

**OFFICE OF THE COURT ADMINISTRATOR, COMPLAINANT, VS.
PRESIDING JUDGE TINGARAAN U. GUILING; CLEOTILDE P. PAULO,
OFFICER-IN-CHARGE; GAUDENCIO P. SIOSON, PROCESS SERVER;
AND REYNER ...**

A.M. No. RTJ-19-2549 [Formerly OCA IPI No. 19-4920-RTJ]. June 18, 2019

Ponente: CARANDANG, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/a3ecbd5e2ac3/>

CARANDANG, J.:

This is an administrative complaint based on the Judicial Audit and Inventory of Cases conducted in the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Branch 109 of Pasay City, presided by Judge Tingaraan Guiling, on April 14-30, 2015, pursuant to Travel Order No. 42 dated April 13, 2015.

In a Memorandum[1] dated December 17, 2015, the judicial audit team reported that as of audit date, Branch 109 had a total case load of 1,456 active cases consisting of 409 criminal cases and 1,047 civil cases, based on the records actually presented to and examined by the team which are classified hereunder according to the status-stage of proceedings:

STATUS/STAGE OF PROCEEDINGS

CRIMINAL

CIVIL

TOTAL

Warrants/Summons

1

59

60

Arraignment

9

0

9

Preliminary Conference/Pre-Trial/JDR

62

73

135

Trial/Hearing

177

265

442

For Compliance

5

127

132

No Action Taken

17

22

39

No Further Action/Setting

78

131

209

With Pending Motions/Incidents

22

92

114

Submitted for Decision

24

130

154

Decided/Withdrawn/ Terminated

2

48

50

Dismissed

5

52

57

Archived

4

45

49

Suspended Proceedings

3

0

3

Newly Filed

0

3

3

TOTAL

409

1047

1456

On May 28, 2015, June 22, 2015, July 10, 2015, and August 6, 2015, Branch 109 forwarded to the Court copies of Orders and Decisions in relation to the list of cases that were needed to be acted upon by RTC, Branch 109, Pasay City. Thereafter, the team found that there were 17 criminal cases with no action taken, 78 criminal cases with no further action/setting, 22 criminal cases with motions/pending incidents, and 24 criminal cases submitted for decision. Meanwhile, there were 22 civil cases with no action taken, 134 civil cases with no further action/setting, 92 civil cases with motions/pending incidents, and 132 civil cases submitted for decision.

The following are the audit team's general adverse findings: 1) many of the records were not paginated nor chronologically arranged; 2) there were Pleadings/Documents[2] received by the court without date and time stamped thereon; 3) there were no returns of summons on the writ of replevin in Civil Case No. 14-16623; 4) not all criminal case folders had Certificates of Arraignment; 5) the court was delayed in the submission of its Semestral Docket Inventory and Monthly Report of Cases with the Statistical Reports Division of the Court Management Office (as of April 2015, the court has yet to submit the 2011 Second Semester of the Semestral Docket Inventory to Second Semester of 2014, and its Monthly Report of Cases for June 2014 to February 2015, both the old and new forms); 6) the court's general docket books were not updated; and 7) the Pre-trial Orders were only signed by the Presiding Judge.

Regarding cases involving annulment of marriages and Recognition of Divorce Decree, the team noted these findings:

- The Office of the Solicitor General filed manifestations and motions that it be furnished copy of the petitions

and other relevant documents. Despite the absence of compliance, trial proceeded.[3]

- Process Server Gaudencio Sioson immediately availed of service of summons by substituted service in many cases on the ground that respondent was either out of the house, in the office, or out for work.[4]

- On the other hand, Sheriff Reyner De Jesus availed of substituted service of summons indicating in his Returns of Summons that he made "several attempts" before resorting to substituted service of summons.[5] There were cases where summons were served by Sheriff de Jesus and the return stated that the same was served "upon a person who claimed to be respondent." The returns made by the Sheriff and the Process Server contained general statements and noncompliance with the rule laid down in G.R. No. 130974, entitled "Ma. Imelda M. Manotoc v. Honorable Court of Appeals and Agapita Trajano, et al." decided on August 16, 2006. Likewise, there was no statement in the Return of the facts and circumstances surrounding the attempted personal service and there were no details on the date and time of the attempts on personal service, the inquiries made to locate the defendant, the name of occupants of the alleged residence of the defendant and the acts done to serve the summons. No statement was made that the person found in the alleged dwelling of the defendant is of legal age, his relationship with the defendant and whether that person understood the significance of the receipt of the summons and the mandate to immediately deliver it to the defendant or at least notify the defendant of the receipt of summons.

