

**CARLOS B. CREER, COMPLAINANT, VS. CONCORDIO L. FABILLAR,
ACTING JUDGE, MCTC OF GIPORLOS-QUINAPUNDAN, PROVINCE OF
E. SAMAR, RESPONDENT.**

A.M. No. MTJ-99-1218. August 14, 2000

Ponente: VITUG, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/c6098b5954ac/>

VITUG, J.:

Herein respondent Judge Concordio L. Fabillar, Acting Presiding Judge of the 9[th] Municipal Circuit Trial Court of Giporlos-Quinapundan, was administratively charged with "gross ignorance of the law, x x x dishonesty (and) abuse of official position" by complainant Carlos Creer, thusly:

"In view of the unjust and unwarranted acts of the respondent herein of having deprived the complainant herein of his constitutional right of freedom and liberty without due process of law, by his unwarranted baseless whims and caprices caused his imprisonment for a total period of two months and twenty days — that was from March 10 to March 13, 1998, and from May 22, 1998 to August 8, 1998, due to his gross ignorance of laws and rules, dishonesty, abuse of his official position to oppress the herein complainant by reason of illwill resentment and other evil motives which he personally harbored against him."[1]

The administrative charge was an offshoot of Criminal Case No. 1133 where complainant Carlos Creer was indicted for grave coercion. On 29 March 1993, respondent judge found complainant guilty of the crime and meted him a prison term of two (2) months and fifteen (15) days plus a fine of Two Hundred Fifty (P250.00) pesos. Complainant seasonably appealed his conviction to the Regional Trial Court, Branch 3, at Guiuan, Eastern Samar. On 20 February 1998, the Regional Trial Court affirmed the judgment of conviction. Complainant filed a "Motion for Reconsideration."

On 06 March 1998, respondent Judge issued a subpoena commanding complainant and his bondsman to appear before his court on 10 March 1998. During the court session on 10 March 1998, as so scheduled, two of the three bondsmen appeared and submitted their "Withdrawal of Bondsmen," prompting respondent Judge to forthwith issue an order for the immediate apprehension of complainant and to fix the bail for his temporary liberty at P10,000.00. In the afternoon of even date, complainant was arrested and jailed until 13 March 1998 by the Chief of Police of Giporlos, Eastern Samar.

Complainant averred that respondent Judge on 13 March 1998 induced him to affix his signature on an "Application for Probation" and an "Application for Release on Recognizance" to impress legality to the warrant of arrest he had issued and to make it appear that complainant had abandoned his motion for reconsideration. Complainant was also made to sign his conformity to be placed under the custody of Antonia C. Creer. Complainant alleged that he was constrained to sign all those documents due to his being under detention. Three orders were issued by respondent Judge on 13 March 1998, one giving due course to complainant's application for probation, another granting "temporary liberty upon recognizance of Antonia C. Creer," and the last directing the probation officer to conduct a post sentence investigation on the application for probation of complainant and

ordering complainant to report once a week to the Clerk of Court.

On 05 May 1998, respondent Judge allegedly received from the probation officer a recommendation for the disapproval of complainant's petition for probation. On 22 May 1998, respondent Judge issued an order denying probation and revoking complainant's bail on recognizance.

Complainant was thereupon ordered arrested and confined for the second time from 22 May 1998 until 08 August 1998, the full term of his sentence. Complainant claimed that he was arrested and confined for the second time because of his persistence in pursuing his appeal and respondent Judge could not have been unaware that the judgment of conviction was not yet final. Indeed, the Regional Trial Court issued an order, only dated 23 May 1998, requiring the prosecution and respondent Judge to file their comment or opposition to the pending motion for reconsideration. In a decision, dated 26 November 1998, the Regional Trial Court gave due course to complainant's motion for reconsideration and reversed the judgment of conviction rendered by respondent Judge.

The Court Administrator required respondent Judge Fabillar to comment on the complaint against him. In his comment, dated 18 December 1998, respondent Judge denied any wrongdoing.

The Court Administrator, following its evaluation, made these observations; viz:

"According to respondent, the Decision on Appeal dated February 29, 1998, was received by him on February 24, 1998 and after a reasonable period of time, he required complainant to appear in court in order to apprise him thereof so that he could take such action as he deemed fit in the premises. The complainant not only failed to appear in answer to his summons but he even refused to sign the subpoena served on him by the court's process server. Because the bondsmen could not produce the body of the accused at said hearing, respondent required them to do so within a period of thirty (30) days and to show why no judgment on their bond should be taken on account of their failure to perform their obligation under their bond. Respondent avers that all the bondsmen — Mrs. Inciso, Mrs. Macabutas and Julio Abrinzosa, announced their intention to withdraw as bondsmen for complainant but respondent advised them that they could only do so after they had produced the body of the accused in court.

