

## SECOND DIVISION

**[ A.C. No. 12766 (Formerly CBD Case No. 12-3589), October 07, 2020 ]**

**RODOLFO L. ORENIA III, COMPLAINANT, VS. ATTY. ROMEO S. GONZALES, RESPONDENT.**

### DECISION

**INTING, J.:**

For the Court's consideration is the Resolution<sup>[1]</sup> dated May 28, 2019 of the Integrated Bar of the Philippines (IBP) Board of Governors which resolved to grant respondent Atty. Romeo S. Gonzales' (Atty. Gonzales) Motion for Partial Reconsideration<sup>[2]</sup> of the IBP Board of Governors' Resolution No. XXII-2016-414<sup>[3]</sup> dated August 26, 2016. The IBP Board of Governors reconsidered and deleted the six-month suspension from the practice of law imposed against Atty. Gonzales, but affirmed the immediate revocation of his notarial commission, and disqualified him from being commissioned as a notary public for two years.

#### *The Antecedents*

Atty. Gonzales was the counsel of a certain Domingo C. Reyes (Mr. Reyes), one of the owners of Anaped Estate, Inc. (Anaped). Through Atty. Gonzales, Mr. Reyes and his siblings filed a criminal complaint for Falsification of Public Document and Use of Falsified Documents<sup>[4]</sup> against one Rodrigo C. Reyes and a certain Emerencia R. Gungab,<sup>[5]</sup> the employers of Rodolfo L. Orenia III (complainant).

In return, complainant tiled a Complaint Affidavit<sup>[6]</sup> for *Estafa* through Falsification of Public Document (counter-complaint) against Mr. Reyes, his siblings, and Atty. Gonzales. Pending resolution by the prosecutor's office of the complainant's counter-complaint, complainant filed the instant administrative case<sup>[7]</sup> for Disbarment against Atty. Gonzales.

Complainant alleged the following:

On December 28, 1998, Atty. Gonzales notarized a Deed of Sale executed by one Antonio A. Guanzon. The document was recorded in Atty. Gonzales' notarial registry as Doc. No. 305; Page No. 62; Book No. 10; Series of 1998, and certified by the Office of the Clerk of Court, Regional Trial Court (RTC), Quezon City.<sup>[8]</sup> On December 29, 1998, Atty. Gonzales notarized another document called Director's Certificate,<sup>[9]</sup> and was assigned the same notarial details as the Deed of Sale he notarized the day prior. Atty. Gonzales failed to record the Director's Certificate in his notarial register.

Complainant averred that in addition to Atty. Gonzales' failure to record the Director's Certificate in his notarial register, he also participated in its falsification

because the Director's Certificate was never authorized by the Anaped's Board of Directors. He further averred that the parties to the purported Director's Certificate could not have personally signed and executed the certificate in the presence of Atty. Gonzales. According to the complainant, Atty. Gonzales also misrepresented himself as the Corporate Secretary of Anaped when he signed the minutes of the meeting dated March 24, 2006.<sup>[10]</sup>

Lastly, complainant accused Atty. Gonzales of being liable for conduct unbecoming a lawyer because Atty. Gonzales attempted to hit him and told him the following: "*ulo/ka*" during the preliminary investigation of the counter-complaint he filed. This prompted him to file the instant case for disbarment against Atty. Gonzales with the IBP Commission on Bar Discipline (CBD).<sup>[11]</sup>

On October 22, 2012, Atty. Gonzales filed his Answer<sup>[12]</sup> admitting that he indeed failed to record the Director's Certificate in his notarial register due to the inadvertence of his former secretary. Atty. Gonzales denied the other allegations against him, and claimed that the disbarment case was a harassment suit to force him to drop the cases he was handling against the complainant's employers.

