NATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE REGISTER · SEPTEMBER 13, 1999

LIFTING OF THE ORDER OF DEBARMENT OF EXAMINEES FOUND TO HAVE COMMITTED IRREGULARITIES IN THE OCTOBER, 1993 LICENSURE EXAMINATIONS FOR ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS AND MASTER ELECTRICIANS

PRC RESOLUTION NO. 628, S. 1999, September 13, 1999

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): https://batas.org/library/b8a98069f08a/

WHEREAS, the examination papers of the examinees in the October, 1993 Electrical Engineering Licensure Examinations who were found to have committed irregularities by violating the rule on anonymity in licensure examinations were cancelled and said examinees were also debarred from taking future licensure examinations in Resolution No. 96-466 dated December 12, 1996.

WHEREAS, while a number of debarred examinees filed their petitions/motions for reconsideration on Resolution No. 96-466, s. 1996, said Resolution has already become final when said petitions/motions were filed.

WHEREAS, through their petitions/motions for reconsideration, several examinees confessed their guilt and accepted their participation in the irregularities during the 1993 Electrical Engineering Licensure Examinations.

WHEREAS, the Chairman and Members of the Board of Electrical Engineering, in their letter to the Chairman and Members of the Commission dated August 30, 1999, interceding in behalf of the examinees, requested the Commission, as an act of compassion, to lift the debarment order of the said examinees from taking future licensure examinations pointing out that the period of more than five (5) years is more than enough for them to suffer the consequences of their misdemeanor and that the talents of these debarred examinees will be wasted unless they will be allowed to take licensure examinations for electrical engineers and master electricians.

WHEREAS, the Commission finds merit in the grounds set forth in the petition of the Chairman and Members of the Board of Electrical Engineering for the lifting of the debarment order.

WHEREAS, the Commission resolved as it hereby RESOLVES to grant the petition of the Chairman and Members of the Board of Electrical Engineering as an exception to the strict policy of the Commission on irregularities in licensure examinations as an act of compassion to the examinees in the 1993 Electrical Engineering examinations who were found to have violated the rule on anonymity in licensure examinations. Accordingly, the Commission hereby ORDERS the lifting of the debarment order in its Resolution No. 96-466 and allows said examinees to take future licensure examinations. However, their examination papers in that examination shall remain cancelled.

In view of certain incidents peculiar only to TERRENCE A. HIMAN and LUISITO B. FORTICH, their cases shall be dealt with by the Commission separately.

SO ORDERED.

Adopted: 13 Sept. 1999

(SGD.) HERMOGENES P. POBRE

Turn this case into an audio lecture - facts, issues, ruling and doctrine - at batas.org

Commission Chairman

(SGD.) ALFONSO G. ABAD
(SGD.) AVELINA DE LA REA-TAN
Associate Commissioners

Attachment:

RESOLUTION NO. 96-466
December 12, 1996

FACT FINDING INVESTIGATION OF THE PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE REPORTED IRREGULARITY IN THE OCTOBER 1993 ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING LICENSURE EXAMINATIONS
This refers to the Report of the Committee of Prosecutors created to conduct a fact-finding investigation of the persons responsible for the reported irregularity in the October, 1993 Electrical Engineering Licensure Examination.

As a background information, during the October, 1993 licensure examination in Electrical Engineering, the Board of Electrical Engineering created under R.A. No. 184 is composed of Engr. Paul J. Woo, incumbent Chairman, and Engrs. Rafael Florentino and Baylon Tolentino, incumbent members.

The licensure examinations in Electrical Engineering were given simultaneously in the cities of Manila, Bacolod and Davao on October 22, 23 and 24, 1993.