- Cases proceeded even if respondent was not validly served with summons, no Notice of Appearance of the Office of the Solicitor General was received by the court, and the prosecutor had not yet complied with the submission of the report on collusion. There were also cases where the copy of the orders sent to the petitioners was returned by the post office with the notation that petitioners are not residents of the area.[6] It was also observed that Judge Guiling prioritized the hearing of annulment of marriage cases and that they were decided within a short span of time.[7]

The team also observed the continued presence of a certain man conversing with the staff during the audit. That man was present in the court the entire day from 14 to 29 April 2015 (Monday to Thursday). The man introduced himself as "Mang Boy" or Mr. Adolf Mantala. The team first thought that he was a friend of the staff but information was gathered on the last day of the audit that Mr. Mantala is the personal secretary of Sheriff de Jesus who takes the call of petitioners in replevin cases whenever Sheriff de Jesus is not around. His presence was tolerated by Judge Guiling and OIC Paulo.

During the exit conference, the team brought to the attention of the court that information was received earlier about some records being kept by Sheriff de Jesus in the trunk of his car. On one hand, Sheriff de Jesus replied that he had already returned all the replevin cases to the court. On the other hand, OIC Cleotilde Paulo did not offer any explanation as to why said records were in the possession of Sheriff de Jesus.

With the team's several adverse findings, Judge Guiling, Officer-in-Charge Ms. Cleotilde Paulo, Sheriff Reyner de Jesus, and Process Server Mr. Gaudencio Sioson were ordered to explain why they should not be administratively charged.[8]

Meanwhile, Judge Guiling was directed to: 1) take appropriate action on all cases that require his immediate action, especially those with pending motions or incidents, and those that are submitted for decision; 2) explain (a) why he should not be administratively charged when he proceeded to hear cases involving annulment of marriage despite invalid service of summons, and prior to the receipt of the Notice of Appearance of the OSG and the Report on Collusion, and non-compliance of the parties on the Manifestation and Motion of the OSG to be furnished with copies of the petitions and their annexes; and (b) why the court, as of April 2015, failed to submit within the prescribed period the Monthly Report of Cases from June to February 2015, and the Semestral Docket Inventory from July to December 2011 to July to December 2014; and 3) prioritize the hearing of criminal and

civil cases (except annulment and nullity of marriage) especially those filed beyond the ten (10) year period.[9]

The Report and Recommendation of the OCA

On June 27, 2016, the OCA submitted the following recommendations:[10]

- The instant judicial audit report be RE-DOCKETED as an administrative complaint against Hon. Tingaraan U. Guiling, Presiding Judge, Branch 109, Officer-in-Charge Ms. Cleotilde P. Paulo, Process Server Gaudencio P. Sioson and Sheriff Reynier de Jesus, all of Regional Trial Court, Pasay City;
- Judge Guiling be found GUILTY of gross dereliction of duty, gross inefficiency, and gross incompetence for undue delay in rendering judgment in twenty-three (23) criminal cases and forty (40) civil cases; undue delay in the resolution of motions or incidents in seventeen (17) criminal cases and sixty-three (63) civil cases, violation of Supreme Court rules, directives and circulars; undue delay in the submission of monthly reports; failure to maintain the confidentiality of court records and proceedings; and violation of the rules on annulment of marriage;
- Judge Guiling be RELIEVED of the judicial and administrative functions effective immediately and to continue until further orders from this Court, EXCEPT TO;

(a)

DECIDE with dispatch the remaining five (5) criminal and eleven (11) civil cases submitted for decision referred to above, and SUBMIT to the Court, through the Office of the Court Administrator (OCA), copies of the decisions within thirty (30) days from notice;

(b)

RESOLVE with dispatch the remaining motions/incidents in six (6) criminal and fifty-four (54) civil cases, and SUBMIT to the Court, through the OCA, copies of the corresponding resolutions within thirty (30) days from notice;

(c)

TAKE APPROPRIATE ACTION immediately in the two (2) criminal and eight (8) civil cases wherein no action was taken from the time of their filing, and thirty-eight (38) criminal and sixty (60) civil cases without further setting for a considerable length of time, and SUBMIT to the Court, through the OCA, within thirty (30) days from notice a copy of each order and resolution, if any, issued in connection therewith; and

(d)

EXPLAIN within thirty (30) days from notice why he proceeded to hear cases involving annulment of marriage despite invalid service of summons, and prior to the receipt of the Notice of Appearance of the Office of the Solicitor General and the Report of Collusion (in cases grounded on Article 36 of the Family Code); and the non-compliance of the parties with the Manifestation and Motion of Office of the Solicitor General to be furnished with copies of the petitions and their annexes;

