

GERTRUDES V. VDA. DE VELAYO, COMPLAINANT, VS. JOHN C. RAMOS, IN HIS CAPACITY AS SHERIFF IV, REGIONAL TRIAL COURT, BRANCH 24, ECHAGUE, ISABELA, RESPONDENT.

A.M. No. P-99-1332. January 17, 2002

Ponente: YNARES-SANTIAGO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/e1c4583dd8df/>

YNARES-SANTIAGO, J.:

In a sworn letter-complaint dated February 4, 1998[1] filed with the Office of the Court Administrator (OCA), Gertrudes V. Vda. de Velayo charged John C. Ramos, Sheriff IV, RTC, Branch 24, Echague, Isabela with Grave Misconduct relative to Civil Case No. Br. 24-0070, allegedly committed thus:

After harvesting the palay from an agricultural land subject of a civil case pending with the Court of Appeals, said Sheriff forcibly took TEN (10) cavans of palay on November 18, 1997, sold it, received the proceeds and misappropriated for his personal use and benefit to the amount of P2,612.00. This amount should have been deposited in court on November 18, 1997.

BUT, the sheriff did not deposit it in court per certification of the Clerk of Court dated December 10, 1997.

After I have complained to the Court of this misappropriation by the sheriff, he (Sheriff Ramos) made it appear that Sheriff Ramos delivered the P2,612.00 representing proceeds of Ten (10) Cavanese on the same day December 10, 1997. This is not true because when I complained to the court against the sheriff on the Ten (10) Cavanese worth P2,612.00, the court issued Annex “B” [to the effect] that the sheriff did not deposit it. He deposited it only after I have complained. The misappropriation was already committed a long time.[2]

Respondent filed his answer[3] on June 10, 1998. He explained that complainant was one of the plaintiffs in Civil Case No. Br. 24-0070 entitled “Spouses Horace Velayo and Gertrudes Velayo v. Andres Guillermo, et al.,” filed before the RTC, Branch 24, Echague, Isabela. The court decided the case against plaintiffs, ordering them to vacate the land subject thereof and to restore its possession to defendants. Plaintiffs were likewise ordered to deliver the landowner’s share of the rice harvested on the subject land from 1981 until the defendants shall have been restored to its possession. Thereafter, plaintiffs appealed to the Court of Appeals, but the appeal was dismissed for failure to file their brief. Appellants then filed a petition for certiorari with the Supreme Court, which was likewise dismissed.

Complainant filed a petition for annulment of the said decision with the Court of Appeals. Hence, the RTC, Branch 24 of Echague, Isabela directed the parties to refrain from entering and/or cultivating any portion of the land subject of the case during the pendency of the petition.[4]

Meanwhile, it appears that complainant hired workers to enter the land subject of the case and to plant palay thereon. Thus, defendant Andres Guillermo filed a special civil action for indirect contempt against her. During the hearing of the case for contempt, the court issued an order enjoining the parties to strictly adhere to their agreement, and directed the Deputy Sheriff to closely manage and supervise the reaping and threshing of the standing crop and thereafter to deposit with the Court the landowner’s share.

On November 17, 1997 respondent Deputy Sheriff learned that complainant's hired workers were harvesting the palay on the subject land. At the ricefield, he saw one of the hired workers loading palay on the hand tractor and two (2) tricycles. After the hired workers left, respondent and his men found that there were still ten (10) sacks of palay left behind, so they delivered the same to a nearby grain dealer for deposit. However, since the palay was still wet, respondent decided to accept the amount of P2,612.00 as payment for the wet palay. He then prepared and filed his partial Sheriff's return on the implementation of the Court Order.[5]

On November 27, 1997, respondent returned to the rice field to supervise the harvesting of the remaining palay but noticed that the grains were still unripe, hence, he postponed the harvesting until the following week. On December 3, 1997, respondent went back to the rice field and saw that the carabaos had destroyed and ate the standing crops. In the afternoon of December 10, 1997, he deposited the amount of P2,612.00 with the court.

On the basis of the foregoing, respondent refutes complainant's allegation that he forcibly took the ten (10) cavans of palay. He took the same believing that it was his duty to do so because he perceived that the complainant was determined to violate the order of the Court by not giving any landowner's share of the rice harvest.[6]

In the meantime, respondent compulsorily retired from service effective December 14, 1998.[7] In his letter dated June 28, 1999,[8] he requested for the release of his retirement benefits subject to the retention of the amount of P20,000.00 to answer for whatever liability that may be imposed on him in this administrative case.