On April 10, 2013, Atty. Gonzales submitted his Respondent's Conference Brief.<sup>[13]</sup>

On January 30, 2014, Atty. Gonzales filed an Omnibus Motion<sup>[14]</sup> praying for the dismissal of the complaint against him on the ground of the complainant's failure to file his conference brief. Atty. Gonzales also submitted an undated Affidavit of Undertaking<sup>[15]</sup> purportedly executed by the complainant which contained a commitment by the latter to provide information against his employers, and to cause the dismissal of the instant disbarment case in exchange for money.

On February 7, 2014, the IBP CBD issued another Notice of Mandatory Conference<sup>[16]</sup> scheduled on March 5, 2014. During the mandatory conference, only Atty. Gonzales appeared.<sup>[17]</sup> The Investigating Commissioner then terminated the mandatory conference, and issued an Order<sup>[18]</sup> directing the parties to submit their respective Position Papers.

On March 27, 2014, Atty. Gonzales filed his Respondent's Position Paper.<sup>[19]</sup> He reiterated his defense that his failure to record the Director's Certificate in his notarial register, and to assign a different document number to the instrument was due to the inadvertence of his former secretary. He also reiterated that complainant executed an Affidavit of Undertaking offering to dismiss the instant case and provide information against his employers. Still, complainant did not submit his Position Paper.

#### *Recommendation of the IBP Investigating Commissioner*

In the Report and Recommendation<sup>[20]</sup> dated August 11, 2015, Investigating Commissioner Almira A. Abella-Orfanel recommended for the dismissal of the complaint against Atty. Gonzales for lack of merit.<sup>[21]</sup>

#### *Recommendation of the IBP Board of Governors*

In the Resolution No. XXII-2016-414<sup>[22]</sup> dated August 26, 2016, the IBP Board of Governors reversed the recommendation of Investigating Commissioner Almira A.

Abella-Orfanel, and recommended that Atty. Gonzales be placed under a six month suspension from the practice of law. Additionally, it disqualified Atty. Gonzales from being commissioned as a rotary public with revocation of his current notarial commission.

Aggrieved, Atty. Gonzales moved for the reconsideration of the IBP Board of Governors' Resolution No. XXII-2016-414.

On May 28, 2019, the IBP Board of Governors passed a Resolution<sup>[23]</sup> which granted Atty. Gonzales' Motion for Partial Reconsideration<sup>[24]</sup> of the August 26, 2016 Resolution No. XXII-2016-414. It deleted Atty. Gonzales' six-month suspension from the practice of law, but imposed against him the immediate revocation of his notarial commission, and the disqualification of his commission as a notary public for two years.<sup>[25]</sup>

### *The Ruling of the Court*

The Court adopts the findings of the IBP Board of Governors, but modifies the penalty it recommended.

Time and again, the Court has stressed that the duties of a notary public are dictated by public policy. As such, a notary public is mandated to discharge with fidelity the duties of his office.<sup>[26]</sup> Having taken a solemn oath under the Code of Professional Responsibility, a lawyer commissioned as a notary public has a responsibility to faithfully observe the rules governing notarial practice.<sup>[27]</sup>

In keeping with the faithful observance of his duties, a notary public shall keep, maintain, protect and provide for lawful inspection, a chronological official notarial register of notarial acts consisting of a permanently bound book with numbered pages.<sup>[28]</sup> Section 2, Rule VI of the Notarial Rules requires that every notarial act must be registered in the notarial register, *viz.*:

SEC. 2. Entries in the Notarial Register. — (a) For every notarial act, the notary shall record in the notarial register at the time of notarization the following:

- (1) the entry number and page number;
- (2) the date and time of day of the notarial act;
- (3) the type of notarial act;
- (4) the title or description of the instrument, document or proceeding;
- (5) the name and address of each principal;
- (6) the competent evidence of identity as defined by these Rules if the signatory is not personally known to the notary;
- (7) the name and address of each credible witness swearing to or affirming the person's identity;
- (8) the fee charged for the notarial act;
- (9) the address where the notarization was performed if not in the notary's regular place of work or business; and
- (10) any other circumstance the notary public may