- Judge Guiling be FINED in the amount of FIFTY THOUSAND PESOS (P50,000.00) and the salaries and other

benefits accruing to him be WITHHELD effective immediately until such time that the Court shall have ordered the restoration of his judicial and administrative functions;

- Hon. Caridad G. Cuervo, Presiding Judge, Branch 113, Regional Trial Court, Pasay City, be DESIGNATED as Assisting Judge of Branch 109, Regional Trial Court, Pasay City, to HEAR all active cases in that court;

- Judge Cuervo be ENTITLED to an additional expense allowance and judicial incentive allowance as provided in the Resolution dated 2 February 1999 of the Court En Banc in A.M. No. 99-1-04-SC, as amended by the Resolution of the Court En Banc dated 17 January 2006;

- Officer-in-Charge Ms. Cleotilde P. Paulo be SUSPENDED for six (6) months without salaries and allowances for violation of Supreme Court rules, directives and circulars, undue delay in the submission of monthly reports, failure to maintain the confidentiality of court records and proceedings, and violation of the rules on annulment of marriage;

- Sheriff Mr. Reynier de Jesus be FINED in the amount of TWENTY THOUSAND PESOS (P20,000.00) for failure to maintain the confidentiality of court records and proceedings, and violation of the rules on annulment of marriage; and

- Process Server Mr. Gaudencio P. Sioson be FINED in the amount of FIVE THOUSAND PESOS (P5,000.00) for violation of the rules on annulment of marriage.

The Ruling of the Court

After a judicious review of the records of the case, this Court agrees with the findings and recommendations of the OCA.

I. Judge Tingaraan Guiling

Judge Guiling was granted an extension of thirty (30) days from February 9, 2016 to fully comply with the directives issued to him by the Deputy Court Administrator. On March 11, 2016, Judge Guiling forwarded copies of orders, alias warrants of arrest and decisions issued by him in compliance with the Memorandum^[11] dated January 12, 2016, directing him to take appropriate action on the remaining criminal and civil cases.

However, despite these submissions from Judge Guiling, the OCA still found two (2) criminal and eight (8) civil cases with no action taken from the time of their filing; thirty-eight (38) criminal and sixty (60) civil cases without further setting; and six (6) criminal and fifty-four (54) civil cases with unresolved motions or incidents, and five (5) criminal and eleven (11) civil cases undecided and submitted for decision. Judge Guiling did not provide any justification for his delay in the rendition of judgment in numerous cases. He failed to submit any explanation as to why he should not be administratively charged for proceeding to hear cases involving annulment of marriage despite invalid service of summons, prior to the receipt of the Notice of Report on Collusion (in cases grounded on Article 36 of the Family Code), and the non-compliance of the parties with the Manifestation and Motion of the OSG to be furnished with copies of the petitions and their annexes.

Article VIII, Section 15 (1)^[12] of the 1987 Constitution mandates lower court judges to decide a case within the reglementary period of ninety (90) days. The New Code of Judicial Conduct under Section 5 of Canon 6 likewise directs judges to perform all judicial duties, including the delivery of reserved decisions, efficiently, fairly and with reasonable promptness. Rules prescribing the time within which certain acts must be done are indispensable to prevent needless delays in the orderly and speedy disposition of cases. Thus, the 90-day period is mandatory.^[13] The speedy disposition of cases in our courts is a primary aim of the Judiciary, so that the ends of justice may not be compromised and the Judiciary will be true to its commitment to provide litigants their

constitutional right to speedy trial and speedy disposition of their cases.[14]

Judge Guiling incurred delay in rendering judgment in twenty-three (23) criminal cases and forty (40) civil cases, and in resolving motions or incidents in seventeen (17) criminal cases and sixty-three (63) civil cases. Worse, when given the chance to explain his side, respondent judge did not offer any explanation as to why there was delay in the rendition of judgment and resolution of pending motions or incidents.

As to the charges of violation of Supreme Court rules, directives and circulars, undue delay in the submission of monthly reports, and failure to maintain the confidentiality of court records and proceedings, the findings of the OCA are substantiated. Judge Guiling again failed to submit any explanation as to why he proceeded to hear cases of annulment of marriage despite invalid service of summons, before the receipt of the Notice of Report on Collusion (in cases grounded on Article 36 of the Family Code), and before the parties with the Manifestation and Motion of the OSG to be furnished with copies of the petitions and their annexes.

