

**REINARIO B. BIHAG, MATEO CORTES, BENJAMIN CABATIC,
NASSROLLAH D. MONTUD, TEDDY BERNALES, KARIM
MACAROMPAN, DONATO CALICA, JR., CLAIRE GREBERN ELUMIR,
AND EDGAR DEMAVIVAS, COMPLA...**

A.C. No. 12880 [Formerly CBD Case No. 15-4573], April 29, 2026

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/a-c-no-12880/>

PER CURIAM:

Before the Court is a Motion, for Leave of Court, to Recognize Incorporated Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error for Coram Nobis with Judicial Notice[1] filed by respondent Edgardo O. Era (Era) which, in the main, seeks reversal of the November 23, 2021 Decision[2] (Assailed Decision) of this Court holding him administratively liable for violations of the Lawyer's Oath, Rule 138 of the Rules of Court, and Canons 1, 7, 10, 15, 17, 20, and Rules 1.01, 1.02, 7.03, 10.01, 10.02, 10.03, 20.01, 20.02 and 20.04 of the Code of Professional Responsibility (CPR), for which he was disbarred from the practice of law and ordered to return the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05 to Lanao del Norte Electric Cooperative (LANECO).[3]

Antecedents

The present case originated from a Verified Complaint[4] for disbarment filed by complainants—members of LANECO, namely, Reinario B. Bihag, Benjamin Cabatic, Claire Grebem Elumir, Nassrollah D. Montud, and former members of the Board of Directors of LANECO, namely, Mateo Cortes, Karim Macarompan, Donato Calica, Jr., Teddy Bernales, and Edgar Demavivas (collectively Bihag, et al.)—before the Integrated Bar of the Philippines-Commission on Bar Discipline (IBP-CBD), alleging Era's violation of the Lawyer's Oath and multiple provisions of the CPR.

In the Assailed Decision,[5] the Court upheld the factual and legal findings of the IBP-CBD. However, diverging from the recommended two-year suspension, the Court, in accordance with Rule 138, Section 27 of the Rules of Court,[6] imposed the penalty of disbarment upon Era, citing his various ethical breaches that rendered him unfit to practice law. The Court adjudged Era administratively liable for unlawful, dishonest, and deceitful conduct, which undermined public trust in the legal system, and for violations of the Lawyer's Oath, Rule 138 of the Rules of Court, and Canons 1, 7, 10, 15, 17, 20, and Rules 1.01, 1.02, 7.03, 10.01, 10.02, 10.03, 20.01, 20.02 and 20.04 of the CPR. Specifically, the Court found that:

a)

Era took advantage of his superior knowledge of the law when he split LANECO's causes of action into two separate petitions (one for real property tax and another for franchise tax) to charge multiple fees, despite the issues being interrelated and capable of resolution in a single case;[7]

b)

Era engaged in dishonest and deceitful conduct by overcharging his success fees;[8]

c)

Era engaged in deceitful conduct by deliberately withholding a copy of the engagement contract from the LANEKO Board of Directors;[9]

d)

Era engaged in dishonest and deceitful conduct by colluding with Engineer Resnol Torres to manipulate the outcome of the collection suit brought against LANEKO for the recovery of his success fees;[10] and

e)

Era's attempt to claim success fees resulted in other violations of the provisions of the CPR such as causing controversy with client concerning compensation, and continuing to represent LANEKO despite having been discharged as its counsel.[11]

The Court concluded that Era, rather than being an advocate of justice, became a perpetrator of injustice.[12] His reprehensible conduct proves that he represents the embodiment of what a lawyer must never be.[13]

The Court likewise directed Era to return to LANEKO the sum of PHP 4,159,749.05 within 30 days from receipt of a copy of the Assailed Decision. This amount represents the excess of what the Court deemed as adequate compensation for all legal services rendered by Era to LANEKO.[14] Furthermore, Era was ordered to pay a fine of PHP 10,000.00 for non-compliance with the directives of the IBP-CBD.[15]

Despite a lapse of over two years since the Assailed Decision was rendered, Era has failed to comply with the Court's order to return the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05 to LANEKO. Consequently, Bihag, et al. filed a Motion with Manifestation[16] dated March 4, 2024, requesting the Court to issue an order enforcing the Assailed Decision and directing Era to return the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05 to LANEKO.

