

MALAYANG SAMAHAN NG MGA MANGGAGAWA SA M. GREENFIELD (MSMG-UWP), ITS PRESIDENT BEDA MAGDALENA VILLANUEVA, MARIO DAGANIO, DONATO GUERRERO, BELLA P. SANCHEZ, ELENA TOBIS, RHODA TAM...

G.R. No. 113907. April 20, 2001

Ponente: GONZAGA-REYES, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-no-113907/>

GONZAGA-REYES, J.:

Before us is petitioners' motion for partial reconsideration of our decision dated February 28, 2000,[1] the dispositive portion of which reads:[2]

"WHEREFORE, the petition is GRANTED; the decision of the National Labor Relations Commission in Case No. NCR-00-09-04199-89 is REVERSED and SET ASIDE; and the respondent company is hereby ordered to immediately reinstate the petitioners to their respective positions. Should reinstatement be not feasible, respondent company shall pay separation pay of one month salary for every year of service. Since petitioners were terminated without the requisite written notice at least 30 days prior to their termination, following the recent ruling in the case of Ruben Serrano vs. National Labor Relations Commission and Isetann Department Store, the respondent company is hereby ordered to pay full backwages to petitioner-employees while the Federation is also ordered to pay full backwages to petitioner-union officers who were dismissed upon its instigation. Since the dismissal of petitioners was without cause, backwages shall be computed from the time the herein petitioner employees and union officers were dismissed until their actual reinstatement. Should reinstatement be not feasible, their backwages shall be computed from the time petitioners were terminated until the finality of this decision. Costs against the respondent company.

SO ORDERED."

Petitioners allege that this Court committed patent and palpable error in holding that "the respondent company officials cannot be held personally liable for damages on account of employees' dismissal because the employer corporation has a personality separate and distinct from its officers who merely acted as its agents" whereas the records clearly established that respondent company officers Saul Tawil, Carlos T. Javelosa and Renato C. Puangco have caused the hasty, arbitrary and unlawful dismissal of petitioners from work; that as top officials of the respondent company who handed down the decision dismissing the petitioners, they are responsible for acts of unfair labor practice; that these respondent corporate officers should not be considered as mere agents of the company but the wrongdoers. Petitioners further contend that while the case was pending before the public respondents, the respondent company, in the early part of February 1990, began removing its machineries and equipment from its plant located at Merville Park, Paranaque and began diverting jobs intended for the regular employees to its sub-contractor/satellite branches;[3] that the respondent company officials are also the officers and incorporators of these satellite companies as shown in their articles of incorporation and the general information sheet. They added that during their ocular inspection of the plant site of the respondent company, they found that the same is being used by other unnamed business entities also engaged in the manufacture of