Anent the presence of a certain Mr. Adolf Mantala in Branch 109, this Court finds that Judge Guiling, Ms. Paulo (being the officer-in-charge of the court) and Sheriff de Jesus (as he allowed Mr. Mantala to be his alter ego in facilitating replevin cases and receiving phone calls from petitioners) guilty of violation of Section 1, Canon II of the New Code of Judicial Conduct for Court Personnel.[15] As correctly found by the OCA, Mr. Mantala is an outsider and should not have been granted access to the cases or proceedings in court. Mr. Mantala was allowed to answer calls from parties regarding replevin cases and to drive the seized vehicles in replevin cases. This runs counter to the mandate that court personnel shall not disclose to any unauthorized person any confidential information acquired by them while employed in the judiciary.

Classified as less serious charges under Section 9, Rule 140 of the Rules of Court are undue delay in rendering decisions or orders, and violation of Supreme Court rules, directives and circulars, penalized with either suspension without pay for a period of not less than one (1) month, but not more than three (3) months, or a fine of more than P10,000.00, but not more than P20,000.00.[16] With respect to Judge Guiling's offense of undue delay in rendering decisions or orders, the Court imposes upon him a penalty of fine in the amount of Twenty Thousand Pesos (P20,000.00). For his violation of Supreme Court rules, directives and circulars, and violation of the rules on annulment of marriage, Judge Guiling is ordered to pay a fine of Twenty Thousand Pesos (P20,000.00).

Meanwhile, under Section 10 of the same Rule 140, undue delay in the submission of monthly reports is considered a light offense. Section 11(C) of Rule 140 provides that if the respondent is guilty of a light offense, any of the following may be imposed: (i) a Fine of not less than P1,000.00 but not exceeding P10,000.00; and/or (ii) Censure, (iii) Reprimand, (iv) Admonition with warning.[17] Thus, a fine in the amount of Ten Thousand Pesos (P10,000.00) is imposed against Judge Guiling for undue delay in the submission of monthly reports.

In fine, this Court finds that the OCA's recommended fine of Fifty Thousand Pesos (P50,000.00) imposed against Judge Guiling is proper for all his infractions. However, the recommendation by the OCA to relieve Judge Guiling of his judicial and administrative functions has already been rendered moot by his compulsory retirement last February 25, 2018. In view of the retirement of Judge Guiling, the aforementioned penalty of fine shall be deducted from his retirement benefits.

II. Cleotilde P. Paulo

The OCA found OIC Cleotilde P. Paulo guilty of violation of Supreme Court rules, directive and circulars, undue delay in the submission of monthly reports, failure to maintain the confidentiality of court records and proceedings and violation of rules on annulment of marriage. However, in the judicial audit report, no adverse

findings for violation of rules on annulment of marriage against Ms. Paulo was found by the audit team. Such violation was only imputed against Judge Guiling. Thus, this Court deems that the finding and recommendation for violation of rules on annulment of judgment against Ms. Paulo be not considered.

In a Letter[18] dated January 22, 2016, Cleotilde Paulo explained that as officer-in-charge, she performs multiple functions. She explained that the failure to submit the required monthly reports was not intentional but was merely due to the absence of criminal in-charge and civil in-charge from 2010 to 2013. The previous civil in-charge was promoted to legal researcher of another court while the criminal in-charge took a study leave for the Bar examinations. Ms. Paulo further explained that she has no knowledge of any records being taken outside the court by Sheriff de Jesus other than for the purpose of having the same photocopied at the request of interested parties. She did not allow, consent to, nor tolerate Sheriff de Jesus taking court records inside his car and she will never tolerate such acts. As to the presence of Mr. Mantala, Ms. Paulo stated that he started to regularly visit Sheriff de Jesus only a couple of months before the audit commenced. Mr. Mantala never performed any task in Branch 109. His interaction in Branch 109 is limited to Sheriff de Jesus and nothing else. However, this statement of Ms. Paulo was contradicted by the report of Executive Judge Racquelen A. Vasquez who stated that upon his assumption as Presiding Judge of Branch 109, Judge Guiling brought Mr. Mantala with him as his personal aide.[19]

The Court finds the explanation given by Ms. Paulo with respect to the findings of the audit team regarding her violation of Supreme Court rules, directive and circulars, undue delay in the submission of monthly reports, and failure to maintain the confidentiality of court records inadequate to absolve her. As officer-in-charge, Ms. Paulo is charged with safekeeping of all records, papers, files, exhibits and public property committed to her charge, including the library of the court, and the seals and furniture belonging to her office. The Rules of Court provides that no record shall be taken from the clerk's office without an order from the court except as otherwise provided by the rules. Clearly, Ms. Paulo was remiss in the discharge of her function in allowing Sheriff de Jesus to bring some records out of the court premises which were found inside the trunk of his car, and Mr. Adolf Mantala to have an access to court records and proceedings.

