

Title: Carpio v. Hon. Sergio Doroja, Edwin Ramirez and Eduardo Toribio - Subsidiary Liability of Vehicle Owner

Facts:

- On October 23, 1985, Edwin Ramirez, driving a Fuso Jitney owned by Eduardo Toribio, hit pedestrian Dionisio Carpio, causing Carpio to suffer a fractured left clavicle and requiring three months of medical attention.
- Ramirez was charged with Reckless Imprudence Resulting in Serious Physical Injuries but pleaded guilty to a lesser offense, resulting in a conviction on May 27, 1987, for Reckless Imprudence Resulting to Less Serious Physical Injuries. He was sentenced to one to two months of Arresto Mayor and was ordered to indemnify Carpio for a total of P1,745.00.
- Ramirez filed for probation, and the trial court decided not to summon Toribio despite his potential civil liability as the owner, considering Ramirez's indigency.
- Carpio, through the private prosecutor, appealed the civil aspect of the case, seeking increased moral and compensatory damages. The Regional Trial Court awarded an additional P5,000 in moral damages but retained other liabilities.
- A writ of execution was issued against Ramirez, returning unsatisfied due to his insolvency. Carpio then moved for a subsidiary writ of execution against Toribio, which the trial court denied, stating the appellate decision did not address subsidiary liability and categorizing the case as "culpa-aquiliana," not "culpa-contractual."
- Carpio's motion for reconsideration on the denial of subsidiary execution was also denied, leading to the present certiorari petition at the Supreme Court.

Issues: The primary issue is whether the subsidiary liability of the owner-operator, Eduardo Toribio, can be enforced in the same criminal proceeding involving Ramirez or if it requires a separate civil action.

Court's Decision:

- The Supreme Court set aside the trial court's order denying the subsidiary execution, directing it to address the claim within the same proceedings against Ramirez.
- The Court clarified that under Article 103 of the Revised Penal Code, an employer's subsidiary liability becomes operable automatically upon their worker's conviction and confirmed insolvency, so long as engagement in any industry and fulfillment of duties during the offense is established.
- The Court decided that the nature of the proceeding is not changed by failing to appeal on subsidiary grounds, nor does it amend the appellate court's decision. It falls within the court's jurisdiction as part of execution.

- The Court emphasized that subsidiary liability can be claimed without a new lawsuit because it is inherently linked to the criminal suit's decision once all conditions are satisfied.

Doctrine: The case underlines the application of Article 103 concerning subsidiary employer liability and reaffirms that such liability can be adjudged and executed within the original criminal case framework without requiring a separate civil action, provided the requisite conditions, such as insolvency, are proven.

Class Notes:

- Subsidiary Liability: Art. 103 Revised Penal Code—employers are subsidiarily liable if:

1. Engaged in industry.
2. Offense during employee's duties.
3. Employee's insolvency upon conviction.

- Doctrine applies similarly to the principles articulated in *Pajarito v. Seneris*, regarding the soundness of executing subsidiary liability without necessitating another suit.

- No separate action for employer's liability under Article 103 is needed; instead, the liability follows the criminal decision.

Historical Background: This case arose during a period where delineating civil liability from criminal convictions was gaining prominence, reinforcing the principle of holding employers financially accountable for their employee's criminal acts within their operational conduct, reflecting an evolving emphasis on vicarious liability without prolonged judicial processes.