

JUDGE RAYMUNDO Z. ANNANG, COMPLAINANT, VS. TERESITA GARAMPIL VDA. DE BLAS, STAFF ASSISTANT II, MTC OF GUIMBA, NUEVA ECIJA, RESPONDENT.

A.M. No. P-91-602. October 15, 1991

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/c587ad76a722/>

PER CURIAM:

On the basis of an unsworn letter-complaint, dated 24 April 1991, sent to him by Araceli M. Agustin, mother of an accused, Judge Emmanuel T. Leyno of the Municipal Trial Court of Guimba, Nueva Ecija, in a memorandum dated 24 April 1991, directed Mrs. Teresita Garampil Vda. de Blas, Staff Assistant II in said court, to explain within 72 hours why she should not be charged administratively for grave misconduct in office committed as follows:

"That on March 25, 1991, upon learning that a warrant for the arrest of Melchor Agustin accused in Criminal Case No. 11516 for Assault Upon a Person in Authority has been issued by the Court you proceeded to the restaurant of the mother of the accused, Araceli Agustin, and demanded from her the sum of Eight Hundred Fifty Pesos (P850.00), purportedly to secure a personal bail bond for the provisional liberty of her son, Melchor Agustin, but one month has already elapsed up to this writing and despite the supplications of the mother for you to secure the necessary bond you failed to do so to the prejudice of the accused who was arrested and now languishing in jail per letter complaint and affidavit submitted by Mrs. Araceli Agustin, hereto attached.

You are further reported to have beg (sic) the warrant officer not to implement the warrant of arrest till after you have raised sufficient money to cover the amount you have taken from Mrs. Agustin."

Mrs. Blas received a copy of the above memorandum on 25 April 1991. For reasons only known to her, she did not file any explanation or answer.

By way of a 1[st] Memorandum dated 6 May 1991, Judge Leyno forwarded to Judge Raymundo Z. Annang, Executive Judge of the Regional Trial Court, Third Judicial Region, at Guimba, Nueva Ecija, the letter-complaint of Mrs. Agustin and his aforesaid memorandum and further informed the Executive Judge that:

"An inquiry from the complainant, Araceli Agustin on April 24, 1991, revealed that said Mrs. Blas appeared in her restaurant in Guimba, Nueva Ecija on March 25, 1991, and presented herself to be the person in charge of securing bail bond for the Court so that she entrusted to Mrs. Blas the sum of P850.00 for the purpose of securing the personal bail bond for her son Melchor Agustin accused in Criminal Case No. 11516 for the latter's personal liberty. Accused was apprehended on April 17, 1991 and detained in the Municipal Jail.

An examination of PFC Bernardo de Guzman, warrant officer, revealed that he was prevailed upon by said Mrs. Blas to suspend momentarily the apprehension of the accused. This, on the assumption that she may be able to raise enough money to cover up what she has received. Mrs. Blas, however, up to this writing, has not secured the necessary bail bond for the provisional liberty of the accused Melchor Agustin."

In a 4[th] Indorsement dated 15 May 1991, Executive Judge Annang referred to Mrs. Blas the basic letter of Mrs.

Agustin and other pertinent documents for her comment/explanation within five (5) days from receipt thereof. Mrs. Blas received them at 11:05 o'clock in the morning of 15 May 1991. Again, for reasons only known to her, she did not file any comment or explanation.

In his letter of 17 June 1991, addressed to the Honorable Chief Justice thru the Court Administrator, Executive Judge Annang, after reciting the foregoing facts, and more specifically the failure of Mrs. Blas to file a comment or explanation required in both the Memorandum of Judge Leyno and his aforesaid indorsement, concluded:

"For failure and refusal of Teresita G. Blas to give her side in this case, the undersigned found the complaint of Mrs. Araceli Agustin as meritorious.

The aforesaid act of respondent Teresita G. Blas constitutes not only a violation of law but serious and gross misconduct in office which is condemnable in any civilized society."

and recommended that Teresita G. Blas be suspended from office for a period of two (2) months without pay, with a warning that a repetition of the same or similar act in the future will be dealt with more severely.