The subjects for examination where the anomalies/irregularities were allegedly committed and the corresponding examiners are as follows:

I. Professional Electrical Engineer

a) Mathematics — Examiner: Engr. Rafael Florentino
b) Electrical Engineering — Examiner: Engr. Paul J. Woo
c) Electrical Design and Construction — Examiner: Engr. Paul J. Woo
d) General Engineering — Examiner: Engr. Baylon Tolentino

II. Associate Electrical Engineer

a) Strength of Materials — Examiner: Engr. Rafael Florentino
b) General Engineering — Examiner: Engr. Baylon Tolentino
c) Electrical Machineries — Examiner: Engr. Paul J. Woo

III. Assistant Electrical Engineer

a) General Engineering — Examiner: Engr. Baylon Tolentino
b) Electrical Engineering — Examiner: Engr. Paul J. Woo
c) Mathematics — Examiner: Engr. Rafael Florentino

IV. Master Electrician

a) Application of Ohm’s Law — Examiner: Engr. Baylon Tolentino
b) Phil. Electrical Code — Examiner: Engr. Paul J. Woo

The alleged irregularity was brought to the attention of the Chairman of the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) in the joint letters dated May 6, 1994 and June 6, 1994 of Mr. Jose T. Prado and Ms. Priscilla C. Reyes, both of the PRC, pointing out their observations on the answer sheets of a number of -examinees in the said

licensure examination as follows:

1. Rampant questionable erasures of shaded answer blocks, a clear violation of instruction to examinees that erasures are not allowed.

2. Shaded answer blocks of the answer sheets are totally different from the other shaded blocks of the same answer sheets. Indication that it was done by another person other than the examinee.

3. Two kinds of pencils of different shade and make are used in the shading of answers a departure from the officially required Mongol No. 1.

4. One answer sheet in the subject strength of materials part II was overrated.

5. Shaded blocks after erasures were made, generally revealed that answer sheets in the subjects of general engineering and electrical engineering have the same pattern of answers.

6. Concerned examinees received unusually very high grades in the subjects electrical engineering and general engineering, in contrast with the very low grades they obtained in the subject mathematics."

On the basis of the findings and observations of the employees of the Rating Division of the Commission who initially examined the answer sheets of the examinees, there are 478 examinees who appear to have been involved in the irregularity or anomaly broken down as follows:

a) Professional Electrical Engineer 44 Examinees
b) Associate Electrical Engineer 63 Examinees
c) Assistant Electrical Engineer 275 Examinees
d) Master Electrician 96 Examinees

TOTAL 478 Examinees

In view of the large number of examinees involved in the irregularity and the limited number of examinees who testified during the fact-finding investigation as shown in the Report of the Special Committee, the Commission decided to examine individually the answer sheets of all the examinees involved to determine, on the basis of the identifying marks/signs or codes written by the examinees on their answer sheets and the grades obtained, who among the said examinees were able to establish their link or connection with the examiners and were benefited by such link or connection.

As shown in all the answer sheets, the irregularity consists of marks/signs written by the examinees on their answer sheets designed to identify themselves or disclose their identities to the examiners. These marks which are clear and visible on the answer sheets violate the Rule on Anonymity and other pertinent rules provided in the General Instructions to Examinees.

Before the adoption of full computerization in licensure examinations, the examination in a particular subject is partly computerized and partly manual. In the computerized portion, the examinee enters his answers in the answer sheets by blackening the answer box or block pertaining to the answer of his choice. The answer sheet is corrected by the computers. In the manual portion which is usually problem solving and therefore calls for computation, the examinee answers the questions in writing and his answers are corrected manually by the examiners.

A close scrutiny of the answer sheets involved in the irregularity would show that all of the answer sheets bore marks or signs that are clear and visible to the naked eyes.