The Court, in a Resolution dated August 17, 1999, granted the request of respondent for the release of his retirement benefits but directed the OCA's Financial Management Office to retain the amount of Twenty Thousand (P20,000.00) Pesos from said benefits to answer for whatever liability may be imposed on him.[9] The Court further resolved to refer the case to Executive Judge Bonifacio T. Ong, Regional Trial Court, Branch 24, Echague, Isabela, for investigation, report and recommendation.[10]

During the pendency of the investigation, however, complainant executed an Affidavit of Desistance dated September 24, 1999[11] declaring, among others, that she had already pardoned respondent for what he had done, and that she was now desisting from further prosecuting the case against him.

On October 12, 1999,[12] Executive Judge Bonifacio T. Ong submitted his report wherein he recommended the dismissal of the case against respondent. He found that there was no misappropriation of the money, legally speaking, because respondent Ramos was able to account or deposit the said sum of money in court before the complaint was filed. Furthermore, respondent, as Deputy Sheriff, was authorized by the court to closely manage and supervise the reaping and threshing of the standing crops and thereafter to deposit with the court the landowner's share.[13]

It appearing from the report of the Executive Judge that no formal investigation was conducted in view of the execution of the affidavit of desistance of complainant, a Resolution dated February 8, 2000[14] was issued referring the case to the Executive Judge for a more thorough investigation.

In his investigation report dated June 2, 2000,[15] Executive Judge Ong recommended the imposition of a fine of Two Thousand (P2,000.00) Pesos upon respondent for his delay in depositing with the court the amount of P2,612.00 representing the value of ten (10) cavans of palay. Executive Judge Ong, however, maintained his finding that respondent did not commit misappropriation.

We agree with the Investigating Judge.

The administration of justice is a sacred task and it demands the highest degree of efficiency, dedication and

professionalism.[16] In this regard, sheriffs and deputy sheriffs, being ranking officers of the court and agents of the law, must discharge their duties with great care and diligence. In serving and implementing court writs, as well as processes and orders of the court, they cannot afford to err without affecting adversely the proper dispensation of justice.[17] Sheriffs play an important role in the administration of justice and as agents of the law, high standards are expected of them.[18] They should always hold inviolate and invigorate the tenet that a public office is a public trust.[19]

It must be remembered that the deposit of items in litigation is not a discretionary matter and until the court had made its decision as to the disposal thereof, the presumption is that the seized items should remain in the court's custody, hence, to be deposited in court, not delivered to any of the parties in the absence of a directive to that effect in the seizure order.[20] Thus, immediately after executing the order, the officer must make a return thereon to the clerk or judge of the court from which the order issued, with a full statement of his proceedings under the order and a complete inventory of the property attached.[21] In fact, Section 6, Rule 57 of the 1997 Rules of Civil Procedure states that:

Sheriff's return. – After enforcing the writ, the sheriff must likewise without delay make a return thereon to the court from which the writ issued, with a full statement of his proceedings under the writ and a complete inventory of the property attached, together with any counter-bond given by the party against whom the attachment is issued, and serve copies thereof on the applicant. (emphasis ours)

Sheriffs, as public officers are repositories of public trust and are under obligation to perform the duties of their office honestly, faithfully and to the best of their ability. They are bound to use reasonable skill and diligence in the performance of their official duties particularly where the rights of individuals may be jeopardized by their neglect.[22] It must be borne in mind that the conduct required of court personnel must be beyond reproach and must always be free from suspicion that may taint the judiciary.[23] It is therefore incumbent upon every member of the judiciary family to work hand in hand in restoring and upholding, rather than destroying, the integrity of the courts to which they belong.[24]

There can be no question that the act of respondent in tardily depositing with the court the proceeds of the ten (10) cavans of palay harvested on November 18, 1997[25] is deserving of reproof. Worse, respondent attempted to cover for his lapse by making it appear that he immediately deposited the same on December 10, 1997,[26] when the clerk of court had earlier issued a certification stating that he had not deposited the money.[27] Respondent, therefore, failed to live up to the standards set for court personnel, and conducted himself in a manner prejudicial to the service.[28] Thus:

Time and again, we have emphasized the heavy burden and responsibility which court personnel are saddled with in view of their exalted positions as keepers of public faith. They must be constantly reminded that any impression of impropriety, misdeed or negligence in the performance of official functions must be avoided. As we have held in the case of *Mendoza vs. Mabutas*,[29] this Court condemns and would never countenance such 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 diminish or even just tend to diminish the faith of the people in the Judiciary.[30]

In *Canlas v. Balasbas*,[31] the Court held:

At the grassroots of our judicial machinery, sheriffs and their deputy sheriffs are indispensably in close contact with the litigants, hence, their conduct should be geared towards maintaining the prestige and integrity of the court, for the image of a court of justice is necessarily mirrored in the conduct, official or otherwise, of the men and women who work thereat from the judge to the least and lowest of its personnel; hence, it becomes the imperative sacred duty of each and everyone in the court to maintain its good name and standing as a temple of

justice.

The sheriff is a court officer primarily responsible for the speedy and efficient service of all court processes and writs originating from his court and the branches thereof and those that may be delegated to him by other courts.[32] As an officer whose duties form an integral part of the administration of justice, a sheriff and his deputies may be properly dismissed,[33] fined,[34] or suspended[35] from office by this Tribunal, in the exercise of its administrative supervision over the judicial branch of the government, for actions committed in violation of the Rules of Court which impedes and detracts from a fair and just administration of justice.[36] Given the prevailing facts of the case, and considering further that the incident appears to be the first offense of respondent during his stint in the Judiciary, the Court considers the recommended sanction appropriate for respondent's misdeed.

WHEREFORE, in view of all the foregoing, respondent Sheriff IV John C. Ramos is hereby FINED the amount of Two Thousand (P2,000.00) Pesos, the said sum to be deducted from the Twenty Thousand (P20,000.00) Pesos ordered retained by the OCA-Financial Management Office out of the retirement benefits accruing to him. The remainder thereof shall be released to respondent upon finality of this Decision.

SO ORDERED.

Davide, Jr., C.J., (Chairman), Puno, Kapunan and Pardo, JJ., concur.

[1] Rollo, p. 1.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Id., pp. 5-8

[4] Id., pp. 9-10.

[5] Id., p. 11.

[6] Id., pp. 7-8.

[7] Id., p. 13.

[8] Id., p. 16.

[9] Id., p. 21.

[10] Id., p. 20.

[11] Id., p. 23.

[12] Id., pp. 25-26.

[13] Id., p. 26.

[14] Id., p. 40.

[15] Id., pp. 46-48.

[16] Contreras v. Mirando, 280 SCRA 608, 610 [1997].

[17] Magat v. Pimentel, 346 SCRA 153, 159 [2000]; Ignacio v. Payumo, 344 SCRA 169, 172 [2000].

- [18] Llamado v. Ravelo, 280 SCRA 597 [1997].
- [19] Ventura v. Concepcion, 346 SCRA 14, 18 [2000].
- [20] Onquit v. Binamira-Garcia, 297 SCRA 354 [1998].
- [21] Pecson v. Sicat, Jr., 298 SCRA 122, 129-130 [1998], citing Section 6, Rule 57, Rules of Court.
- [22] Pecson v. Sicat, Jr., *supra*, at 131.
- [23] Abanil v. Ramos, Jr., 346 SCRA 20, 24 [2000].
- [24] Contreras v. Mirando, *supra*, at 611.
- [25] Rollo, p. 3, Annex A.
- [26] *Ibid.*, p. 2, Annex C.
- [27] *Id.*, p. 3, Annex B.
- [28] Dionisio v. Gilera, 312 SCRA 287 [1999].
- [29] 223 SCRA 411 [1993], citing *Sy v. Academia*, 198 SCRA 705 [1991].
- [30] Loyao, Jr. v. Armecin, 337 SCRA 47, 52 [2000].
- [31] 337 SCRA 41, 46 [2000], citing *Vda. de Abellera v. Dalisay*, 268 SCRA 64, 67 [1997].
- [32] *V.C. Ponce Co., Inc. v. Eduarte*, 343 SCRA 445, 459 [2000].
- [33] *Araza v. Garcia, et al.*, 325 SCRA 1 [2000].
- [34] *OCA v. Cabe*, 334 SCRA 348 [2000].
- [35] *Gomez v. Concepcion*, 331 SCRA 503 [2000]; *Sebastian v. Valino*, 224 SCRA 256 [1993].
- [36] *Re: Danilo Cunanan*, 238 SCRA 421 [1994], citing *Hipolito v. Mergas*, 195 SCRA 6 [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.