Anent the charge of undue delay in the submission of monthly reports, this Court finds Ms. Paulo's explanation unmeritorious. The dates pointed out by Ms. Paulo when the civil in-charge and criminal in-charge were promoted and took a leave of absence, respectively, were way before June 2014 to February 2015. As admitted by Ms. Paulo in her letter, a new civil cases clerk-in-charge was appointed in 2013. Through an office Memorandum dated October 23, 2013, she gave Mr. Alonto Paramihan, Jr., former criminal cases clerk-in-charge who was promoted to court interpreter, additional duty to temporarily act as criminal clerk-in-charge. In September 2014, a new criminal clerk-in-charge was appointed to Branch 109. All of these facts show that Ms. Paulo could have submitted the court's monthly reports on time had she exerted more effort to comply with Supreme Court directive as there was no shortage of personnel, an excuse she would like the Court to consider.

Hence, the Court adopts the penalty of suspension for six (6) months without salaries and allowances recommended by the OCA as it is in accordance with Section 11(B)[20] of Rule 140 of the Rules of Court.

III. Sheriff Reyner De Jesus

The OCA recommended that Sheriff Mr. Reyner de Jesus be fined in the amount of P20,000.00 for failure to maintain the confidentiality of court records and proceedings and for violation of the rules on annulment of marriage.

Sheriff de Jesus, in a Letter[21] dated January 22, 2016, admitted that he was not familiar with the ruling laid down in the case of *Manotoc v. Court of Appeals*. [22] Sheriff de Jesus denied that he took custody of case records involving *replevin*, brought them out of the court room, and placed them inside the trunk of his car. He likewise

denied any knowledge of Mr. Mantala taking calls for him but admitted that sometimes he requested Mr. Mantala to drive for him when he implemented his writs of replevin outside Metro Manila.

The explanation submitted by Sheriff de Jesus why he availed of substituted service of summons and made a general statement in his returns in cases of annulment of marriage cannot absolve him from liability. He should have been aware of existing rules and jurisprudence governing the functions of his office. Worthy to note that the Manotoc case is not a new case but was promulgated way back in 2006.

With respect to the charge of failure to maintain the confidentiality of court records and proceedings, his denial cannot prevail over the observations and findings of the audit team. Furthermore, Ms. Paulo, in her Letter dated January 22, 2016, admitted there were occasions when Sheriff de Jesus would bring records outside the court premises to accommodate parties requesting to photocopy the records. This is contrary to the statement of Sheriff de Jesus that only the respective clerks-in-charge of criminal and civil cases were able to bring records outside the court to photocopy the records. Thus, the Court is inclined to believe the observation and findings of the audit team that Sheriff de Jesus kept some records in the trunk of his car.

In fine, this Court adopts the recommendation of the OCA to impose the penalty of fine of Twenty Thousand Pesos (P20,000.00) against Sheriff de Jesus.

IV. Process Server Gaudencio Sioson

Lastly, the OCA recommended that Process Server Mr. Gaudencio Sioson be fined in the amount of P5,000.00 for violation of the rules on annulment of marriage.

In his Letter[23] filed on January 25, 2016, Process Server Gaudencio Sioson explained that it was his honest belief that service made to the relative of the respondent was sufficient compliance with the rules. However, after his attention was called, he started to observe the procedures laid down in the Manotoc case.

The explanation submitted by Sheriff de Jesus cannot absolve him from liability. He should have been aware of existing rules and jurisprudence governing the functions of his office. It is worthy to note that the Manotoc case is not a new case but was promulgated way back in 2006. Thus, this Court sustains the recommendation of the OCA to impose the penalty of fine of Five Thousand Pesos (P5,000.00) against Process Server Gaudencio Sioson.

