

ATTY. FRANCISCO R. SOTTO AND ONG TIAO, PETITIONERS, VS. HON. COURT OF APPEALS, CONSOLIDATED BANK & TRUST CORPORATION, THE SOLID GUARANTY INC., LEONARDO T. DE GUZMAN, AND CITY SH...

G.R. No. L-41750. June 16, 1976

Ponente: BARREDO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/e8124865d8fc/>

BARREDO, J.:

Petition for certiorari assailing as having been rendered in grave abuse of discretion the resolution of the Court of Appeals (Seventh Division) of August 29 and October 9, 1975 in CA-G.R. No. 57151-R, Ong Tiao vs. Consolidated Bank & Trust Co., et al., finding Ong Tiao and his counsel, Atty. Francisco R. Sotto, herein petitioners, guilty of contempt of said court for having committed "acts of falsification" in the printing and filing of the record on appeal in said case.

Finding sufficient ground on the face of the petition for a review of the impugned resolutions, We required respondents to answer, but after the hearing, and the submission of their respective memoranda, the parties filed on April 1, 1976, the following motion:

"COME NOW the petitioners and private respondents, the latter represented by its President and General Manager and duly authorized by the Board, upon suggestion made in open court during the oral argument on February 16, 1976, that the above-entitled case be settled amicably; further, this contempt proceedings arose out from mere misunderstanding and honest mistakes due to lack of communication between the parties; and furthermore, in the interest of justice and equity to all parties concerned, the herein private respondents hereby withdraw their OMNIBUS MOTION dated May 26, 1975 (Annex 'S', petition) and petitioners and private respondents move that the RESOLUTIONS of the Court of Appeals (Annexes 'Y' and 'E') be both set aside.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully prayed that the RESOLUTIONS (Annexes 'Y' and 'EE', petition) of the Court of Appeals be both set aside, and be declared without force and effect." (Page 240, Record.)

In other words, it is now virtually admitted by private respondent Bank that the filing by it in the Court of Appeals of its motion which resulted in the condemnatory resolution aforementioned was due to "mere misunderstanding and honest mistakes due to lack of communication between the parties." While the Court did gather at the hearing the impression that indeed the whole controversy between the parties arose more because of confusion as to the correct procedure to follow in the printing and filing of their respective records on appeal, both parties having decided to elevate the case to the Court of Appeals, than from any malicious intent on the part of petitioners to mislead the court and prejudice respondent Bank's appeal, for which reason, a member of the Court expressed the view then that it would be best to settle the matter amicably between the parties, now that respondent Bank has apparently come to the realization that its motion to declare petitioners in contempt was actually unwarranted, it is but proper that the prayer to set aside the resolutions in question should be addressed to the Court of Appeals. In other words, since it appears that the parties are not submitting the case now before us on the merits of their

respective claims but because respondent Bank now concedes that its filing of the contempt motion in the Court of Appeals was quite precipitate and rather uncalled for, the Court of Appeals, against whom the supposed contempt was committed, must be the one to determine whether or not to recall its resolutions impugned in the petition. Only the court against whom contempt is committed, and not the appellate court to which the contempt order has been elevated, has the authority to act on a joint motion for withdrawal and acknowledgment of the parties indicating that after all no contempt was intentionally committed.

Accordingly, let this case be remanded to the Court of Appeals for appropriate action on the above-transcribed "omnibus" motion of the parties. No costs.

Fernando, (Chairman), Antonio, Aquino, and Martin, JJ., concur.

Concepcion, Jr., J., is on official leave.

Martin, J., was designated to sit in the Second Division.

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.