The markings that generally appear on the questioned answer sheets consist of double shading or blackening of

Study hands-free: podcast-style lessons with read-along highlighting - batas.org

the answer blocks or boxes in the computerized portion of the examination sheet as follows:

a) Two (2) answer boxes or blocks in one number of the answer sheet are shaded or blackened such that one box or block is lightly shaded or blackened while the other box or block is blackened or shaded heavily, indicative of the fact that somebody who has access to the examination papers other than the examinee has also shaded or blackened the answer boxes of the answer sheets.

b) Two (2) answer blocks or boxes in one number of the answer sheet are shaded or blackened such that one block or box is completely shaded while the other is not completely shaded or blackened or the shading or blackening consists of a single or sometimes double strokes of the pencil used usually uneven and heavy or goes beyond the area of the box, indicative of the fact that somebody who has access to the examination papers other than the examinee has also shaded or blackened the answer blocks of the answer sheets.

Aside from the above markings, there are other marks or signs written by the examinees on their answer sheets whose obvious purpose is to identify themselves to the examiners.

Such identifying marks or signs are the following:

1. The manner by which the letter “E” was written in the answer sheet of the subject “MATHEMATICS” and the first letter “E” in the words “GENERAL”, ‘ELECTRICAL” and “ENGINEERING” in the Professional Electrical Engineer, Assistant Electrical Engineer and Associate Electrical Engineer examinations.

In the word “MATHEMATICS”, the lower horizontal line in the letter “E” is short while the upper and middle horizontal lines are longer and sometimes written closely.

The same method of writing the first letter “E” in the answer sheet of the subjects “ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING” and “GENERAL ENGINEERING” was used although at times the examinee wrote the first letter “E” of the said words heavily and the lower horizontal line is as long as the other two.

There are a total of 104 examinees who wrote the identifying mark letter “E” on their answer sheets, either in the subject “MATHEMATICS” only or in the subjects “GENERAL ENGINEERING” and “ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING” or in all of these three subjects.

2. Eight (8) examinees wrote their initials and two (2) examinees wrote their names on the answer sheets.

3. Eleven (11) examinees appear to have intentionally misspelled the word “SOLUTION” by omitting the letter “I”.

4. Five (5) examinees placed or wrote dots in the box of the word “SET”.

5. There are other examinees who used different kinds of identifying marks or signs such as name is written on space for subject, unnecessary computation, writing name on answer sheet, unnecessary mark/sign.

We cannot perceive of any reason or purpose why an examinee would place or write unnecessary marks or signs on his/her answer sheet/s, considering that this act is prohibited by the General Instructions to Examinees, except to identify himself to the examiner of the subject where he placed or wrote such unnecessary marks or signs in order that the examiner, upon identifying the examinee through the marks or signs, could do or perform whatever he undertook to do, presumably with valuable consideration, to make the examinee pass in his subject.

This perception or conclusion has been confirmed/substantiated by examinees who testified before the Special Committee which conducted the fact-finding investigation on the alleged irregularity.

Mr. Renato P. Maceda, an examinee in the Associate Electrical Engineering examination (ID No. 11000658)

when he testified stated that there was an irregularity during the October, 1993 Electrical Engineering Licensure Examination. He admitted having written the capital letter "E" With a short bar at the bottom in the subjects "Strength of Materials", "General Engineering" and "Electrical Engineering". He likewise admitted that the letter "E" with a short bar at the bottom was given to him by Engr. Rolando Caballero for purposes of identification. He further admitted that he paid Engr. Rolando Caballero the amount of P17,500.00 the night before the examination.

This admission has been corroborated by Mr. Lemuel D. Cacdac, Mr. Arsenio M. Estrada and Mr. Graciano T. Pata, all examinees in Assistant Electrical Engineering.

In his letter dated January 25, 1995, Mr. Cacdac stated as follows:

> "I admit that I had done something wrong during the said exam. I promised to pay him, Engr. Aquino and Engr. Evaristo if I pass the licensure exam even if I know that we cannot afford to pay him, in turn our reviewers instructed us of the code that we will use in our paper. I had done this without the knowledge of my parents, hoping that I can raise the money if I find a job after I pass the exam. My parents income is enough only for our needs. My mother is a teacher and my father is a Pastor.
>
> "I don't know Engr. Caballero personally because I am a graduate of Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University but I attended a review at the Luzon Colleges where I met his assistant/reviewers.
>
> "They convinced me to pay because they are always saying that it is very hard for us to pass without their help."

