

**SCOUT RAMON V. ALBANO MEMORIAL COLLEGE, PETITIONER, VS.
HON. CARMELO C. NORIEL, AND FEDERATION OF FREE WORKERS
(SCOUT RAMON V. ALBANO MEMORIAL COLLEGE CHAPTER),
RESPONDENTS.**

G.R. No. L-48347. October 03, 1978

Ponente: FERNANDO, Acting C.J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/9345cd8d4a9b/>

FERNANDO, Acting C.J.:

The grave abuse of discretion imputed to respondent Director of Labor Relations Carmelo C. Noriel, when he ordered a certification election at the instance of private respondent, Federation of Free Workers, was his alleged failure to abide by previous rulings of the Department of Labor. Assuming such to be the case, the point raised is not decisive of this controversy. As was made apparent in the Comment of Solicitor General Estelito P. Mendoza,[1] the challenged order conforms to the decisions of this Court. Where the law is concerned, it is this Tribunal that speaks authoritatively. Petitioner has failed to make out a case. We dismiss.

The controversy began with the filing of a petition for certification election on September 22, 1977 by the Scout Ramon V. Albano Memorial College Chapter of private respondent labor union. It alleged that the written consent of 67 employees out of an alleged total working force of 200, more or less, had been secured. There was, on October 21, 1977, a motion to dismiss the petition filed by the employer, the present petitioner. It was based on the lack of the 30% consent requirement, as there were 250 employees, the required thirty percent of the said work force being 75. With the figure of the actual number of employees in the school establishment thus supplied, private respondent submitted on October 26, 1977 the additional signatures of 22 employees in support of its plea for a certification election. There was an opposition on the part of the present petitioner. It was filed on November 2, 1977. Then came, fifteen days later, an order from the Med-Arbiter assigned to the case dismissing the petition for certification on the ground that the compliance with the 30% requirement must be shown as of the time of its filing. Private respondent appealed to the Bureau of Labor Relations such order of the Med-Arbiter dismissing its petition. Respondent Noriel on February 8, 1978 sustained the appeal, ordering a certification election at the Scout Ramon V. Albano Memorial College within twenty (20) days from receipt thereof, with the following as contending unions: 1. FFW (Scout Ramon V. Albano Memorial College Chapter); 2. No Union. Petitioner moved for its reconsideration, but it did not succeed. An appeal to the Secretary of Labor was likewise of no avail. Hence this petition.

As set forth at the outset, there is no merit to this petition.

1. The present Labor Code did not take effect until November 1, 1974.[2] The day before, on October 31, 1974, this Court, speaking through Justice E. Fernandez, now retired, in *Confederation of Citizens Labor Union v. National Labor Relations Commission*,[3] held fast to the existing doctrine emphasizing the significance of a certification election in a regime of collective bargaining. Then in the first decision after its effectivity, *United Employees Union of Gelmart Industries v. Noriel*,[4] it was pointed out: "The institution of collective bargaining

is, to recall Cox, a prime manifestation of industrial democracy at work. The two parties to the relationship, labor and management, make their own rules by coming to terms. That is to govern themselves in matters that really count. As labor, however, is composed of a number of individuals, it is indispensable that they be represented by a labor organization of their choice. Thus may be discerned how crucial is a certification election. So our decisions from the earliest case of PLDT Employees Union v. PLDT Co. Free Telephone Workers Union to the latest, Philippine Communications, Electronics & Electricity Workers' Federation (PCWF) v. Court of Industrial Relations, had made clear."^[5] The same principle was again given expression in language equally emphatic in the subsequent case of Philippine Association of Free Labor Unions v. Bureau of Labor Relations:^[6] "Petitioner thus appears to be woefully lacking in awareness of the significance of a certification election for the collective bargaining process. It is the fairest and most effective way of determining which labor organization can truly represent the working force. It is a fundamental postulate that the will of the majority, if given expression in an honest election with freedom on the part of the voters to make their choice, is controlling. No better device can assure the institution of industrial democracy with the two parties to a business enterprise, management and labor, establishing a regime of self-rule."^[7] That is to accord respect to the policy of the Labor Code, indisputably partial to the holding of a certification election so as to arrive in a manner definitive and certain concerning the choice of the labor organization to represent the workers in a collective bargaining unit.^[8]

2. Conformably to the above basic concept, this Court, in the aforesaid Philippine Association of Free Labor Unions decision, recognized that the Bureau of Labor Relations, in the exercise of sound discretion, may order a certification election notwithstanding the failure to meet the 30% requirement. Once that requisite is complied with, however, the Code makes clear that "it shall be mandatory for the Bureau to conduct a certification election for the purpose of determining the representative of the employees in the appropriate bargaining unit and certify the winner as the exclusive collective bargaining representative of all the employees in the unit."^[9] Necessarily then, the argument of petitioner as to the inability of private respondent to come up with the required signatures when the petition was first filed falls to the ground. At any rate, additional signatures were subsequently secured. The allegation that there was thereafter a retraction on the part of a number of such signatories lends added support to the decision arrived at by respondent Noriel that the only way of determining with accuracy the true will of the personnel involved in the bargaining unit is to conduct a certification election. At any rate, that is a factual matter, the resolution of which by respondent Noriel is entitled to respect by this Tribunal.^[10]

