

**## Title:**

Teresita Quintos-Deles vs. The Commission on Constitutional Commissions et al.

**## Facts:**

- **April 6, 1988:** Petitioner Teresita Quintos-Deles, along with three others, was appointed by President Corazon Aquino as sectoral representatives pursuant to Article VII, Section 16(2), and Article XVIII, Section 7 of the Constitution.
- **April 6, 1988:** Executive Secretary Catalino Macaraig Jr. transmitted the appointments to Speaker Ramon Mitra Jr., noting their positions.
- **April 18, 1988:** The appointed sectoral representatives, including Deles, attempted to take their oaths before Speaker Mitra but were obstructed due to opposition from some Congress members who insisted on the need for confirmation by the Commission on Appointments (CA).
- **April 25, 1988:** Amidst the controversy, the President submitted the appointments for confirmation by the CA.
- **April 22, 1988:** Deles addressed Speaker Mitra arguing against the need for confirmation and highlighting the discriminatory nature of this requirement.
- **May 2, 1988:** Speaker Mitra responded, emphasizing that since the President submitted her appointment to the CA, it now fell under the CA's jurisdiction.
- **May 10, 1988:** Deles received an invitation from the CA for a committee meeting to deliberate her appointment.
- **May 11, 1988:** Deles responded, questioning the CA's jurisdiction over her appointment.
- **May 12, 1988:** The CA Committee, chaired by Sen. Edgardo Angara, ruled against Deles' position.
- **Petitioner's Response:** Deles filed a petition for prohibition and mandamus, arguing that her appointment did not require CA confirmation.

**## Issues:**

1. **Constitutional Requirement:** Does the Constitution necessitate the appointment of sectoral representatives to be confirmed by the Commission on Appointments?
2. **Specific Provisions:** Whether the appointment falls under Article VII, Section 16, which details officers that need CA confirmation.
3. **Relevance of EO 198:** Whether Executive Order No. 198 impacts the requirement for confirmation.
4. **Historical Applications:** How the prior appointments of sectoral representatives were handled and if precedent exempts current appointments from confirmation.

## ## Court's Decision:

- **Requirement of Confirmation:** The Court affirmed the need for confirmation by the CA, referencing Section 16, Article VII, which states that appointments to certain offices explicitly require confirmation. It pointed out that sectoral representatives fall under "other officers whose appointments are vested in him in this Constitution."
- **Reference to Section 16, Article VII:** The Court emphasized that petitioner's appointment was made during a congressional recess, invoking paragraph 2 of Section 16, justifying the need for confirmation.
- **Mison Doctrine Application:** The Court reiterated its stance from the Sarmiento vs. Mison case, reaffirming that only the positions specified in the first sentence of Section 16, Article VII, need CA consent. The sectoral representatives are indeed listed under the category needing confirmation as they are not exempted like members of the judiciary or the Ombudsman.
- **Impact of EO 198:** The Court ruled that EO 198 does not override the constitutional requirement for confirmation, as the order concerns nomination procedures and not appointment confirmations.
- **Historical Handling:** Although initial sectoral representatives appointed earlier didn't undergo CA confirmation, the Court highlighted that the procedure did not set a binding precedent applicable to current appointments.

Thus, the petition was dismissed for lacking merit.

## ## Doctrine:

- **Confirmation Requirement:** Appointments of sectoral representatives made by the President require confirmation by the Commission on Appointments per Section 16, Article VII of the Constitution.
- **Mison Doctrine:** Appointments listed in the first sentence of Section 16, Article VII, including additional officers explicitly vested by the Constitution, require CA confirmation unless expressly exempted by the Constitution.

## ## Class Notes:

- **Key Concepts:**
- **Sectoral Representatives:** Appointed under Article XVIII, Section 7.
- **Confirmation by CA:** Required for those listed in Article VII, Section 16.

- **Statutory Provisions**:
- **Section 16, Article VII**: Specifies which Presidential appointments need CA confirmation.
- **Section 5, Article VI**: Defines composition and appointment of the House of Representatives, including sectoral representatives.
- **Section 7, Article XVIII**: Grants Presidential authority to appoint sectoral representatives until a law is passed.
- **Application**: This case underscores the necessity and constitutional mandate for confirming sectoral representatives appointed by the President.

**## Historical Background:**

- After the 1987 Constitution's ratification, it facilitated sectoral representation in Congress to ensure diverse group participation. The 1988 appointments aimed to implement this but faced legal scrutiny on procedural grounds, reflecting ongoing adjustments and clarifications in the evolving political and legal framework.