The Court subsequently issued a Resolution[17] dated May 28, 2024 (Show Cause Order), directing Era to explain why he should not be held in contempt for failing to comply with the Assailed Decision, specifically the directive to return the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05. In addition, the Court directed Era to comply with the Assailed Decision to return the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05 to LANEKO within 10 days from notice of the Resolution.

Era initially responded by filing a Notice, Response & Motion, with Leave of Court, for Extension of Time, to File More Appropriate Response & Motion (Motion for Time)[18] dated July 1, 2024, asserting that he has received "new evidence" which would prove Bihag et al.'s fabrication and suppression of evidence, thereby seriously impairing the administration of justice, and allowing governmental misconduct. Thus, Era requested a 30-day extension to prepare a more "appropriate response and motion." [19]

On August 16, 2024, Bihag et al. filed their Comment/Opposition[20] to Era's Motion for Time, arguing that said Motion for Time should be denied outright for being frivolous, Bihag et al. claim that LANEKO's tax liability being mentioned by Era as the basis for the alleged fabrication is entirely different from the year of LANEKO's tax liability subject of Era's disbarment complaint.[21]

On August 20, 2024, the Court issued a Resolution[22] granting Era's Motion for Time with a warning that no further extension will be given.

After more than two months from his requested period of extension, or on October 18, 2024, Era filed his (1) Reply to Comment, and (2) Motion, For Leave of Court, To Recognize Incorporated Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error for Coram Nobis with Judicial Notice (Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error)[23] dated October 18, 2024, wherein he directly challenged the Assailed Decision. He reiterated his allegations of intentional suppression and

fabrication of evidence by Bihag et al., which he argued constituted prosecutorial misconduct, misled the Court and led to his wrongful disbarment.[24] Thus, he prayed for the case to be remanded to the IBP-CBD for reinvestigation.[25]

In particular, Era advanced the following arguments: (a) Bihag et al.'s assertion of only a PHP 31 million real property tax liability is belied by the fact that LANECO actually paid real property tax amounting to PHP 97.2 million from 1995 to 2018;[26] (b) his representations concerning LANECO's real property tax liability remained consistent, whereas Bihag et al.'s claims were predicated on falsehoods, fabricated evidence, and the suppression of crucial information;[27] (c) the collusion between LANECO's Board of Directors and the Provincial Government of Lanao del Norte warranted his initiation of legal action against LANECO;[28] and (d) the newly surfaced suppressed evidence demonstrated that his decision not to withdraw from the case in the proceedings before the Court of Appeals – Cagayan de Oro, were based on a legitimate agreement with LANECO and not intended to prejudice its interests.[29]

On January 14, 2025, the Court noted Bihag et al.'s Comment/Opposition to Era's Motion for Time dated July 1, 2024 and Era's Reply to said Comment/Opposition.[30]

The Court's Ruling

The Court resolves to deny with finality the instant Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error as no compelling reason and no substantial argument have been adduced by respondent to warrant the grant of the reliefs sought. Respondent is likewise found liable of the less serious offense of willful and deliberate disobedience of the orders of the Court for filing his Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error more than two months beyond the extension granted by the Court. Moreover, respondent is cited in indirect contempt for his continued refusal to comply with the Court's order to return the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05 to LANECO. In addition, the clerk of court is directed to issue a Writ of Execution to enforce the Assailed Decision directing respondent to return the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05.

Preliminarily, respondent's Motion. for Issuance for Writ of Error should be denied outright in accordance with the doctrine of finality and immutability of judgment. The doctrine precludes the reconsideration of final and executory judgments absent any of the settled exceptions.

