

CAMPOS RUEDA CORPORATION, PETITIONER, VS. HON. JOSE S. BAUTISTA, AS PRESIDING JUDGE, HON. BALTAZAR M. VILLANUEVA, HON. ARSENIO I. MARTINEZ, HON. AMANDO C. BUGAYONG, AS ASSOCIATE...

G.R. No. L-18453. September 29, 1962

Ponente: DIZON, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/96b4970136fa/>

DIZON, J.:

Respondent Muyot was employed by petitioner at its gasoline station located at 1012 Azcarraga St. (now Recto Avenue), Manila, at a monthly salary of P200.00 from May 21, 1949 to May 31, 1953, and at P230.00 from June 1 to December 31, 1953. On November 26, 1958 he filed a complaint against petitioner with the Court of Industrial Relations (Case No. 1140-V) to recover compensation for alleged overtime, Sunday and holiday services rendered during said period.

On December 8, 1958 petitioner moved to dismiss the complaint on the following grounds: that the claims set forth therein were barred by (a) the statute of limitations; (b) the decision rendered by Regional Office No. 1, Department of Labor in Case No. C-4364 entitled "Manuel Muyot, Complainant, vs. Super Service and Auto Supply, Jose A. Campos, Manager, Respondent"; and by the decisions of the Court of First Instance of Manila in Civil Case No. 30138 entitled "Manuel Muyot, Plaintiff, vs. Campos Rueda Corporation, Defendant", and in Civil Case No. 36060 entitled "Campos Rueda Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Julianio E. Estrella, etc., et al., Respondents".

Respondent Muyot opposed said motion to dismiss alleging that, as the decisions relied upon therein were rendered by courts that had no jurisdiction over the subject-matter, the same did not constitute *res judicata*; that his causes of action were not barred by the statute of limitations because the legal period provided for in Section 7-A of Commonwealth Act No. 444, as amended by Republic Act No. 1993, was interrupted when he filed a case with the Department of Labor on October 27, 1955 and another with the Court of First Instance on July 7, 1956.

On March 17, 1959, petitioner filed a supplementary motion to dismiss alleging that the Court had no jurisdiction over the subject-matter because the complaint did not seek the reinstatement of Muyot who, according to the complaint, ceased to be an employee of petitioner since December 31, 1953. In other words, the claim merely involved collection of pay for overtime, Sunday and holiday work.

On August 3, 1959, the Court of Industrial Relations, through Judge Arsenio I. Martinez, denied petitioner's motion to dismiss and required him to answer the complaint. In its order of August 15, 1959, the respondent court, en banc, also denied petitioner's motion for reconsideration.

On November 11, 1959, petitioner filed its answer denying respondent's claim for overtime and Sunday and holiday services pay. Among other affirmative defenses it reasserted its contention that respondent court had no jurisdiction over the subject matter of the case.

During the trial, upon motion of respondent Muyot, respondent court issued a subpoena duces tecum requiring the

petitioner "to bring the Daily Time Records of employees working at the Super Service Station for the years 1952-1953".

Petitioner filed a motion to quash the subpoena on the ground that (a) it did not reasonably designate the particular employee or employees' daily time record concerned, but gave a blanket description which the rules do not allow; (b) that the records sought to be produced did not appear to be prima facie relevant to the issue involved in the case and (c) that the respondent in whose behalf the subpoena duces tecum was issued had not offered or tendered to advance the reasonable cost of producing the records sought to be produced.

On June 24, 1960, the respondent court, through Judge Jose S. Bautista, denied the motion to quash, and on July 11, 1960, the court, en banc, also denied petitioner's motion for reconsideration.

Hence the present original action for Certiorari, and Prohibition filed by Campos Rueda Corporation, to annul the respondent court's orders of August 3 and 15, 1959, June 24 and July 11, 1960 mentioned heretofore.

The allegations made in Muyot's complaint against petitioner show conclusively that his employment with the latter was terminated on December 31, 1953—almost five years before said complaint was filed; that, without asking for his reinstatement, neither directly nor indirectly, he only sought to collect what, in his opinion, was due and payable to him for overtime, Sunday and holiday services he had rendered to his former employer during the period of his employment.

In *Roman Catholic Archbishop etc. vs. Jimenez Yanson, et al.*, G. R. Nos. L-12341 and L-12345 decided on April 30, 1958, we held:

"In the present case, it is apparent that the petition below is simply for the collection of unpaid salaries and wages alleged to be due for services rendered years ago. No labor dispute appears to be presently involved since the petition itself indicates that the employment has long terminated and petitioners are not asking that they be reinstated. Clearly, the petition does not fall under any of the cases enumerated in the law as coming within the jurisdiction of the Industrial Court, so that it was error for that court not to have ordered its dismissal."