garments. Petitioners further claim that the respondent company no longer operates its plant site as M. Greenfield thus it will be very difficult for them to fully enforce and implement the court's decision. In their subsequent motion filed on the same day, petitioners also pray for the (A) inclusion of the names of employees listed in Annex "D" of the petition which they inadvertently omitted in the caption of the case, to wit: (1) Amores, Imelda (2) Andres, Josefina (3) Aragon, Felicidad (4) Arias, Genevive (5) Arroyo, Salvacion (6) Arceo, Elizabeth (7) Anonuevo, Monica (8) Abellada, Josefina (9) Advincula, Harmelina (10) Ajayo, Rosario (11) Alilay, Marilyn (12) Almario, Anliza (13) Almario, Angelita (14) Almazan, Marilou (15) Almonte, Rosalina (16) Alvaran, Marites (17) Alvarez, Edna (18) Ampo, Anacorita (19) Aquino, Leonisa (20) Bactat, Celia (21) Carpio, Azucena G. (22) Cruz, Amelia (23) Glifonia, Eugenia (24) Escurel, Evelyn F. (25) Hilario, Bonifacio G. (26) Payuan, Adoracion (27) Perez, Mercedita (28) Rempis, Zenaida (29) Rosario, Margie deL (30) Salvador, Norma (31) Sambayanan, Olivia (32) Tiaga, Aida (33) Torbela, Maria (34) Trono, Nenevina (35) Varona, Asuncion (36) Vasquez, Elisa M. (37) Villanueva, Milagros (38) Villapondo, Eva C. (39) Villon, Adeliza T.; (B) correction of their own typographical errors of the names of employees appearing in the caption, which should be as follows: Manuela Avelin, Belen Barquio, Lita Buquid, Violeta C. Ciervo, Marilou Dejocos, Maximina Faustino, Primitiva Gomez, Myrna Palaca, Mercedita Perez, Rebecca Poceran, Amorlita Rotairo, Emma Saludario, Tita Senis, Salvacion Wilson,[4] Anita Ahillon, Gregoria Arguelles, Tessie Balbis, Betty Borja, Rodrigo Buella, Celsa Doropan, Maria Enicame, Josephine Lasco, Julita Maniba, Juanita Osuyos, Juana Overencio, Azucena Postigo, Cristina Rapinan, Roselyn Rivero, Edeltrudes Romero, Rodelia Royandoyon, Fausta Segundo, Teodora Sulit, Elena Tebis, Paulina Valdez,[5] Susan Abogona, Diana Adovas, Carmen Rosimo Basco, Macaria Barrion, Maria Fe Berezo, Matilde de Blas, Rufina Bugnot, Aurora Bravo, Jovita Cera, Precila Carta, Amalia Eugenio, Milagros Fonseca, Jose Irlanda, Rowena Jarabejo, Regina Lapidario, Josie Marcos, Shirley Melegrito, Noemi Menguillo, Teresita Nierves, Ricardo Paloga, Florenia Ragos, Leonila Rodil, Emma Saludario, Narcisa Songuad, Josie Sumarsar, Evangeline Tayco;[6] (C) inclusion of other employees similarly situated whose names were not included in Annex "D" or in the caption of the case, to wit: (1) Dionisa Aban, (2) Alicia Aragon, (3) Vicky Francia, (4) Nelita F. Gelongos, (5) Erlinda San Juan, (6) Erlinda Baby Patungan Manalo, (7) Jenette Patungan,[7] (8) Blandina Simbahan,[8] (9) Asuncion Varona,[9] (10) Josefina Andres, (11) Teresita Arales, (12) Alice Artikulo, (13) Esther Cometa, (14) Eliza Cabiting, (15) Erlinda Dalut, (16) Edna Fernandez, (17) Emily Inocencio, (18) Esperanza Jalocon, (19) Imelda Jarabe, (20) Mercedes Pabadora, (21) Venerado Pastoral, (22) Cristina Perlas, (23) Margie del Rosario.[10]

In their Comment, the Solicitor General interposes no objection to petitioners' prayer for the inclusion of omitted and similarly situated employees and the correction of employees' names in the caption of the case.

On the other hand, private respondent company officials Carlos Javelosa and Remedios Caoleng, in their Comment, state that considering that petitioners admitted having knowledge of the fact that private respondent officers are also holding key positions in the alleged satellite companies, they should have presented the pertinent evidence with the public respondents; thus it is too late for petitioners to require this Court to admit and evaluate evidence not presented during the trial; that the supposed proof of satellite companies hardly constitute newly discovered evidence. Respondent officials interpose no objection to the inclusion of employees inadvertently excluded in the caption of the case but object to the inclusion of employees who were allegedly similarly situated for the reason that these employees had not been parties to the case, hence should not be granted any relief from the court. Respondent company failed to file its comment.[11]

Petitioners' contention that respondent company officials should be made personally liable for damages on account of petitioners' dismissal is not impressed with merit. A corporation is a juridical entity with legal personality separate and distinct from those acting for and in its behalf and, in general from the people comprising it.[12] The rule is that obligations incurred by the corporation, acting through its directors, officers and

employees, are its sole liabilities.[13] True, solidary liabilities may at times be incurred but only when exceptional circumstances warrant such as, generally, in the following cases:[14]