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the Court finds as follows:

(1)

JUDGE TINGARAAN GUILING, former Presiding Judge of the Regional Trial Court, Branch 109 of Pasay City, GUILTY of gross dereliction of duty, gross inefficiency and gross incompetence for undue delay in rendering judgment in 23 criminal cases and 40 civil case; undue delay in the resolution of motions or incidents in 17 criminal cases and 63 civil cases, violation of Supreme Court rules, directives and circulars, undue delay in the submission of monthly reports; failure to maintain the confidentiality of court records and proceedings, and violation of the rules of annulment of marriage, for which he is FINED Fifty Thousand Pesos (P50,000.00) to be deducted from his retirement benefits;

(2)

CLEOTILDE P. PAULO, officer-in-charge RTC, Branch 109 of Pasay City, GUILTY of violation of Supreme Court rules, directive and circulars, undue delay in the submission of monthly reports, and failure to maintain the confidentiality of court records and proceedings, for which she is SUSPENDED for six (6) months without salaries and allowances;

(3)

REYNER DE JESUS, Sheriff of RTC, Branch 109 of Pasay City GUILTY for failure to maintain the confidentiality of court records and proceedings, and violation of the rules on annulment of marriage for which he is FINED Twenty Thousand Pesos (P20,000.00); and

(4)

GAUDENCIO P. SIOSON, process server of RTC, Branch 109 of Pasay City GUILTY of violation of the rules on annulment of marriage for which he is FINED Five Thousand Pesos (P5,000.00).

SO ORDERED.

Bersamin, C. J., Carpio, Del Castillo, Perlas-Bernabe, Leonen, Jardeleza, Caguioa, A. Reyes, Jr., Gesmundo, J. Reyes, Jr., Lazaro-Javier, and Inting, JJ., concur.
Peralta, and Hernando, JJ., on official business.

[1] Rollo, Volume II, pp. 1086-1171.

[2] SPA dated 9-8-11 in Civil Case No. 11-06088; undated SPA in Civil Case No. 14-16337; SPA dated 4-14-14 in Civil Case No. 14-16390; SPA dated 7-4-14 in Civil Case No. 14-16503; SPA dated 12- 16-14 in Civil Case No. 14-16593; SPA dated 9-22-14 in Civil Case No. 14-17741; Notice of Appearance of the OSG in Civil Case No. 13-15121; Notice of Appearance of the OSG in Civil Case No. 14-15711; Notice of Appearance of the OSG in Civil Case No. 14-16933; Notice of Appearance of the OSG in Civil Case No. 14-17753; Pre-Trial Brief in Civil Case No. 14-15536

[3] Some of these cases are: 1) Civil Case No. 12-12177, Lagata vs. Lagata, Annulment of Marriage; 2) Civil Case No. 13-14791, Marzan vs. Marzan, Annulment of Marriage; 3) Civil Case No. 14-14641, Cejoco vs. Ambobayog, Annulment of Marriage; 4) Civil Case No. 14-15185, Colangoy vs. Colangoy, Annulment of Marriage; 5) Civil Case No. 14-16467, Virut vs. Virut, Annulment of Marriage; and 6) Civil Case No. 14-17037, Shimizu vs. Shimizu, Recognition of Foreign Divorce.

[4] Some of these cases are: 1) Civil Case No. 07-1703, Fababaer vs. Fababaer; 2) Civil Case 10-04276, Charito Pasayan vs. Adeline Pasayan; 3) Civil Case No. 11-06948, Michelle Totralba vs. Eric Torralba; 4) Civil Case No. 11-06968, Frederick Padre vs. Margie Padre; 5) Civil Case No. 11-08178, Jenny Yntico vs. Eric Yntico; 6) Civil Case No. 12-10346, Nolito Tarnate vs. Efrenia Bahicos; 7) Civil Case No. 12-10178, Ma. Soledad Lumague vs. Robert Lumague; 8) Civil Case No. 12-11618, Patrick Mulato vs. Shierill Mulato; 9) Civil Case No. 12-11800, Evelyn Tugadi-Reyes vs. Raymond Reyes; 10) Civil Case No. 13-14322, Dulay vs. Man; 11) Civil Case No. 13-14944, C. Bautista vs. C. Bautista; 12) Civil Case No. 13-15028, M.I. Catacutan vs. E. Mateo; 13) Civil Case No. 13-15074, Rodriguez vs. Rodriguez; 14) Civil Case No. 13-15078, Rico vs. Rico; 15) Civil Case No. 14-15518, Abolencia vs. Abolencia; 16) Civil Case No. 14-15660, Oliveros vs. Oliveros; 17) Civil Case No. 14-15688, Candelario vs. Celeridad; 18) Civil Case No. 14-16110, Boles-Lagula vs. Lagula; 19) Civil Case No. 14-16549, Noel Chavez vs. Anna Marie Chavez; 20) Civil Case No. 14-16522, Tan vs. Tan; 21) Civil Case No. 14-17669, Gonzales vs. Manset-Gonzales; 22) Civil Case No. 14-17784, Legaspi vs. San Pedro; 23) Civil Case No. 14-17788, Imee Rose Molina vs. Roberto Molina; 24) Civil Case No. 14-17990, N. Cortez vs. J. Cortez; 25) Civil Case No. 14-18216, Rase vs. Rase; 26) Civil Case No. 14-18266, Leonardo vs. Torres; 27) Civil Case No. 14-18308, Samarita vs. Samarita; 28) Civil Case No. 14-18438, Rogelio Mangubat, Jr. vs. Joan Cabadu-Mangubat; 29) Civil Case No. 15-18648, Canete vs. Canete; 30) Civil Case No. 15-18750, Ronquillo vs.