The Office of the Court Administrator submitted this case for the consideration of the Court.

We consider this case as one filed by the disciplining authority pursuant to paragraph (c) of Section 36 of the Civil Service Decree.[1] This forecloses any possible question which may be raised due to the failure of Mrs. Araceli Agustin to verify her letter-complaint.

As shown above, respondent employee chose to disregard the memorandum of Judge Leyno and the indorsement of Executive Judge Annang which respectively directed her to show cause, within seventy-two hours, why she should not be administratively charged for grave misconduct, and to comment/explain, within five days, on the complaint of Mrs. Agustin. This conduct could only mean either indifference to and disregard of the authority of her superiors, or admission of the facts contained in the above-mentioned memorandum of Judge Leyno and indorsement of Judge Annang.

The charges are serious and if these were unfounded or untrue, respondent would, undoubtedly, lose no time to refute the charge as her honor and her position in the government are at stake. Honor is a precious commodity and many would even risk their lives to defend it. One's employment may be the only source of income to sustain a life worthy of human dignity, hence it would not be unnatural to protect it at all costs.

This Court considers then respondent's deliberate failure to comply with the memorandum and the indorsement as waiver of her right to be heard or admission of the truth of the charges.

We do not hesitate to rule that respondent committed grave misconduct in office, dishonesty, and conduct prejudicial to the best interest of the service when she solicited and received from Mrs. Agustin the sum of P850.00 allegedly to be used to secure the bail bond for the provisional liberty of Mrs. Agustin's son, Melchor Agustin, under the pretext that she is the personnel of the court in charge of processing bail bonds; prevailed upon the warrant officer to defer or suspend the service of the warrant for the arrest of Melchor until she shall have secured the bond; and when she failed and refused to return to Mrs. Agustin the aforesaid sum. She must suffer the consequences therefor.

This Court had said before, and reiterates it here, as it has done in other cases, that the conduct and behavior of every one connected with an office charged with the dispensation of justice, from the presiding judge to the lowliest clerk, should be circumscribed with the heavy burden of responsibility. His conduct, at all times, must not only be characterized by propriety and decorum but above all else must be above suspicion.[2] Indeed, every employee of the judiciary should be an example of integrity, uprightness and honesty.[3] In *Sy vs. Academia*, et

al.,[4] this Court reiterates its strict policy on the conduct of officers and employees in the judiciary, thus:

"The administration of justice is a sacred task. By the very nature of their duties and responsibilities, all those involved in it must faithfully adhere to, hold inviolate, and invigorate the principle solemnly enshrined in the 1987 Constitution that a public office is a public trust; and all public officers and employees must at all times be accountable to the people, serve them with utmost responsibility, integrity, loyalty and efficiency, and act with patriotism and justice, and lead modest lives (Sec. 1, Art. XI).

This Court condemns and would never countenance any conduct, act or omission on the part of all those involved in the administration of justice which would violate the norm of public accountability and would diminish or even just tend to diminish the faith of the people in the Judiciary."

Respondent does not deserve to stay a moment longer in the judiciary.

WHEREFORE, in the light of the foregoing, the Court resolved to DISMISS respondent Teresita Garampil Vda. de Blas, Staff Assistant II of the Municipal Trial Court of Guimba, Nueva Ecija, from the service for grave misconduct, dishonesty, and conduct prejudicial to the best interest of the service, with forfeiture of all benefits and with prejudice to re-employment in any branch of service of the Government, including government-owned or controlled corporations.

SO ORDERED.

Fernan, C.J., Narvasa, Gutierrez, Jr., Cruz, Paras, Feliciano, Padilla, Bidin, Griño-Aquino, Medialdea, Regalado, and Davide, Jr., JJ., concur.

Melencio-Herrera, J., on leave.

[1] P.D. No. 807.

[2] Jereos, Jr. vs. Reblando, Sr., 71 SCRA 126.

[3] Ablanida vs. Intia, Adm. Matter No. R-770-P, 17 May 1988.

[4] Adm. Matter No. P-87-72 and Adm. Matter No. P-90-481, 3 July 1991.

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.