

**ABOITIZ & COMPANY, INC., PETITIONER, VS.
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION COMMISSION, HERMOGENA T.
CAÑETE AND PIONEER DETECTIVE CREDIT SECURITY AGENCY, INC.,
RESPONDENTS.**

G.R. No. L-42134. April 30, 1976

Ponente: TEEHANKEE, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/9bdbc26922ca/>

TEEHANKEE, J.:

While respondent Workmen's Compensation Commission correctly held petitioner as the owner of the establishment guarded by the deceased security guard liable for the payment of death compensation as the statutory employer, respondent commission erred in not holding respondent Pioneer Detective Credit Security Agency, Inc. as the direct employer or agency who supplied the security guard liable in turn to petitioner for reimbursement of the amount of compensation awarded.

In its Resolution of even date, the Court denied for lack of merit the petition of petitioner Aboitiz & Co. Inc. for review of respondent Workmen's Compensation Commission's decision affirming its Cebu Unit's decision ordering petitioner to pay respondent claimant Hermogena T. Cañete as widow and her minor children death benefits in the sum of P6,000.00 for the death of Anastacio Cañete (from hypertensive heart disease which caused a fatal heart attack in the course of his employment) plus P200.00 for burial expenses, P300.00 attorney's fee and P61.00 administrative fee and assessing the further sum of P300.00 as attorney's fee and P5.00 as costs of review in the commission.

The Court however gave limited due course to the petition insofar as petitioner claimed the right to be reimbursed by respondent security agency and complained against the commission's absolving sub silentio said agency of all liability from the claim that had been filed against both of them jointly and alternatively. The Court further resolved to treat the limited petition as a special civil action and declared the same submitted for decision after respondent security agency had failed to file its comment despite an extension secured by its counsel, Atty. Edgar Gica, for the purpose (and for which he has been cited for contempt of court).

Petitioner has valid cause for complaint. Under its contract for security guard service with respondent security agency, the latter had expressly assumed sole responsibility for all liabilities under the labor laws including the Workmen's Compensation Act that may be claimed by the guard, as follows:

"h) The AGENCY shall solely assume all responsibilities and liabilities for any claim or demand by or against the guard arising under all Philippine Labor Laws, including overtime pay, extra compensation on Sundays and legal holidays, liability under the Workmen's Compensation Act, Social Security Act, * * *." [1]

While petitioner was statutorily liable [2] for the death compensation for purposes of the Workmen's Compensation Act, still the security agency should be held ultimately liable as the direct employer who employed and furnished the security guard in pursuance of its business of providing business establishments with the

services of security guards. Furthermore, as already indicated, the security agency was contractually liable to hold petitioner safe and harmless from any such claims by virtue of the agency's express contractual undertaking to assume sole and ultimate liability therefor.

ACCORDINGLY, judgment is hereby rendered sentencing respondent Pioneer Detective Credit Security Agency, Inc. to reimburse and pay petitioner all the amounts that were adjudged against petitioner in the respondent commission's decision of November 12, 1975.

SO ORDERED.

Makasiar, Esguerra, Muñoz Palma, and Martin, JJ., concur.

[1] Petition, Rollo, page 11.

[2] (a) "Employer" includes every person or association of persons, incorporated or not, public or private, and the legal representative of the deceased employer. It includes the owner or lessee of a factory or establishment or place of work or any other person who is virtually the owner or manager of the business carried on in the establishment or place of work but who, for the reason that there is an independent contractor in the same, or for any other reason, is not the direct employer of laborers employed there." (Sec. 39 Workmen's Compensation Act as amended.)

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.