Solanoy-Ronquillo; 31) Civil Case No. 15-18784, Milario-Ytable vs. Ytable II; 32) Civil Case No. 15-18820, Almazan vs. Sangalang-Amazon; 33) Civil Case No. 15-18836, Rocha-Hibaya vs. Hibaya; 34) Civil Case No. 15-18897, Jimmy Ipaniz, Jr. vs. Jackylou Montanez; 35) Civil Case No. 15-18904, Bernardino vs. Rivero-Bernardino; 36) Civil Case No. 15-18928, Majait vs. Majait; and 37) Civil Case No. 15-19069, Aura vs. Serwelas-Aura.

[5] Some of these cases are: 1) Civil Case No. 06-0320, Tan vs. Tan; 2) Civil Case No. 11-08101, Bobby G. Miguel vs. Joybelle R. Miguel; 3) Civil Case No. 12-10749, Nulod vs. Francisco-Nulod; 4) Civil Case No. 12-12195, Quilab vs. Quilab; 5) Civil Case No. 13-12605, Jimenez vs. Jimenez; 6) Civil Case No. 13-13071, Paguirigan vs. Paguirigan; 7) Civil Case No. 13-13387, Punta vs. Guervarra; 8) Civil Case No. 13-13873, G. Fevidal vs. A. Monforte-Fevidal; 9) Civil Case No. 13-13931, Michelle San Diego Sy Lee Yong vs. James Grundy; 10) Civil Case No. 13-14933, Ramos vs. Ramos; 11) Civil Case No. 13-14949, Alido vs. Alido; 12) Civil Case No. 14-15241, Alangcao vs. Alangcao; 13) Civil Case No. 14-15571, R. Dela Cruz vs. I. Babiera; 14) Civil Case No. 14-15837, Avila vs. Matawaran-Avila; 15) Civil Case No. 14-16153, Asuem vs. Asuero; 16) Civil Case No. 14-16311, Yamaro vs. Yamaro; 17) Civil Case No. 14-17081, Rivera vs. Rivera; 18) Civil Case No. 14-17503, Using vs. Lising; 19) Civil Case No. 14-17509, Paz vs. Tolentino; 20) 14-17609, Malapit vs. Malapit; 21) Civil Case No. 14-17717, Lleno vs. Lleno; 22) Civil Case No. 14-17863, Joson vs. Joson; 23) Civil Case 14-17915, Libang vs. Libang; 24) Civil Case No. 14-17931, M. Cura Canda vs. R. Canda; 25) Civil Case No. 14-18006, Gilhang vs. Gilhang; 26) Civil Case No. 14-18009, Dedicatoria vs. Dedicatoria; 27) Civil Case No. 14-18235, Bamba vs. Bamba; 28) Civil Case No. 14-18263, Cruz vs. Luginmo; 29) Civil Case No. 15-18583, Escurel vs. Linsangan; 30) Civil Case No. 15-18851, Suehara vs. Suehara; 31) Civil Case No. 15-18947, Almirez vs. Almirez; and 32) Civil Case No. 15-19027, Faelnar vs. Faelnar.