On the other hand, Mr. Estrada, in his letter dated January 24, 1995, made the following statements:

> "In case of taking my exam before some person are collecting payment for ensurity of our exam before and after of the examination. Some of them are the companion of Engr. R. Caballero. Before the examination they are calling on the names individually for the payments of our live-in review and also for the insurity. Pero ang alam ko at natandaan ay ang pagbigay nila ng codings sa amin bago ang pagsusulit. Kasama pa rito ang ibang instructor na kanyang pinag-utusan ng pagbigay ng codings. At kahit nagbigay sila ng codings ay nag solve din ako sa aking test papers, at na solve ko rin lahat ang mga solving problem at marami akong pagkakamali kaya sa aking pagkakamali ay nagkaroon ng maraming erasures. Karamihan sa amin ay nagbigay ng buong bayad para sa kanilang pagsusulit. Lalong-lalo na kay Engr. Evaristo at Engr. R. Aquino ang kanyang mga kasamang Instructor."

Lastly, Mr. Graciano T. Pata, in an affidavit-complaint executed on February 14, 1995, stated as follows:

> "1. I am one of the examinees in 1993 Professional Regulations Commission Board Examination for Assistant Electrical Engineering;
>
> "2. I took the said examination in Bacolod City in 1993;
>
> "3. Prior to taking the board exams, my professor Rolando Caballero in Luzon Colleges (where I graduated) told me and my 21 co-graduates from Luzon Colleges that we have to "insure" with him our passing the said board exam for asst. elect. engineering;
>
> "4. To insure with him our passing means that I have to pay him the amount of P14,000.00 which I did pay him on October 18, 1993. The payment took place in Louella's Dormitory located at near PRC corner Espana, Sampaloc, Manila;
>
> "5. I took the board exams for Asst. Electrical Engineering in Bacolod City on October 22 & 23, 1993. I studied very well for the exams. I answered all the questions the best I could;
>
> "6. I only paid the P14,000.00 to Engr. Rolando Caballero to insure my passing and I was given a code (letter E)."

Bar review courses, mock exams and a study planner that keeps you on pace - batas.org

Engr. Rafael Florentino, a member of the Board of Electrical Engineering, the examiner in the subject "Mathematics" (in Professional Electrical Engineer and Assistant Electrical Engineer) and "Strength of Materials" (in Associate Electrical Engineer) when shown some test papers of some examinees in the subjects whose examinations were given by Engr. Paul J. Woo and Engr. Baylon Tolentino and requested to comment on the grades given by the examiners on the said subjects, stated that the examiners were too generous in giving grades to the examinees.

Engr. Florentino pointed out that in his subject, Strength of Materials (Associate Electrical Engineer), he gave the examinee, Henry V. Misanes (I.D. No. 11000481), a score of 9 points in the manual portion of the examination, but somebody who had access to the test papers, had jacked-up the score by blackening or shading the figure "40" in the rating box (Part II) (Exh. "J-2"), thus making it appear that the total score of Mr. Misanes is "49".

Engr. Florentino testified that the total score that could be obtained in his subject was "45" not "49".

The person who could have jacked-up the score of Mr. Misanes is the one who had access to the examination papers.

Mr. Joemar Penaroyo, a contractual employee assigned in the Rating Division of the Commission, testified that Engr. Paul J. Woo requested him to give his (Engr. Woo's) test papers. Engr. Woo also requested him to bring out the test papers of Engr. Florentino and give it to him.

Joemar Penaroyo gave the test papers of Engr. Florentino to Engr. Paul Woo because of the assurance of Engr. Woo that Engr. Florentino would come. He trusted Engr. Paul Woo that is why he gave the test papers of Engr. Florentino to him. When Penaroyo reported this matter to his Chief, Mr. Jose T. Prado, he was scolded.