In the *Mindanao Bus Employees etc. vs. the Court of Industrial Relations, et al.*, we also held:

"The petitioner union claims that its members employed by the respondent company are entitled to overtime wages which have not been paid notwithstanding repeated demands, and prays 'that after due hearing, respondent employer be ordered to pay for the herein claims and for such other relief as justice and equity may merit.' It is clear that the case is for collection of overtime wages claimed to be due and unpaid and does not involve hours of employment under Commonwealth Act No. 444. Hence the Court does not have jurisdiction over the case and correctly dismissed the petition."

Again, in *Price Stabilization Corporation vs. Court of Industrial Relations, et al.*, 108 Phil., 134, decided on May 23, 1960, we clearly and unequivocally restated the same view as follows:

"* * * where the employer-employee relationship is still existing or is sought to be reestablished because of its wrongful severance (as where the employee seeks reinstatement), the Court of Industrial Relations has jurisdiction over all claims arising out of, or in connection with employment, such as those related to the Minimum Wage Law and the Eight-Hour Labor Law. After the termination of the relationship and no reinstatement is sought, such claims become mere money claims, and come within the jurisdiction of the regular courts.

"We are aware that in 2 cases, *Mindanao Bus Employees Labor Union (PLUM) vs. Mindanao Bus Co., et al.*, G. R. No. L-9795, prom. December 28, 1957; *Gomez vs. North Camarines, Lumber Co., Inc.* 104 Phil., 294, some statements implying a different view have been made, but we now hold and declare the principle set forth

in the next preceding paragraph as the one governing all cases of this nature."

Three days after the promulgation of the decision in the Price Stabilization case (*supra*), we again held in *Sta. Cecilia Saw Mills Co. vs. Court of Industrial Relations, et al.* 108 Phil., 300:

"It appears from the 'compliance' of the respondents * * * that they are no longer in the service of the petitioner, * * * and that they are not seeking reinstatement to their respective positions. Hence no labor dispute is involved in the case and for that reason the Court of Industrial Relations has not jurisdiction to hear and determine the respondents' petition."

The decisions abovequoted apply squarely to the present case, making it clear and beyond question that the Court of Industrial Relations does not have jurisdiction over respondent Muyot's claims subject matter of case No. 1140-V filed with said court.

Respondent Muyot must have finally realized that the Court of Industrial Relations had no jurisdiction over his claims for, according to his answer filed in the present case, he had filed on July 14, 1961—more than two years after the filing of his action—a motion for leave to amend his complaint and to admit the amended complaint attached to his motion, the amendment consisting precisely in the addition of a third cause of action where, *inter alia*, he alleged that on May 31, 1953, he was illegally dismissed by herein petitioner and that, as a consequence, he was entitled to reinstatement, with back wages from the date of his illegal dismissal up to his actual reinstatement.

Obviously the purpose of the amendment was to make his case fall within the jurisdiction of the respondent court. This attempt is, in our opinion, of no avail.

It is settled in this jurisdiction that the jurisdiction of a court is determined by the allegations made in the complaint or petition. On the other hand, we have also held heretofore that this principle applies to proceedings in the Court of Industrial Relations (*Administrator etc. vs. Alberto, et al.*, G. R. No. L-12133, October 31, 1958).

The insufficiency of the allegations of Muyot's complaint to place his action within the jurisdiction of the respondent court could not be cured by amendment, for in *Rosario vs. Carandang*, we clearly held that "a complaint can not be amended so as to confer jurisdiction on the court in which it is filed, if the cause of action originally set forth was not within the court's jurisdiction." (*Rosario vs. Carandang, et al.*, 96 Phil., 845 51 Off. Gaz. [5] 23871).

Moreover, the record does not show at all that the Court of Industrial Relations has admitted the amended complaint.

In the light of our view on the question of jurisdiction, we deem it unnecessary, for the purpose of this decision, to decide the question of *res judicata* and prescription of the causes of action raised in the petition under consideration.

Wherefore, the writs prayed for are granted and, as a consequence, the orders complained of are annulled. With costs.

Bengzon, C. J., Padilla, Labrador, Concepcion, Reyes, J. B. L., Paredes, and Makalintal, 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.