

**CRISOSTOMO ARANZANSO, PETITIONER, VS. HONORABLE
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER EUGENIO I. SAGNIT, JR., IN HIS
CAPACITY AS ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER OF WORKMEN'S
COMPENSATION COMMISSION AND...**

G.R. No. L-40658. June 30, 1976

Ponente: MARTIN, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/92b14b5fd9f3/>

MARTIN, J.:

Petition for review of the decision of the Workmen's Compensation Commission in RO4-WC Case No. 19174, entitled Crisostomo Aranzanso, claimant vs. G.A. Machineries, respondent, which reversed the award made by the Acting Referee, Regional Office No. 4, Manila, granting the claim of the petitioner for compensation benefits under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Petitioner started with the respondent Company in 1968 as a carpenter, working eight (8) hours a day for six days a week, and almost everyday including Sundays. On September 5, 1971, while on vacation he suffered a stroke as a result of which he was taken to the Galauran Memorial Clinic & Laboratory where he was treated by Dr. Iluminada Hernandez. He was also treated by Dr. Manuel de Asis of the National Orthopedic Hospital from November 11, 1971 up to 1973. For his hospitalization he spent the amount of P871.25. The findings and evaluation of the Compensation Rating Medical Officer of the Workmen's Compensation Section, Regional Office No. 4, Manila, show that the petitioner was totally disabled for labor from September 16, 1971 up to February 20, 1973 and that he was suffering from 60% N.S.D. (Annex A. Decision of Acting Referee).

As a result of his illness, the petitioner filed his claim against the respondent for disability benefits compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act. The respondent controverted the claim claiming that the petitioner was on vacation at the time he suffered a stroke and that his employment did not cause nor aggravate his ailment.

After the hearing, the Acting Referee of Regional Office No. 4, Manila, made an award, the dispositive portion of which reads as follows:

"WHEREFORE, premises considered, judgment is hereby rendered ordering respondent, Gami Machineries, Inc.:

1) To pay claimant thru this Office the sum of ONE THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED SIXTY ONE PESOS AND SIXTY CENTAVOS (P1,461.60) as temporary total disability compensation benefits and the sum of TWO THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED FORTY SIX PESOS AND FORTY CENTAVOS (P2,246.40) as permanent partial disability compensation benefits or the total amount of THREE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED EIGHT PESOS (P3,708.00) plus a weekly compensation of P19.60 beginning February 20, 1973 until claimant's illness shall have been cured or until he shall have received the total amount of P6,000.00 as disability compensation benefits;

2) To pay claimant the sum of P871.25 as medical expenses reimbursement;

- 3) To pay claimant's counsel of record, Atty. Luis Fernandez, the sum of P185.40 as partial attorney's fee;
- 4) And, to pay this Office the sum of P38.00 plus P1.00 for every P100.00 that claimant shall receive beginning February 20, 1973, as administrative fees pursuant to Section 55 of the Act.

SO ORDERED."

In due time, the respondent moved to elevate the case for review by the respondent Commission. Finding no merit in the award made by the Acting Referee, the respondent Commission reversed the same and dismissed the claim of petitioner. A motion to reconsider the decision was denied.

Hence this petition for review.

Petitioner makes capital of the respondent Commission's alleged error in holding that the illness of petitioner is not work-connected or work-aggravated and therefore not compensable under the Workmen's Compensation Act. In resolving against the claim of the petitioner, respondent Commission adheres to the doctrine laid down by this Court in *A.L. Ammen Transportation Co. vs. WCC*,^[1] that "an injury sustained while on leave of absence is not compensable." In said case it was held:

"The requirement that to be compensable the death must occur while the worker is performing some work in the course of or arising out of his employment requires three things: (1) the injury must be received during the period covered by the employment; (2) the worker must be shown to have been injured at the time and place where the performance of his work requires him to be, and (3) the worker must have been doing something in pursuance of his work."

In the opinion of the respondent commission, the foregoing requirements were not met in the case of the petitioner because his illness came while he was on vacation leave, that is, he was not at the time and place where the performance of his work requires him to be and that he was not doing something in pursuance of his work. True it is, that the petitioner was not actually at the time and at the place of work when he suffered the stroke because he was on vacation - but it must be noted that when the petitioner went on vacation, it did not mean that he ceased to be under the employ of the respondent. He still was. An employee as a matter of public policy is entitled to vacation and sick leave in order to improve their health and physical well-being. The days that they are on vacation are considered part of the period of their employment and if during this period an employee suffers injury, or illness, such injury or illness will be deemed as having arisen out of his employment, and therefore compensable. It is interesting to note that the petitioner here became ill only two days after he went on vacation to rest. It would have been worse for him had he not taken his vacation because then the physical force he used to exert in his work as a carpenter would have hastened the attack. Well-established is the doctrine that an illness is presumed to have arisen out of employment or aggravated by the same once shown to have intervened during employment.^[2] And the statutory presumption is that the claim is compensable unless the employer proves the contrary.^[3] The burden of proof that said illness did not arise out of employment or at least aggravated by his employment shifts to the employer, and the employee is relieved of the burden to show causation.^[4] The records do not show that the respondent has proven by substantial evidence that the illness of the petitioner could have arisen out of factors other than the nature of his employment, such as activities engaged in by petitioner in the two days he was on vacation before he became ill which might have caused or contributed to the development or acceleration of his illness which finally culminated into a cerebro-vascular attack. But even if there are such other factors, that fact alone is not sufficient to affect the compensability of his claim. In *Albana vs. Quisumbing*, *supra*, this Court held:

"The mere fact that factors other than the claimant's employment may have also contributed to the aggravation of his illness, the same is not a drawback to its compensability. For, under the law, it is not required that the

employment be the sole factor in the growth, development or acceleration of claimant's illness to entitle him to the benefits provided for. It is enough that his employment had contributed, even in a small degree, to the development of the disease. Under the Workmen's Compensation Law, it is not necessary for a claimant to carry the burden of proof to establish his case to the point of demonstration. It is sufficient to show that the hypothesis on which he bases his claim is probable."

IN VIEW OF THE FOREGOING , the decision of the respondent Commission is reversed and set aside and the award made by the Acting Referee of Regional Office No. 4, Manila, is hereby affirmed. With costs against private respondent.

SO ORDERED.

Teehankee, (Chairman), Makasiar, Muñoz Palma, and Aquino, JJ., concur.

Aquino, J., was designated to sit in the First Division.

[1] 12 SCRA, 27

[2] Maria Cristina Fertilizer Corp. vs. WCC, 60 SCRA 228

[3] Agustin vs. WCC, 12 SCRA, 55

[4] Abana vs. Quisumbing, 22 SCRA, 1278.

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.