[6] Some of these cases are: 10-02866; 10-04276; 10-04198; 11-05662; 11-06700; 11-07202; 11-08178; 12-09545; 12-09975; 12-10346; 12-10379; 12-10878; 12-11329; 12-11641; 12-11650; 12-11724; 12-11896; 12-12035; 13-12834; 13-13091; 13-13280; 13-13373; 13-13359; 13-13625; 13-13657; 13-13680; 13-13813; 13-13834; 13-13914; 13-13970; 13-14042; 13-14099; 13-14268; 13-14289; 13-14487; 13-14623; 13-14816; 13-14878; 13-14944; 13-14949; 13-14977; 13-15050; 13-15028; 13-15077; 13-15151; 14-14641; 14-15185; 14-15224; 14-15241; 14-15312; 14-15394; 14-15436; 14-15450; 14-15462; 14-15477; 14-15524; 14-15572; 14-15685; 14-15698; 14-15732; 14-15736; 14-15742; 14-15763; 14-15908; 14-16069; 14-16108; 14-16211; 14-16417; 14-16680; 14-16754; 14-16758; 14-16933; 14-16966; 14-16011; 14-16183; 14-16208; 14-16269; 14-16271; 14-16315; 14-16333; 14-16390; 14-16497; 14-16408; 14-16430; 14-16500; 14-16503; 14-16506; 14-16522; 14-16548; 14-16549; 14-16610; 14-16881; 14-16899; 14-16917; 14-16919; 14-16932; 14-17015; 14-17036; 14-17072; 14-17090; 14-17097; 14-17105; 14-17153; 14-17228; 14-17360; 14-17404; 14-17415; 14-17451; 14-17460; 14-17472; 14-17501- 14-17503; 14-17518; 14-17521; 14-17734; 14-17556; 14-17569; 14-17577; 14-17761; 14-17609; 14-17751; 14-17788; 14-17864; 14-17948; 14-17990; 14-18008; 14-17990; 14-18008; 14-18024; 14-18056; 14-18207; 14-18230; 14-18234; 14-18235; 14-18307; 14-18462; 14-18505; 15-18630; 15-18786; 15-18809; 15-18851; 15-18915; 15-18970.

[7] Some of these cases are: 13-13970; 13-14338; 13-14878; 13-14944; 13-14977; 13-15050; 14-15205; 15207; 14-15233; 14-15236; 14-15241; 14-15264; 14-15312; 14-15329; 14-15394; 14-15436; 14-15446; 14-15450; 14-15479; 14-15480; 14-15485; 14-15522; 14-15531; 14-15548; 14-15660; 14-15688; 14-15T20; 14-15732; 14-15742; 14-15809; 14-15811; 14-15871; 14-16011; 14-16014; 14-16039; 14-16110; 14-16150; 14-16153; 14-16201; 14-16211; 14-16252; 14-16267; 14-16265; 14-16337; 14-16383; 14-16390; 14-16497; 14-16408; 14-16450; 14-16467; 14-16500; 14-16548; 14-16549; 14-16597; 14-16610; 14-16701; 14-16713; 14-16739; 14-16777; 14-16787; 14-16919; 14-17072; 14-17091; 14-17140; 14-17153; 14-17356; 14-18016.

[8] Rollo, Volume II, pp. 1167-1171.

[9] Id.

[10] Rollo, Volume I, pp. 61-63.

[11] Rollo, Volume II, pp. 1086-1171.

[12] SECTION 15. (1) All cases or matters filed after the effectivity of this Constitution must be decided or resolved within twenty-four months from date of submission for the Supreme Court, and, unless reduced by the Supreme Court, twelve months for all lower collegiate courts, and three months for all other lower courts.

x x x x

[13] Re: Findings on the Judicial Audit Conducted at the 7[th] Municipal Circuit Trial Court, Liloan Compostela, Liloan, Cebu, 784 Phil. 334, 340 (2016).

[14] Re: Judicial Audit Conducted in the RTC, Br. 20, Cagayan de Oro City, Misamis Oriental, 730 Phil. 23, 41 (2014).

[15] SECTION 1. Court personnel shall not disclose to any unauthorized person any confidential information acquired by them while employed in the Judiciary, whether such information came from authorized or unauthorized sources.

Confidential information means information not yet made a matter of public record relating to pending cases, as well as information not yet made public concerning the work of any justice or judge relating to pending cases, including notes, drafts, research papers, internal discussions, internal memoranda, records of internal deliberations, and similar papers.

The notes, drafts, research papers, internal discussions, internal memoranda, records of internal deliberations and similar papers that a justice or judge uses in preparing a decision, resolution or order shall remain confidential even after the decision, resolution or order is made public.

[16] Re: Evaluation of Administrative Liability of Judge Lubao, 785 Phil. 14, 28 (2016)

[17] Id.

[18] Rollo, Volume I, pp. 293-297.

[19] Id. at 1084-1085.

[20] SECTION 11. Sanctions. — A. If the respondent is guilty of a serious charge, any of the following sanctions may be imposed:

x x x x

B. If the respondent is guilty of a less serious charge, any of the following sanctions shall be imposed:

1. Suspension from office without salary and other benefits for not less than one (1) nor more than three (3) months; or
2. A fine of more than P10,000.00 but not exceeding P20,000.00.

[21] Rollo, Volume I, pp. 363-365.

[22] 530 Phil. 454 (2006).

[23] Rollo, Volume I, pp. 319-320.

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.