In the present case, respondent's pleading, although captioned as "Motion, For Leave of Court, To Recognize Incorporated Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error for Coram Nobis with Judicial Notice," is, in its essence and effect, a motion seeking reconsideration of the Assailed Decision, and as such, is impermissible. The prayer of the Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error states:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Respondent respectfully prays before this Honorable Supreme Court En Banc, to issue the Resolution with following order, viz.:

1. To admit the instant pleading though belatedly filed based on the aforesaid grounds with profuse apologies but incomparable to the period of time of [14] years within which this was not disclosed and suppressed and defer the implementation of the Decision;
2. To refer the matter to IBP-CBD2.1. to determine the existence and authenticity of the aforesaid newly emerging documents, and other memoranda, internal communications and minutes of the meetings, which are suppressed but secured by the Respondent as mere machine copies up to now. Nonetheless, admitted by Petitioners and Opposing in its most recent comment dated [August 16, 2024];
- 2.2. To take judicial notice of those proceedings where fabricated and suppressed evidence were used and as proof of prosecutorial misconduct to bring miscarriage of justice such as: 2.2.1. NEA-Adcom, NEA, Court of Appeals and the Honorable Supreme Court;

2.2.2. IBP-CBD and this Honorable Supreme Court En Banc;

2.2.3. RTC-Tubod, Lanao Del Norte and Court of Appeals as proof how the events transpired and took advantage by Petitioners and Opposing Counsel;

2.2.4. Make a consolidated recommendation on the basis of its findings and, eventually, vacate its Decision.

Thereafter, all other prayers that are just and equitable are likewise prayed for under the extra-ordinary circumstances.[31] (Emphasis supplied.)

It is important to reiterate that the Assailed Decision, promulgated on November 23, 2021, has already attained finality.[32] Era failed to timely file a motion for reconsideration within the prescribed fifteen-day period from the receipt of a copy of the Assailed Decision.[33] Consequently, this Court is precluded from entertaining any subsequent motions for reconsideration, as doing so would violate the established doctrine of finality or immutability of judgment.

As explained by this Court in *Montehermoso v. Batuto*:[34]

Under the doctrine of finality of judgment or immutability of judgment, a decision that has acquired finality becomes immutable and unalterable, and may no longer be modified in any respect, even if the modification is meant to correct erroneous conclusions of fact and law, and whether it be made by the court that rendered it or by the Highest Court of the land. Any act which violates this principle must immediately be struck down.[35]

Moreover, in *Aliviado v. Procter & GamblePhils., Inc.*,[36] the Court held that:

It is a hornbook rule that once a judgment has become final and executory, it may no longer be modified in any respect, even if the modification is meant to correct an erroneous conclusion of fact or law, and regardless of whether the modification is attempted to be made by the court rendering it or by the highest court of the land, as what remains to be done is the purely ministerial enforcement or execution of the judgment

The doctrine of finality of judgment is grounded on fundamental considerations of public policy and sound practice that at the risk of occasional errors, the judgment of adjudicating bodies must become final and executory on some definite date fixed by law. [...], the Supreme Court reiterated that the doctrine of immutability of final judgment is adhered to by necessity notwithstanding occasional errors that may result thereby, since litigations must somehow come to an end for otherwise, it would even be more intolerable than the wrong and injustice it is designed to correct.[37]

While there are recognized exceptions to the doctrine of finality or immutability of judgment, namely, correction of clerical errors, nunc pro tunc entries which cause no prejudice to any party, and void judgments,[38] it bears stressing that respondent has not presented any argument that falls under any of these exceptions. Respondent's reliance on the purported fabrication and suppression of evidence as a basis for vacating the Assailed Decision is untenable and does not fall within the purview of the recognized exceptions to the doctrine of finality or immutability of judgment.

The above considered, the Motion for the Issuance of Writ of Error must be denied.

