

GENEROSO AMOSCO, COMPLAINANT, VS. JUDGE ADRIANO O. MAGRO OF CAN-AVID, EASTERN SAMAR, RESPONDENT.*A.M. No. 439-MJ. September 30, 1976*

Ponente: FERNANDO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/a-m-no-439/>**FERNANDO, J.:**

Respondent Judge Adriano O. Magro of Can-avid, Eastern Samar, would be held answerable by complainant, Generoso Amosco, of grave misconduct in office for his alleged failure to pay the amount of P215.80 for the purchase of empty Burma sacks. Respondent was required to answer. He denied the charge pointing to the original receipt returned to him by the complainant. Moreover, he invoked the legal defense that since the matter did not involve the discharge of his duties, he could not be held liable for misconduct. Moreover, he took pains to stress that the transaction took place in the town of Dolores and not in Can-avid. Complainant, through counsel, was given the opportunity to file a reply. He did not do so.

The matter was investigated and referred to the Acting Judicial Consultant, Justice Lorenzo Relova. He recommended that the case "may be dismissed outright." [1] His report stated further: "Pursuant to Section 1(v), Presidential Decree No. 6, '[w]illful failure to pay just debts * * *' is a ground for disciplinary action. The term 'just debts' applies to (1) claims adjudicated by a court of law, or (2) claims the existence and justness of which are admitted by the debtor [Section 19-(N), Rule XVIII, B, Civil Service Rules]. Respondent's defense in his answer of May 8, 1973, namely, that 'he has long settled and paid same indebtedness * * * long time ago as evidenced by the original receipt delivered by * * * complainant' to him * * *, would already refute complainant's assertion and place the money claim beyond the purview of the term 'just debts.'" [2]

The recommendation of the Acting Judicial Consultant merits the approval of this Court. Misconduct in office was authoritatively defined by Justice Tuazon in *Lacson v. Lopez* [3] in these words: "Misconduct in office has a definite and well-understood legal meaning. By uniform legal definition, it is a misconduct such as affects his performance of his duties as an officer and not such only as affects his character as a private individual. In such cases, it has been said at all times, it is necessary to separate the character of the man from the character of the officer. * * * It is settled that misconduct, mis-feasance, or malfeasance warranting removal from office of an officer, must have direct relation to and be connected with the performance of official duties amounting either to maladministration or willful, intentional neglect and failure to discharge the duties of the office * * *." [4] More specifically, in *Buenaventura v. Benedicto*, [5] an administrative proceeding against a judge of the court of first instance, the present Chief Justice defines misconduct as referring "to a transgression of some established and definite rule of action, more particularly, unlawful behavior or gross negligence by the public officer." [6] That is to abide by the authoritative doctrine as set forth in the leading case of *In re Horilleno*, [7] a decision penned by Justice Malcolm, which requires that in order for serious misconduct to be shown, there must be "reliable evidence showing that the judicial acts complained of were corrupt or inspired by an intention to violate the law, or were in persistent disregard of well-known legal rules." [8]

WHEREFORE, the administrative complaint against respondent Judge Adriano O. Magro is dismissed for lack of

merit. Let a copy of this resolution be spread on his record.

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

[1] Recommendation of Acting Judicial Consultant, Lorenzo Relova, dated September 1, 1976.

[2] Ibid.

[3] 92 Phil. 456 (1953).

[4] Ibid, 465.

[5] Administrative Case No. 137-J, March 27, 1971, 38 SCRA 71.

[6] Ibid, 76.

[7] 43 Phil. 212 (1922).

[8] Ibid. Cf. Enriquez v. Araula, Adm. Case No. 270-J, Dec. 18, 1973, 54 SCRA 232; Tombo v. Medina, Adm. Case No. 929, Jan. 17, 1974, 55 SCRA 13; Lampauog v. Villarojo, Adm. Matter No. 381-MJ, Jan. 28, 1974, 55 SCRA 304; Bartolome v. De Borja, Adm. Matter No. 1096, May 31, 1976.

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.