1. When directors and trustees or, in appropriate cases, the officers of a corporation -
 - (a) Vote for or assent to patently unlawful acts of the corporation;
 - (b) act in bad faith or with gross negligence in directing the corporate affairs;
 - (c) are guilty of conflict of interest to the prejudice of the corporation, its stockholders or members, and other persons.[15]
- (2) When a director or officer has consented to the issuance of watered stocks or who, having knowledge thereof, did not forthwith file with the corporate secretary his written objection thereto.[16]
- (3) When a director, trustee or officer has contractually agreed or stipulated to hold himself personally and solidarily liable with the Corporation.[17]
- (4) When a director, trustee or officer is made, by specific provision of law, personally liable for his corporate action.[18]

In labor cases, particularly, the Court has held corporate directors and officers solidarily liable with the corporation for the termination of employment of corporate employees done with malice or in bad faith.[19] Bad faith or negligence is a question of fact and is evidentiary.[20] It has been held that bad faith does not connote bad judgement or negligence; it imports a dishonest purpose or some moral obliquity and conscious doing of wrong; it means breach of a known duty thru some motive or interest or ill will; it partakes of the nature of fraud.[21]

In the instant case, there is nothing substantial on record to show that respondent officers acted in patent bad faith or were guilty of gross negligence in terminating the services of petitioners so as to warrant personal liability. As held in *Sunio vs. NLRC*,[22]

"We now come to the personal liability of petitioner, Sunio, who was made jointly and severally responsible with petitioner company and CIPI for the payment of the backwages of private respondents. This is reversible error. The Assistant Regional Director's Decision failed to disclose the reason why he was made personally liable. Respondents, however, alleged as grounds thereof, his being the owner of one half (1/2) interest of said corporation, and his alleged arbitrary dismissal of private respondents.

Petitioner Sunio was impleaded in the Complaint in his capacity as General Manager of petitioner corporation. There appears to be no evidence on record that he acted maliciously or in bad faith in terminating the services of private respondents. His act, therefore, was within the scope of his authority and was a corporate act.

It is basic that a corporation is invested by law with a personality separate and distinct from those of the persons composing it as well as from that of any other legal entity to which it may be related. Mere ownership by a single stockholder or by another corporation of all or nearly all of the capital stock of a corporation is not of itself sufficient ground for disregarding the separate corporate personality. Petitioner Sunio, therefore, should nor have been made personally answerable for the payment of private respondents' back salaries."

Petitioners' claim that the jobs intended for the respondent company's regular employees were diverted to its satellite companies where the respondent company officers are holding key positions is not substantiated and was raised for the first time in this motion for reconsideration. Even assuming that the respondent company officials are also officers and incorporators of the satellite companies, such circumstance does not in itself amount to fraud. The documents attached to petitioners' motion for reconsideration show that these satellite companies[23] were established prior to the filing of petitioners' complaint against private respondents with the Department of Labor

and Employment on September 6, 1989 and that these corporations have different sets of incorporators aside from the respondent officers and are holding their principal offices at different locations. Substantial identity of incorporators between respondent company and these satellite companies does not necessarily imply fraud.[24] In such a case, respondent company's corporate personality remains inviolable.[25]

Although there were earlier decisions of this Court in labor cases where corporate officers were held to be personally liable for the payment of wages and other money claims to its employees, we find those rulings inapplicable to this case. In *La Campana Coffee Factory, Inc. vs. Kaisahan ng Manggagawa sa La Campana (KKM)*,[26] *La Campana Coffee Factory, Inc.* and *La Campana Gaugau Packing* were substantially owned by the same person. They had one office, one management, and a single payroll for both businesses. The laborers of the gaugau factory and the coffee factory were also interchangeable, i.e., the workers in one factory worked also in the other factory.

In *Claparols vs. Court of Industrial Relations*,[27] the *Claparol Steel and Nail Plant* which was ordered to pay its workers backwages, ceased operations on June 30, 1957 and was succeeded on the next day, July 1, 1957 by the *Claparols Steel Corporation*. Both corporations were substantially owned and controlled by the same person and there was no break or cessation in operations. Moreover, all the assets of the steel and nail plant were transferred to the new corporation.