In any case, even if the Court disregards the rule on immutability of judgment, the Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error remains untenable due to its failure to demonstrate any compelling grounds that would warrant a review of the Assailed Decision, and consequently, the grant of the reliefs sought.

Respondent's claim of fabrication of evidence by the complainants is patently false and unsupported by the records.

To prove that complainants' claim of PHP 31,112,311.64 real property tax liability is false, respondent relies on

documents purportedly showing that LANECO paid PHP 97,208,318.66 in real property taxes to the Provincial Government of Lanao Del Norte for the period of 1995 to 2018.[39] However, even without delving into the authenticity of these documents, it is evident that they pertain to a period different from that considered in the complainants' Verified Complaint and Position Paper, as well as in the Assailed Decision, which is from 1993 to 2009.[40] Hence, the amount of tax liabilities would surely be different.

Moreover, respondent's computation of the estimated real property tax liabilities of LANECO[41] cannot be sufficient basis to conclude that complainants fabricated evidence by claiming that its real property tax liabilities amounted only to PHP 31,112,311.64. It must be noted that complainants' claim is based on a Certification issued by the Office of the Provincial Treasurer of the Province,[42] and under Rule 130, Section 46 of the Rules of Court, as amended, "[e]ntries in official records made in the performance of [their] duty by a public officer of the Philippines, or by a person in the performance of a duty specially enjoined by law, are prima facie evidence of the facts therein stated."

Verily, other than his self-serving speculation, respondent failed to adduce evidence to prove that complainants indeed misrepresented or fabricated evidence to show that the real property tax liability of LANECO as of June 30, 2005 is only PHP 31,112,311.64.

As regards respondent's other arguments in the Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error, namely, the collusion between LANECO's Board of Directors and the Provincial Government of Lanao del Norte, and his alleged justified non-withdrawal from the case filed before the Court of Appeals, such arguments are based on his claims of the complainants' supposed fabrication and suppression of evidence. Thus, in light of the discussions above, such arguments have no leg to stand on. In any event, these issues have already been sufficiently addressed by this Court in the Assailed Decision and thus, require no further discussion.

Notably, respondent's continued disregard of the Rules did not escape this Court's attention.

First, respondent requested for an extension of 30 days or until July 31, 2024, to submit a "more appropriate response" to the Court's Show Cause Order.[43] However, his "more appropriate response," which is his Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error, was filed only on October 18, 2024, significantly beyond the deadline he himself requested.

For the foregoing act, the Court finds respondent liable under Canon VI, Section 34(c) of the Code of Professional Responsibility and Accountability (CPRA)[44] viz.:

SECTION 34. Less serious offenses. – Less serious offenses include:

...

(c) Violation of Supreme Court rules and issuances in relation to Bar Matters and administrative disciplinary proceedings, including willful and deliberate disobedience of the orders of the Supreme Court and the IBP;

Respondent is liable for willful and deliberate disobedience for filing his Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error more than two months beyond the extended period granted by the Court.

Notably, respondent himself acknowledges the delay and explained that such delay is "[d]ue to prolonged evidence suppression and misrepresentation by the petitioners and opposing counsel,"[45] and that consequently, he believes he "should be granted additional time to uncover truth after 14 years of evidence suppression to end the misrepresentation." [46]

This explanation by respondent is not only insufficient to justify the belated filing of his Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error but is also misleading. Notably the purported "newly surfaced" documents referenced by respondent

in his Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error are the same documents he already attached to his Motion for Time. The Court thus finds respondent's belated filing inexcusable.

In *Tuazon v. Atty. Dela Cruz*,^[47] the Court found the lawyer liable for willful and deliberate disobedience under Canon VI, Section 34(c) of the CPRA for his "audacious disregard of the lawful orders [...] illustrated by his unjustified failure to file an answer despite imploring the IBP for an extension of time."^[48]

In view of the above, a fine in the amount of PHP 35,000.00 is imposed upon respondent pursuant to Canon VI, Section 37(b) of the CPRA.^[49]

Second, as also discussed above, respondent failed to timely comply with the Court's Assailed Decision requiring him to return to LANECO the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05 within 30 days from receipt of the Decision. Moreover, respondent's "more appropriate response" to the Court's Show Cause Order and reiterative directive for him to Comply with the Court's Assailed Decision within 10 days from receipt of the Resolution was to file a Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error which, as already discussed above, utterly lacks merit.