3. There is relevance likewise to this excerpt from Monark International, Inc. v. Noriel, cited in the Comment of Solicitor General Mendoza: "There is another infirmity from which the petition suffers. It was filed by the employer, the adversary in the collective bargaining process. Precisely, the institution of collective bargaining is designed to assure that the other party, labor, is free to choose its representative. To resolve any doubt on the matter, a certification election, to repeat, is the most appropriate means of ascertaining its will. It is true that there may be circumstances where the interest of the employer calls for its being heard on the matter. An obvious instance is where it invokes the obstacle interposed by the contract-bar rule. This case certainly does not fall within the exception. Sound policy dictates that as much as possible, management is to maintain a strictly hands-off policy. For if it does not, it may lend itself to the legitimate suspicion that it is partial to one of the contending unions. That is repugnant to the concept of collective bargaining. That is against the letter and spirit of welfare legislation intended to protect labor and to promote social justice. The judiciary then should be the last to look with tolerance at such efforts of an employer to take part in the process leading to the free and untrammelled choice of the exclusive bargaining representative of the workers."^[11]

WHEREFORE, the petition for certiorari is dismissed, with costs. This decision is immediately executory. The restraining order is hereby lifted. A certification election must be conducted forthwith.

Barredo, Antonio, Aquino, Concepcion, Jr., and Santos, JJ., concur.

[1] He was assisted by Assistant Solicitor General Reynato S. Puno and Solicitor Jesus V. Diaz.

[2] Presidential Decree No. 570-A, Sec. 64.

[3] L-38955-56, October 31, 1974, 60 SCRA 450.

[4] L-40810, October 3, 1975, 67 SCRA 267.

[5] Ibid, 273. PLDT Employees Union is reported in 97 Phil. 424, a 1955 decision. The Philippine Electronics decision, L-34531, promulgated on March 29, 1974, is found in 56 SCRA 480.

[6] L-42115, January 27, 1976, 69 SCRA 132.

[7] Ibid, 139.

[8] Cf. *Federacion Obrera v. Noriel*, L-41937, July 6, 1976, 72 SCRA 24; *UE Automotive Employees and Workers Union-Trade Unions of the Philippines and Allied Services v. Noriel*, L-44350, Nov. 25, 1976, 74 SCRA 72; *Philippine Labor Alliance Council v. Bureau of Labor Relations*, L-41288, Jan. 31, 1977, 75 SCRA 162; *Today's Knitting Free Workers Union v. Noriel*, L-45057, Feb. 28, 1977, 75 SCRA 450; *Benguet Exploration Miner's Union v. Noriel*, L-44110, March 29, 1977, 76 SCRA 107; *Kapisanan v. Noriel*, L-45475, June 20, 1977, 77 SCRA 414; *Rowell Labor Union-Trade Unions of the Philippines v. Ople*, L-42270, July 29, 1977, 78 SCRA 166; *Vasaar Industries Employees Union v. Estrella*, L-44652, March 31, 1978; *National Mines and Allied Workers Union v. Luna*, L-46722, June 15, 1978; *General Textiles Allied Workers Association v. Director of Bureau of Labor Relations*, L-45719, July 31, 1978.

[9] Article 258 of the Labor Code reads in full: "Requisites for certification election. - Any petition for certification election filed by any legitimate labor organization shall be supported by the written consent of at least thirty percent (30%) of all the employees in the bargaining unit. Upon receipt and verification of such petition, it shall be mandatory for the Bureau to conduct a certification election for the purpose of determining the representative of the employees in the appropriate bargaining unit and certify the winner as the exclusive collective bargaining representative of all the employees in the unit."

[10] Cf. *Antipolo Highway Lines v. Inciong*, L-38523, June 27, 1975, 64 SCRA 441; *Jacqueline Industries v. National Labor Relations Commission*, L-37034, Aug. 29, 1975, 66 SCRA 397; *Federacion Obrera v. Noriel*, L-41937, July 6, 1976, 72 SCRA 24; *Kapisanan ng mga Manggagawa v. Noriel*, L-45475, June 20, 1977, 77 SCRA 414; *Monark International, Inc. v. Noriel*, L-47570-71, May 11, 1978.

[11] Comment, 5. The *Monark International* decision, L-47570-71, was promulgated on May 11, 1978. Cf. *Consolidated Farms, Inc., II v. Noriel*, L-47752, July 31, 1978.

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.