Notably, in the above-mentioned cases, a new corporation was created, owned by the same family, engaged in the same business and operating in the same compound, a situation which is not obtaining in the instant case.

In *AC Ransom Labor Union-CCLU vs. NLRC*,[28] the Court ruled that under the Minimum Wage Law, the responsible officer of an employer corporation can be held personally liable for non-payment of backwages for "if the policy of the law were otherwise, the corporation employer would have devious ways for evading of back wages." This Court said:

"In the instant case, it would appear that RANSOM, in 1969, foreseeing the possibility or probability of payment of backwages to the 22 strikers, organized ROSARIO to replace RANSOM, with the latter to be eventually phased out if the 22 strikers win their case. RANSOM actually ceased operations on May 1, 1973, after the December 19, 1972 Decision of the Court of Industrial Relations was promulgated against RANSOM."

Clearly, the situation in *AC Ransom* does not obtain in this case, where the alleged satellite companies were established even prior to the filing of petitioners' complaint with the Department of Labor.

Petitioners' prayer for the inclusion of employees listed in Annex "D" whose names were admittedly inadvertently excluded in the caption of the case and for the correction of typographical errors of the employees' names appearing in the caption, is well taken and is hereby granted. However, petitioners' prayer for the inclusion of other employees allegedly similarly situated but whose names were not included either in Annex "D" or in the caption of the case must be denied. A judgment cannot bind persons who are not parties to the action.[29] It is elementary that strangers to a case are not bound by the judgment rendered by the court and such judgment is not available as an adjudication either against or in favor of such other person.[30] Petitioners failed to explain why these employees allegedly similarly situated were not included in the submitted list filed before us. Such inclusion would be tantamount to a substantial amendment which cannot be allowed at this late stage of the proceedings as it will definitely work to the prejudice and disadvantage of the private respondents.[31]

WHEREFORE, petitioners' motion for reconsideration is partially granted so as to include the names of employees listed in Annex "D" which petitioners inadvertently omitted in the caption of this case, to wit: (1) Amores, Imelda (2) Andres, Josefina (3) Aragon, Felicidad (4) Arias, Genevive (5) Arroyo, Salvacion (6) Arceo,

Elizabeth (7) Anonuevo, Monica (8) Abellada, Josefina (9) Advincula, Harmelina (10) Ajayo, Rosario (11) Alilay, Marilyn (12) Almario, Anliza (13) Almario, Angelita (14) Almazan, Marilou (15) Almonte, Rosalina (16) Alvaran, Marites (17) Alvarez, Edna (18) Ampo, Anacorita (19) Aquino, Leonisa (20) Bactat, Celia (21) Carpio, Azucena G. (22) Cruz, Amelia (23) Glifonia, Eugenia (24) Escurel, Evelyn F. (25) Hilario, Bonifacio G. (26) Payuan, Adoracion (27) Perez, Mercedita (28) Rempis, Zenaida (29) Rosario, Margie del (30) Salvador, Norma (31) Sambayanan, Olivia (32) Tiaga, Aida (33) Torbela, Maria (34) Trono, Nenevina (35) Varona, Asuncion (36) Vasquez, Elisa M. (37) Villanueva, Milagros (38) Villapondo, Eva C. (39) Villon, Adeliza T.; and to correct the typographical errors of the names of employees appearing in the caption, as follows: Manuela Avelin, Belen Barquio, Lita Buquid, Violeta C. Ciervo, Marilou Dejocos, Maximina Faustino, Primitiva Gomez, Myrna Palaca, Mercedita Perez, Rebecca Poceran, Amorlita Rotairo, Emma Saludario, Tita Senis, Salvacion Wilson, Anita Ahillon, Gregoria Arguelles, Tessie Balbis, Betty Borja, Rodrigo Buella, Celsa Doropan, Maria Enicame, Josephine Lasco, Julita Maniba, Juanita Osuyos, Juana Overencio, Azucena Postigo, Cristina Rapinan, Roselyn Rivero, Edeltrudes Romero, Rodelia Royandoyon, Fausta Segundo, Teodora Sulit, Elena Tebis, Paulina Valdez, Susan Abogona, Diana Adovas, Carmen Rosimo Basco, Macaria Barrion, Maria Fe Berezo, Matilde de Blas, Rufina Bugnot, Aurora Bravo, Jovita Cera, Precila Carta, Amalia Eugenio, Milagros Fonseca, Jose Irlanda, Rowena Jarabejo, Regina Lapidario, Josie Marcos, Shirley Melegrito, Noemi Menguillo, Teresita Nierves, Ricardo Paloga, Florenia Ragos, Leonila Rodil, Emma Saludario, Narcisa Songuad, Josie Sumarsar, Evangeline Tayco.