Canon VI, Section 41 of the CPRA provides:

SECTION 41. Payment of fines and return of client's money and property. – When the penalty imposed is a fine or the respondent is ordered to return the client's money or property, the respondent shall pay or return it within a period not exceeding three (3) months from receipt of the decision or resolution. If unpaid or returned, the Court may cite the respondent in indirect contempt. (Emphasis supplied)

In *Castillejos Consumers Association, Inc. v. Dominguez*,^[50] the Court defined contempt of court, as follows:

Contempt of court has been defined as a willful disregard or disobedience, of a public authority. In its broad sense, contempt is a disregard of, or disobedience to, the rules or orders of a legislative or judicial body or an interruption of its proceedings by disorderly behavior or insolent language in its presence or so near thereto as to disturb its proceedings or to impair the respect due to such a body. In its restricted and more usual sense, contempt comprehends a despising of the authority justice, or dignity of a court.

There are two (2) kinds of contempt of court, namely: direct and indirect. Indirect contempt or constructive contempt is that which is committed out of the presence of the court. A person Who is guilty of disobedience or of resistance to a lawful order of a court or who commits any improper conduct tending, directly or indirectly, to impede, obstruct, or degrade the administration of justice may be punished for indirect contempt.^[51] (Citations omitted)

In relation thereto, Rule 71, Section 3 of the Rules of Court provides for the following acts that may be punished for indirect contempt, viz.:

Section 3. Indirect contempt to be punished after charge and hearing. — After a charge in writing has been filed, and an opportunity given to the respondent to comment thereon within such period as may be fixed by the court and to be heard by himself or counsel, a person guilty of any of the following acts may be punished for indirect contempt;(a) Misbehavior of an officer of a court in the performance of his official duties or in his official transactions;

(b) Disobedience of or resistance to a lawful writ, process, order, or judgment of a court, including the act of a person who, after being dispossessed or ejected from any real property by the judgment or process of any court of competent jurisdiction, enters or attempts or induces another to enter into or upon such real property, for the purpose of executing acts of ownership or possession, or in any manner disturbs the possession given to the person adjudged to be entitled thereto;

(c) Any abuse of or any unlawful interference with the processes or proceedings of a court not constituting

direct contempt under section 1 of this Rule;

(d) Any improper conduct tending, directly or indirectly, to impede, obstruct, or degrade the administration of justice;

(e) Assuming to be an attorney or an officer of a court, and acting as such without authority;

(f) Failure to obey a subpoena duly served;

(g) The rescue, or attempted rescue, of a person or property in the custody of an officer by virtue of an order or process of a court held by him.

The foregoing considered, the Court finds respondent guilty of indirect contempt of court under Rule 71, Section 3 of the Rules of Court, which provides for liability in cases of "[d]isobedience of or resistance to a lawful writ, process, order, judgment, or command of a court," and "any improper conduct tending, directly or indirectly, to impede, obstruct, or degrade the administration of justice" in relation to Canon VI, Section 4 of the CPRA, for his repeated and willful defiance of this Court's orders to return the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05 to LANECO as stated in the Assailed Decision and the Resolution dated May 28, 2024.

As held by the Court in *Marcos v Comelec*,^[52] the power to cite in contempt must be wielded to ensure the infallibility of justice where the defiance or disobedience is patent and contumacious that there is an evident refusal to obey.^[53]

Respondent's persistent and repeated defiance of a final judgment and his attempt to obstruct its execution through his unmeritorious and misleading Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error constitute such contumacious conduct, warranting the finding of indirect contempt.

