

**VICTORIANO FAJOTA, COMPLAINANT, VS. HON. CESAR BALONSO,
ACTING MUNICIPAL JUDGE OF PAIAUIG, ZAMBALES, RESPONDENT.***Adm. Mat. No. 1840-MJ. June 11, 1981*

Ponente: DE CASTRO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/9f944f44b74d/>**DE CASTRO, J.:**

In a verified complaint dated February 21, 1978, complainant charges respondent Judge with gross ignorance of the law. It is alleged in said complaint that respondent, while acting as Municipal Judge of Palauig, Zambales, accepted a criminal complaint for libel filed by one Jose J. Gutierrez against herein complainant, who was deprived of his liberty for more than ten (10) hours when respondent ordered his arrest; that the libel suit was based on the letter of complainant in his capacity as "Kagawad ng Sanggunian Bayan," to the Board of Directors of Zambales Electric Cooperative, Inc. (ZAMECO) regarding the employment in the Cooperative of two active politicians who have pending criminal cases in court; that complainant was only released after posting a real estate bond on June 27, 1977; that respondent ordered his arraignment and the second stage of preliminary investigation on August 5, 1977; that after arraignment, the records were remanded to the Court of First Instance of Zambales, Branch II, Iba; that the actuations of respondent are not in accordance with the provisions of Article 360[1] of the Revised Penal Code, as amended by Republic Act No. 4363, and in utter disregard of Circular No. 27 dated April 5, 1965 of the Department [now Ministry] of Justice reminding judges of inferior courts of said amendment.

Answering the complaint, respondent denied the charge regarding the posting of bail by complainant and contended that "as far as bailbond is concerned, it was prepared and passed upon by the Municipal Court of Castillejos, Zambales, and sent by mail to respondent"; that no preliminary investigation (second stage) was conducted since herein complainant waived the same; that he does not intend to evade any responsibility, and if he had made a mistake in the application of the law, it was because of the ruling enunciated in the case of *Mercader vs. Hon. Valila* (1 SCRA 503-505) wherein the Court held that Republic Act No. 1289, approved on June 15, 1955, amending Art. 360 of the Revised Penal Code, did not deprive the justices of the peace of their power to conduct preliminary investigation; and that said ruling made respondent overlook the later amendment of Art. 360 by Republic Act 4363 on June 19, 1965.

Deputy Court Administrator Romeo D. Mendoza in his Memorandum dated February 24, 1981 pointed out that respondent acted on the complaint for libel contrary to the provisions of Republic Act 4363 since respondent is a Municipal Judge of neither a city nor of a capital of the province; that the claim that he overlooked the amendment introduced by RA 4363 is not a valid excuse for ignorance of the plain categorical provision of the said law, and therefore, he acted without jurisdiction; and in view thereof he recommended the suspension of respondent from office for a period of six (6) months without pay.

We agree with the aforesaid findings and conclusion. It appears undisputed that respondent violated the provision of RA 4363 amending Art. 360 of the Revised Penal Code when he took cognizance of the libel case filed before his court. His explanation for his having overlooked the latest amendment to Art. 360 is not a valid excuse for

ignorance of the provision of said law. It is more so after this Court, in the case of *Quizon vs. Baltazar*[2] a 1975 decision, held, speaking through then Justice Roberto Concepcion:

"The provisions of Act No. 4363 amending Article 360 of the Revised Penal Code are so clear and unmistakable that there can be no room for doubt or even interpretation. In taking cognizance of the libel case, respondent was clearly without jurisdiction. The kindest thing we can say of him is that he is ignorant of the plain and categorical provisions of law. Moreover, as early as April 5, 1967 the Department of Justice circularized all city judges and municipal judges relative to the provisions of Article 360 of the Revised Penal Code as amended by R.A. No. 4363 as follows:

"It should be noted from these provisions that a complaint or information of libel may be filed only in the Court of First Instance. The preliminary investigation of the criminal case may, however, be conducted by the city court of the city or the municipal court of the capital of the province where the case is filed."

There can therefore be no excuse for respondent's error of law."

Respondent judge has exhibited a deplorable lack of assiduity in the effort, which all lawyers specially those dispensing justice, must exert to keep themselves abreast with the growth of the law and jurisprudence. It is thus worthwhile to quote as a stern reminder to him what now Chief Justice Enrique M. Fernando said in his concurring opinion in the abovesited case the following:

". . . It is a truism that the learning process in law does not stop upon graduation from college and admission to the bar. There should be, on the contrary, more sustained intellectual effort on the part of the members of the legal profession. Certainly, judges are not exempt from this obligation. It is even more incumbent on them as they are thought of as the "oracles of the law." There is likely then to be a disillusionment in the judicial process if, as did happen here, an occupant of the bench was found to be woefully lacking in legal knowledge. Nor is this the deplorable aspect of this unfortunate occurrence. There is an even more imperative need for proficiency in the law under a regime of martial rule. The efforts for improvement in the mode of administering the government in all its manifold complexity would come to naught if our people can harbor the suspicion that judges do not even know what the law is."

WHEREFORE, premises considered, respondent judge is hereby suspended from office for a period of six (6) months without pay, with warning that a repetition of similar act shall be administratively dealt with more severely. Let a copy of this resolution be attached to respondent's personal record.

SO ORDERED.

Fernando, C.J., Teehankee, Barredo, Makasiar, Aquino, Concepcion Jr., Fernandez, Guerrero, Abad Santos and Melencio-Herrera, JJ., concur.

[1] "Art. 360 Preliminary investigation of criminal actions for written defamations as provided for in the chapter shall be conducted by the provincial or city fiscal of the province or city, or by the Municipal Court of the City or capital of the province where such actions may be instituted in accordance with the provisions of this article."

[2] 65 SCRA 293.

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.