respondent filed a manifestation alleging that the failure to serve the notice was due to reasons and circumstances not of his fault, considering the fact that the notice was misplaced. Respondent further alleged that he had no intention whatsoever not to serve the notice nor to delay the administration of justice.

On November 20, 1980, Judge Purisima issued an order that the explanation of the respondent in his manifestation was not satisfactory; that it amounts to a confession of guilt; that what is worse, it smacks of indifference to duty and irresponsibility on the part of the process server, irresponsibility, because misplacing the notice shows lack of due care in the handling and keeping of processes or other documents entrusted to him by law, and indifference to duty, because knowing that the date of the pre-trial having long passed, he still served the notice instead of returning it to the Court.

Instead of punishing process server Rogelio Abello for contempt of Court, the Court directed in the dispositive portion, that copy of the order be forwarded to the office of the Honorable Judicial Administrator for whatever disciplinary action he may find appropriate to impose the former, and for such remedial measures as may be adopted to him to preclude similar happening in the future.

Upon receipt of the records of this case, Court Administrator Lorenzo Relova assigned Judge Jose C. Colayco to investigate, report and recommend action on the official actuation of process server Rogelio Abello. The hearing of this case was set on February 6, 1981. Only the respondent was present. The case was reset to another date wherein respondent was given ten (10) days within which to submit true copy of his explanation.

In a memorandum submitted on March 27, 1981, respondent alleged that the failure to serve the Notice of Pre-trial was made in good faith and without the least intention of delaying the administration of justice or causing prejudice to the parties to the case. Respondent further alleged that such failure was due to an honest mistake and excusable negligence which ordinary prudence could not have guarded against and for which he should be absolved from punitive responsibilities.

Respondent stated that he had been in the Office of the Sheriff of the City of Manila for fifteen (15) years and that through all those years up to the present, he has been rendering an efficient, honest, dedicated and loyal service to the courts, the lawyers and the party litigants in all the cases assigned to him.

This is the only time, respondent alleged, that he has ever failed to perform his duty to the satisfaction of the court and the party plaintiff. Respondent begs the kindness of the Court not to consider his honest mistake and excusable negligence as an indifference in the performance of his duties. Respondent has no other means of livelihood and for that matter, he could not be indifferent to the job which provides him and his family their daily bread. Likewise, respondent submits that the long continued service he had already rendered without any complaint against him but for this case, is a testimony that he is not irresponsible in the performance of his assigned duties, for if he is so, he could not have lasted for even one week in his job.

In view of the contrite attitude of the respondent, it is recommended by Judge Colayco with the approval of the Court Administrator that a nominal fine of f 50.00 with a stern warning be imposed upon him as a lesson.

The Court, considering the unblemished service record of the respondent for more than fifteen (15) years and the fact that he promises to be more careful in the future, finds no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the investigating judge.

WHEREFORE, in the light of the foregoing, a fine of P50.00 is imposed on Rogelio Abello with a stern warning that a repetition of similar act in the future would be sternly dealt with.

SO ORDERED.

Teehankee (Chairman), Makasiar, Fernandez and Melencio-Herrera, JJ., concur.

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.