The absence of a formal hearing in the present case is of no moment. As established in *In re Laureta v. Intermediate Appellate Court*,^[54] in contempt cases, a 'trial-type' proceeding is not mandatory as due process requires only that the respondent be afforded an opportunity to be heard.^[55] In this case, respondent was duly provided such opportunity through the Show Cause Order.

Anent the penalty, the Court finds the penalty of fine in the amount of PHP 30,000.00 as appropriate pursuant to Rule 71, Section 7 of the Rules of Court.^[56]

Lastly, the Court directs the clerk of court of the Supreme Court to issue a writ of execution to enforce the Assailed Decision, particularly with respect to the Court's directive for respondent to return the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05 to LANECO.

Under Rule 39,^[57] Section 1 of the Rules of Court, execution shall issue as a matter of right, on motion, upon a judgment or order that disposes of the action or proceeding upon the expiration of the period to appeal therefrom if no appeal has been duly perfected.

In *Camino v. Atty. Pasagui*,^[58] the Court cited the same provision of Rule 39, in relation to Rule 135, Section 6 of the 1997 Rules of Court to enforce a decision in a disbarment complaint. In said case, the Court directed the clerk of court of the Supreme Court to issue a writ of execution following a motion filed by therein complainant to enforce the decision ordering therein respondent to return the loan proceeds to the complainant. The Court explained that the judgment in said case is immediately executory, and therefore enforceable after rendition. It further stated that the execution of the decision therein is already a matter of right, hence, a writ of execution may issue.^[59]

In this case, the Assailed Decision promulgated on November 23, 2021 has long attained finality. Respondent

failed to timely file a motion for reconsideration within the prescribed 15-day period from his receipt of a copy thereof. It was only after March 4, 2024, when complainants filed their Motion with Manifestation stating that respondent has failed to comply with the Court's order to return the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05, that respondent started filing pleadings before this Court to question the Assailed Decision. Surely, at that point, the Assailed Decision has long attained finality and thus, execution should issue as a matter of right on motion of the complainants.

While complainants never expressly prayed for the issuance of a writ of execution, the Court finds that their Motion with Manifestation dated March 4, 2024 praying for the issuance of an order "directing anew [respondent] to return the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05 due to LANECO"[60] is in the nature of a motion for the issuance of a writ execution, in substantial compliance with Rule 39, Section 1 of the Rules of Court. Moreover, in their Comment/Opposition dated August 16, 2024, complainants repeatedly asserted that respondent should comply with the Assailed Decision by returning the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05.[61] Also, in their Motion with Manifestation and Comment/Opposition, complainants prayed for "such further relief and remedies which may be deemed just and equitable under the premises." [62] Verily, complainants' prayer for the issuance of a motion for writ of execution is evident and can be reasonably deduced from their Motion with Manifestation and Comment/Opposition. The Court thus considers and treats complainants' Motion with Manifestation and Comment/Opposition as their motion for the issuance of writ of execution to enforce the Court's directive in the Assailed Decision.

In view thereof, the Court directs the clerk of court of the Supreme Court to issue a Writ of Execution to enforce the Assailed Decision. However, in as much as this Court does not have a sheriff of its own and the Office of the Judiciary Marshals is not yet fully organized, the Ex-Officio Sheriff of Quezon City is directed to execute the money judgment against respondent in accordance with Rule 39, Section 9 of the Rules of Court.

Moreover, to aid the Court, the executive judge of the Regional Trial Court in Quezon City, respondent's place of residence, is hereby authorized to oversee the proceedings of execution; act on and resolve any incident arising therefrom; issue alias Writ of Execution, if necessary, as if the judgment under execution was rendered by the Regional Trial Court; receive and approve the Ex-Officio Sheriffs Return; and to submit Reports on the execution to the clerk of court of the Supreme Court.