Examinees Giovanni de Castro Villaflores, Edgar Epe, Joey Barcelona, Emmanuel Villanueva and Rogelio Cabanilla admitted having made erasures on their answer sheets but explained that they made such erasures because they doubted their original answers. They made the erasures to rectify their answers. Besides, they claim that they were tense and confused.

On the other hand, examinees Ancheta, Danito Bagay, Marilou Ayala-Montano and Edgardo L. Datoon who wrote the capital letter "E" on their answer sheets with the short bar at the bottom, claimed that they were not aware having written the controversial letter "E" because they were engrossed in reading the questions or because of tension and confusion.

The testimonies of examinees Giovanni de Castro Villaflores, Edgar Epe, Joey Barcelona, Emmanuel Villanueva, Rogelio Cabanilia, Arturo G. Ancheta, Danilo Bagay and Marilou Ayala-Montano are self-serving.

A close examination of their answer sheets particularly in the shading and/or blackening of the answer boxes corresponding to their chosen answers clearly shows that there are two (2) shaded/blackened answer boxes in one number clearly indicating that somebody other than the examinees has also shaded the answer boxes to favor the examinees. In these cases, the examinees obtained high grades in the subjects where the double shading/blackening or different kinds of shading/blackening were made.

In accordance with these findings, the Commission initially came out with a Resolution (No. 96-419 issued on April 1, 1996) in this case releasing the names of those who, notwithstanding the identifying marks/signs that they have written on their answer sheets, failed to establish a link or connection with the examiners. For making such identifying marks on their answer sheets which is a violation of the Rule on Anonymity, their examination papers were cancelled with a stern warning that a repetition of the same or similar offense would be dealt with more severely. They were, however, allowed to take future examinations.

Study hands-free: podcast-style lessons with read-along highlighting - batas.org

We agree with the conclusion reached by the Special Committee that there were anomalies in the 1993 Electrical Engineering Licensure Examinations. This fact was sufficiently established by the testimony of Renato Maceda who admitted that the letter "E" with the short bar at the bottom appearing in his test papers particularly in the subjects "Strength of Materials", "General Engineering" and "Electrical Machineries" was the "code" given to him by Engr. Rolando Caballero after he (Maceda) gave the amount of P17,500. demanded by Caballero as consideration for his (Maceda's) passing the said board examination. Mr. Maceda's testimony were corroborated by the statements of Messrs. Lemuel D. Cacdac and Arsenio M. Estrada. Mr. Cacdac, in his letter dated January 25, 1995, implicated not only Engr. Rolando Caballero but also Engrs. Aquino and Evaristo in the anomalies that attended the October, 1993 Electrical Engineering Licensure Examination.

We also agree with the Special Committee's findings that there was a conspiracy between Engrs. Caballero, Aquino and Evaristo (the reviewers) and the examinees who wrote the letter "E" as "code" on their answer sheets on the one hand and the examiners — Engr. Paul Joseph Woo (Chairman of the Board of Electrical Engineering) who was the Examiner in the subjects: "Electrical Engineering" and "Electrical Design and Construction" (Professional Electrical Engineering); "Electrical Machineries" (Associate Electrical Engineering); "Electrical Engineering" (Assistant Electrical Engineering) and "Phil. Electrical Code" (Master Electrician) and Engr. Baylon Tolentino (Member, Board of Electrical Engineering) examiner in the subjects: "General Engineering" (Professional Electrical Engineering); "General Engineering" (Associate Electrical Engineering); "General Engineering" (Assistant Electrical Engineering) and "Ohm's Law" (Master Electrician) on the other.

The conspiracy between the reviewers (Engrs. Caballero, Aquino and Evaristo) and the examiners (Engrs. Woo and Tolentino) was proved by the admissions of Maceda, Cacdac, Estrada and Pata implicating their reviewers in the anomaly for a substantial consideration.