SO ORDERED.

Melo (Chairman), and Sandoval-Gutierrez, JJ., concur.

Vitug, J., reiterates his separate opinion in *Serrano v. NLRC* (G.R. No. 117040, of Jan. 2000)

Panganiban, J., reiterates his separate opinion in *Serrano v. NLRC*, G.R. No. 117040, 27 Jan. 2000.

[1] Justice Purisima retired on October 28, 2000; the motion for reconsideration was raffled to herein ponente.

[2] *Rollo*, pp. 1691-1692; *Decision*, pp. 46-47.

[3] Hannahs Garment Corporation, Design Logistics, Inc., Blusa Inc., Quality Garments, Inc., Greenfield and Santiago, Subscriber's Fashion Link Corporation, Danielles Embroidery Inc.

[4] Motion dated April 4, 2000.

[5] Supplemental motion dated May 31, 2000.

[6] Compliance dated October 13, 2000.

[7] Listed in the motion dated April 4, 2000; Reiterated in the pleading dated August 3, 2000.

[8] Listed in Annex "D".

[9] *Ibid*.

[10] Supplemental motion dated May 31, 2000.

[11] The copy of the resolution dated July 5, 2000 requiring respondent M. Greenfield to inform the Court of the name and address of its new counsel was returned unserved with post master notation, "RTS, Moved left no address", hence this Court resolved that the July 5 resolution was deemed served on respondents.

[12] *Santos vs. NLRC*, 254 SCRA 673.

[13] Ibid.

[14] MAM Realty Development Corporation vs. NLRC, 244 SCRA 797 citing Tramet Mercantile Inc. vs. CA, 238 SCRA 14.

[15] Ibid citing Section 31, Corporation Code.

[16] Ibid citing Section 65, Corporation Code.

[17] Ibid citing De Asis and Co, Inc., vs. CA, 136 SCRA 599.

[18] Ibid citing Article 144, Corporation Code; see also Section 13, PD 115 (Trust Receipts Law).

[19] MAM Realty Development Corp. vs. NLRC, supra; Sunio vs. NLRC, 127 SCRA 390; General Banking and Trust Co., et. al vs. CA and Manuel E. Batucan, 135 SCRA 569.

[20] National Food Authority vs. CA, 311 SCRA 700.

[21] Board of Liquidators vs. Kalaw, 20 SCRA 987, 1007.

[22] 127 SCRA 390, 397-39.

[23] Hannah's Garment Corp. incorporated in January 14, 1987, Annex "C"; Design Logistics in February 1988, Annex "B", Blusa Inc. amended articles of incorporation in August 1988, Annex "D"; Fashion Link October 4, 1988, Annex "E"; Danielle's Embroidery in August 4, 1989, Annex "A"; S.R. Garments Inc. in August 7, 1989, Annex "F" (Petitioners' evidence).

[24] Del Rosario vs. NLRC, 187 SCRA 777.

[25] Ibid.

[26] 93 Phil 160 cited in Del Rosario vs. NLRC, supra.

[27] 65 SCRA 613, cited in Del Rosario vs. NLRC, supra.

[28] 142 SCRA 269.

[29] Matuguina Integrated Wood Products, Inc., vs. CA, 263 SCRA 490 citing Buazon vs. CA, 220 SCRA 182.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Barfel Development Corporation vs. CA, 223 SCRA 268 citing Shaffer vs. Palma, 22 SCRA 934; Philippine Banking Corporation vs. IAC, et. al., 187 SCRA 257.

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.