ACCORDINGLY, the Court resolves to:

1)

DENY with finality the Motion, for Leave of Court, to Recognize Incorporated Motion for Issuance of Writ of Error for Coram Nobis with Judicial Notice filed by respondent Edgardo O. Era;

2)

FIND respondent Edgardo O. Era GUILTY of INDIRECT CONTEMPT of the Supreme Court. Accordingly, the Court orders him to pay a fine in the amount of PHP 30,000.00, within 30 days from notice of this Resolution;

3)

FIND respondent Edgardo O. Era GUILTY of the less serious offense of willful and deliberate disobedience of the orders of the Court under Canon VI; Section 34(c), of the CPRA. Accordingly, the Court ORDERS him to pay a fine in the amount of PHP 35,000.00, within 30 days from notice of this Resolution;

4)

DIRECT the clerk of court of the Supreme Court to ISSUE, within 10 days from notice, a Writ of Execution ordering respondent Edgardo O. Era to RETURN to Lanao del Norte Electric Cooperative the amount of PHP 4,159,749.05.

The clerk of court of the Supreme Court shall immediately transmit the Writ of Execution to the executive judge and the ex-officio sheriff of the Regional Trial Court of Quezon City (with the certified copies of this Resolution and the Decision promulgated on November 23, 2021) for prompt service and implementation.

The legal fees for the service and implementation of the Writ of Execution as provided in Rule 141 of the Rules of Court shall be paid by the complainants.

The executive judge of the Regional Trial Court of Quezon City is hereby authorized to oversee the proceedings of execution; act on and resolve any incident arising therefrom; issue alias Writ of Execution, if necessary, as if the judgment under execution was rendered by the Regional Trial Court; receive and approve Sheriff's Returns; and to submit to the clerk of court of the Supreme Court a Report on the execution; within 15 days, from receipt of the first Sheriffs Return, and a final Report on execution, within 15 days from receipt of the Sheriffs Return stating that judgment is satisfied in full.

Complainants are directed to hereafter deal with the executive judge and the ex-officio sheriff of Quezon City in relation to the enforcement of the Assailed Decision.

5)

REQUIRE the Integrated Bar of the Philippines to CONFIRM within 10 days from receipt of this Resolution, whether respondent Edgardo O. Era has paid the fine of PHP 10,000.00 in accordance with the Decision dated November 23, 2021.

6)

DIRECT respondent Edgardo O. Era to promptly submit to this Court written proof of his compliance with the aforesaid directives of the Court within 15 days from payment of the full amount.

Further, respondent Edgardo O. Era is STERNLY WARNED that his failure to comply with the foregoing directives shall be dealt with more severely.

SO ORDERED.

Gesmundo, C.J., Leonen, S.J., Caguioa, Inting, Zalameda, Gaerlan, Rosario, Dimaampao, Marquez, Kho, Jr., Singh, and Villanueva, JJ., concur.

Hernando, [**] J., on leave.

Lazaro-Javier [***] and J. Lopez, [***] JJ., on official business.

[*] Also referred to as "Reinardo B. Bihag" in some parts of the rollo.

[**] On leave.

[***] On official business.

[1] Rollo, pp. 595-698.

[2] Id. at 484-508.

[3] Id. at 506.

[4] Id. at 2-29.

[5] Id. at 484-508.

[6] Sec. 27. Attorneys removed or suspended by Supreme Court on what grounds. — A member of the bar may be disbarred or suspended from his office as attorney by the Supreme Court for any deceit, malpractice, or other gross misconduct in such office, grossly immoral conduct, or by reason of his conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude, or for any violation of the oath which he is required to take before admission to practice, or for a willful disobedience appearing as an attorney for a party to a case without authority so to do. The practice of soliciting cases at law for the purpose of gain, either personally or through paid agents or brokers, constitutes malpractice.

[7] Rollo, pp. 491-492.

[8] Id. at 492-494.

[9] Id. at 494-495.

[10] Id. at 495-498.

[11] Id. at 498-500.

[12] Id. at 502.

[13] Id.

[14] Id. at 506.

[15] Id.

[16] Id. at 521-523.

[17] Id. at 528-529.