On the other hand, the link between the examiners (Engrs. Woo and Tolentino) and the examinees to the anomaly was established by the following circumstantial evidence:

(1) The letter "E" used as code and appearing on the test papers of the examinees;

(2) High grades given by Engrs. Woo and Tolentino to examinees who were able to establish their link/connection with the use of "code", "marks" or "signs";

(3) Meddling by Engr. Woo in the answer sheets of the subjects assigned to Engr. Rafael Florentino; and

(4) Tampering of the grade of Henry V. Misanes in the subject "Strength of Materials" (subject in Associate Electrical Engineering assigned to Engr. Florentino) by making it appear that the grade of the examinee is "49" (which is beyond the maximum grade obtainable by an examinee in the subject) instead of the grade/score of "9" given by the examiner of the subject.

We also agree with the finding of the Special Committee that Mr. Penaroyo, a utility worker of the PRC, is not a party to the conspiracy. Engr. Paul Woo, by virtue of his position as Chairman of the Board of Electrical Engineering, exerts some moral ascendancy or influence over Penaroyo and the latter, as a subordinate employee in the Rating Division, cannot refuse the request of Engr. Woo.

We concur with the Special Committee's finding that Engr. Rafael Florentino is not in any way involved in the anomaly. In fact, in the subjects assigned to him, the examinees involved in the anomaly got low grades which must have prompted his colleagues (Engrs. Woo and Tolentino) to off-set the said low grades by giving the favored examinees high grades in their respective subjects.

We also concur with the recommendation of the Special Committee that the reviewers, Engrs. Caballero, Aquino

Turn this case into an audio lecture - facts, issues, ruling and doctrine - at batas.org

and Evaristo, the examiners, Engrs. Woo and Tolentino, be administratively charged with unprofessional and/or dishonorable conduct for their participation in the irregularity in accordance with the provisions of Section 32 in relation to Section 31 of R.A. No. 184, otherwise known as the Electrical Engineering Law.

Aside from the administrative charge, the Examiners - Paul Joseph Woo and Baylon Tolentino — may also be liable for violation of Section 3(e) of R.A. No. 3019, otherwise known as the Anti-Graft and Corrupt Practices Act by “x x x giving any private individual any unwarranted benefit, advantage or preference in the discharge of his official, administrative or judicial functions through manifest partiality, evident bad faith or gross inexcusable negligence x x x”.

The examinees who allowed themselves to be used as instruments for corruption are equally liable as co-conspirators. Those who admitted their guilt should be charged unless they are willing to testify for the government.

Similarly, the reviewers, Caballero, Aquino and Evaristo are equally liable for having conspired with the examiners in committing the offense.

The positive testimony of Renato Maceda, corroborated by the statements of Cacdac, Estrada and Pata incriminates Caballero, Aquino and Evaristo to the commission of the irregularity. This testimony is admissible in evidence against Caballero, Aquino and Evaristo applying by analogy, the rule enunciated in the case of People vs. Alvarez (20 SCRA 364 [1967]) which states that “the extra-judicial confession of an accused is admissible against a co-accused when the confession is used as circumstantial evidence to show the probability of participation by the co-conspirator”.

A case for falsification by a public officer under Article 177(6) of the Revised Penal Code should be filed against Engr. Paul Joseph Woo for changing the grade/score of examinee Henry V. Misanes from “9” to “49”.

For the last time, the answer sheets of the examinees were reviewed. It was found that the examinees listed in Annex “A” (Associate Electrical Engineers), in Annex “A-1” (Assistant Electrical Engineer) and in Annex “A-2” (Master Electrician), notwithstanding that these examinees have written “codes” or identifying marks/signs on their answer sheets, have failed to establish the link or to get connection with the examiners as may be shown by the low grades that they have obtained in all subjects.