"Respondent alleges further that on March 16, 1998, when complainant finally appeared in court, his bondsmen executed a written motion withdrawing as such bondsmen. This was granted by the court. Considering that complainant was already without any bailbond, respondent argues that he had no other recourse but to pursue his previous order to arrest the complainant when he failed to appear in court. Thus complainant was placed under custody because of his failure to file another bond.

"Respondent states that while complainant was under detention, he filed an application for probation. The court acted on the same issuing an Order on March 13, 1998 directing the Probation Officer to conduct a post sentence investigation. Complainant also file an application for release on recognizance which the court granted and he was ordered placed under the custody of his daughter-in-law, Ms. Antonia Creer, a public school teacher. A copy of the application for probation and all pertinent papers were transmitted by the Clerk of the Municipal Circuit Court to the Clerk of the Regional Trial Court.

"On May 5, 1998, respondent avers that he received from the Probation Officer, Jesse Montes, a recommendation for the disapproval of the petition for probation. Respondent issued, on May 22, 1998, the Order denying probation and revoking complainant's bail on recognizance.

"Respondent claims that before complainant filed his application for probation, he sent a hand-written note to respondent asking the latter's forgiveness.

"Respondent argues that appeals and probation are mutually exclusionary and that the Regional Trial Court overlooked this mater when it reversed its previous decision on appeal which confirmed respondent's judgment of conviction. He contends that complainant should have been deemed to have abandoned his appeal, as well

as his motion for reconsideration upon the filing of his application for probation with respondent's court." [2]

The matter was referred by this Court to Judge Francisco D. Mazo of the Regional Trial Court at Guiuan, Eastern Samar, for investigation, report and recommendation. Judge Mazo, after an investigation, concluded that respondent was indeed guilty of the charge of ignorance of the law. The Office of the Court Administrator concurred with the Investigating Judge.

The Court agrees. More than anything else, respondent Judge has shown either an utter disregard to, or total unawareness of, the basic provisions of the Law on Probation (P.D. No. 968, as amended by P.D. No. 1990). Section 4 of the law provides:

"Sec. 4. Grant of Probation. — Subject to the provisions of this Decree, the trial court may, after it shall have convicted and sentenced a defendant, and upon application by said defendant within the period for perfecting an appeal, suspend the execution of the sentence and place the defendant on probation for such period and upon such terms and conditions as it may deem best; Provided, That no application for probation shall be entertained or granted if the defendant has perfected the appeal from the judgment of conviction."

Undisputedly, at the time complainant applied for probation, an appeal had already been perfected. Although respondent Judge eventually denied the application, the fact still remained that he had acted on it by asking the probation officer to conduct a post-sentence investigation instead of outrightly denying the same as so explicitly mandated by the law. The Investigating Judge likewise aptly opined that respondent should not have acted on the plea for withdrawal of the bondsmen but should have referred the matter to the appellate court. Clearly, bondsmen should not be relieved of their obligation unless the custody of the accused would have first been relinquished by them to the Court or proper authorities. [3]

Observance of the law, which he is bound to know and sworn to uphold, is required of every judge. [4] When the law is sufficiently basic, a judge owes it to his office to know and to simply apply it; [5] anything less than that would be constitutive of gross ignorance of the law. [6]

The Office of the Court Administrator, upon its verification, reported that in A.M. No. MTJ-97-1128, entitled "Florentino Bagunas vs. Judge Concordio Fabillar," [7] respondent Judge was previously held guilty of partiality, gross ignorance of the law and grave abuse of discretion for which he was suspended for three (3) months with a warning that a similar offense in the future would be dealt with severely.

Nevertheless, the Court finds the recommended penalty of dismissal from the service, with forfeiture of all leave credits and retirement benefits and with prejudice to reemployment in any branch of the government, including government owned and controlled corporations to be too severe. The Court, after due deliberation, considers it to be warranted a suspension of respondent Judge for six (6) months, without pay, as well as an imposition of a fine of P20,000.00, with a new warning of a most severe penalty for another infraction by respondent.

IN VIEW WHEREOF, respondent Judge Concordio Fabillar is **SUSPENDED** from the service for six (6) months, without pay, effective upon his receipt of this decision, and **ORDERED** to pay a fine of P20,000.00, with a warning of a most severe penalty for another infraction by him.

SO ORDERED.

Melo, (Chairman), Panganiban, Purisima, and Gonzaga-Reyes, JJ., concur.

[1] Investigation, Report and Recommendation, p. 2.

[2] Rollo, pp. 63-64.

[3] Investigation, Report and Recommendation, p. 7.

[4] *Hermo vs. De la Rosa*, 299 SCRA 68.

[5] *Bacor vs. De Guzman*, 271 SCRA 328.

[6] *Cortes vs. Agacaoili*, 294 SCRA 423.

[7] Reported in 289 SCRA 383.

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.