[18] Id. at 531-534.

[19] Id. at 533.

[20] Id. at 589-592.

[21] Id. at 590.

[22] Id. at 558.

[23] Id. at 595-698.

[24] Id. at 595-610.

[25] Id. at 610.

[26] Id. at 604-606.

[27] Id. at 606-607.

[28] Id. at 607-608.

[29] Id. at 608-610.

[30] Id. at 700-701.

[31] Id. at 610.

[32] See *Yap-Sumndad v. Friday's Holdings, Inc.*, 869 Phil. 232, 239-240 (2020) [Per C.J. Peralta, First Division].

[33] RULES OF COURT, rule 52, sec. 1.

[34] 891 Phil. 532 (2020) [Per J. Lazaro-Javier, Second Division].

[35] Id. at 532.

[36] 665 Phil. 542 (2011) [Per J. Del Castillo, Second Division].

[37] Id. at 551.

[38] 582 Phil. 357, 367 (2008) [Per J. Velasco, Jr., Second Division].

[39] Rollo, pp. 604-607.

[40] See *Bihag v. Era*, 916 Phil. 174 (2021) [Per Curiam, En Banc].

[41] Rollo, p. 605.

[42] Id. at 573.

[43] Id. at 531-556.

[44] The Code of Professional Responsibility was repealed by A.M. No. 22-09-01-SC or the Code of Professional Responsibility and Accountability, which took effect on May 29, 2023. Significantly, Section 1 of the CPRA provides for its retroactive application, such that, it shall be applied in all pending and future cases, except in instances where "in the opinion of the Supreme Court, its retroactive application would not be feasible or would work injustice, in which case, the procedure under which the cases were filed shall govern." Here, the Court deems the application of CPRA to be proper.

[45] Rollo, p. 599.

[46] Id.

[47] A.C. No. 14000, July 18, 2025 [Per J. Dimaampao, En Banc].

[48] Id. at 13. This pinpoint citation refers to the copy of the Decision uploaded to the Supreme Court website.

[49] Code of Professional Responsibility and Accountability, Canon VI, sec. 37. Sanctions. – ... (b) If the respondent is found guilty of a less serious offense, any of the following sanctions, or a combination thereof, shall be imposed: (1) Suspension from the practice of law for a period within the range of one (1) month to six (6) months, or revocation of notarial commission and disqualification as a notary public for less than two (2) years; (2) A fine within the range of [PHP] 35,000.00 to [PHP] 100,000.00.

[50] 757 Phil. 149 (2015) [Per J. Mendoza, Second Division].

[51] Id. at 158-159.

[52] G.R. No. 277280, September 30, 2025 [Per J. Singh, En Banc].

[53] Id. at 13-14. This pinpoint citation refers to the copy of the Decision uploaded to the Supreme Court website.

[54] 232 Phil. 353 (1987) [Per Curiam, En Banc].

[55] Id. at 389-390.

[56] Sec. 7. Punishment for indirect contempt. — If the respondent is adjudged guilty of indirect contempt committed against a Regional Trial Court or a court of equivalent or higher rank, he may be punished by a fine not exceeding thirty thousand pesos or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

[57] Section 1. Execution upon judgments or final orders. – Execution shall issue as a matter of right, on motion, upon a judgment or order that disposes of the action or proceeding upon the expiration of the period to appeal therefrom if no appeal has been duly perfected. If the appeal has been duly perfected and finally resolved, the execution may forthwith be applied for in the court of origin; on motion of the judgment obligee, submitting therewith certified true copies of the judgment or judgments or final order or orders sought to be enforced and of the entry thereof, with notice to the adverse party. The appellate court may, on motion in the same case, when the interest of justice so requires, direct the court of origin to issue the writ of execution.

[58] 804 Phil. 613 (2017) [Per Curiam, En Banc].

[59] Id. at 616-617.

[60] Rollo, p. 522.

[61] Id. at 590.

[62] Id. at 522, 590.

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.