On the other hand, the examinees listed in Annex “B” (Professional Electrical Engineer), in Annex “B-1” (Associate Electrical Engineer), in Annex “B-2” (Assistant Electrical Engineer) and in Annex “B-3” (Master Electrician) have generally obtained high grades in the subjects of Engr. Woo and Engr. Tolentino clearly indicating that the said examinees, by the identifying “code”, marks/signs written on their answer sheets, have been able to establish the link or to get connection with the examiners. These examinees have not only violated the Rule on Anonymity but also have committed the irregularity that attended the October, 1993 licensure examination in Electrical Engineering.

WHEREFORE, the Commission finds the evidence adduced by the Special Committee sufficient to warrant the filing of administrative charges against Engr. Paul Joseph Woo and Engr. Baylon Tolentino, former Chairman and incumbent Member of the Board of Electrical Engineering, respectively, and Engrs. Rolando Caballero, Aquino and Evaristo for unprofessional or dishonorable conduct in connection with the 1993 Electrical Engineering Licensure Examination in violation of Section 31 in relation to Section 32 of R.A. No. 186 and the filing of criminal complaint in the Ombudsman against said respondents for having violated Section 3(e) of R.A. No. 3019, as amended, otherwise known as the Anti-Graft and Corrupt Practices Act.

The Commission also finds the evidence adduced by the Special Committee sufficient to warrant the filing of a

Bar review courses, mock exams and a study planner that keeps you on pace - batas.org

criminal complaint in the Office of the City Fiscal of Manila against Engr. Paul Joseph Woo for having violated Article 177(6) of the Revised Penal Code for changing the grade/score of Henry V. Misanes in the subject "Strength of Materials" from "9" to "49".

The Commission likewise finds the examinees listed in Annexes "A", "A-1" and "A-2" to have violated the General Instructions to Examinees and hereby cancels their examination papers in the October, 1993 Electrical Engineering Licensure Examination. They are warned that a repetition of the same or similar infraction shall be dealt with more severely. Said examinees, however, are allowed to take future examinations.

The Commission, further, finds the examinees listed in Annex "B"; the examinees listed in Annex "B-1"; the examinees listed in Annex "B-2" and the examinees listed in Annex "B-3" to have not only violated the Rule on Anonymity as well as the General Instructions to Examinees but also to have been involved in the irregularity in the October 22, 23 and 24, 1993 Electrical Engineering Licensure Examinations and hereby cancels their examination papers in the said examination without prejudice to the filing of criminal actions against them if the evidence so warrant. They are hereby debarred from taking future licensure examinations administered by the PRC.

The Commission hereby directs the Legal and Investigation Division:

(1) To file criminal complaints before the Ombudsman against Engrs. Paul Joseph Woo and Baylon Tolentino, formerly Chairman and incumbent Member of the Board of Electrical Engineering, respectively, and Engrs. Caballero, Aquino and Evaristo for violation of Section 3(e) of R.A. No. 3019, as amended.

Examinees Maceda, Cacdac, Estrada and Pata should be included in the indictment should they refuse to testify for the government.

(2) To file formal administrative charges before the Board of Electrical Engineering against Engrs. Paul Joseph Woo and Baylon Tolentino and Engrs. Caballero, Aquino and Evaristo for committing unprofessional or dishonorable conduct in connection with the irregularity in the October, 1993 licensure examination in Electrical Engineering in violation of Section 31 in relation to Section 32 of R.A. No. 186, otherwise known as the Electrical Engineering Law.

(3) To file criminal complaint before the Office of the City Fiscal of Manila against Engr. Paul Joseph Woo for violation of Article 177(6) of the Revised Penal Code for changing the grade/score of Henry V. Misanes in the subject "Strength of Materials" from "9" to "49" by blackening the figure "40" in the box for Rating Part V of examinee's answer sheet.

SO ORDERED.

(SGD.) HERMOGENES P. POBRE
Commissioner
(SGD.) ALFONSO G. ABAD
(SGD.) ROSALINDA D. EVANGELISTA
Associate Commissioners

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.