SECOND DIVISION

[A.M. No. 17-08-191-RTC, February 07, 2018]

RE: DROPPING FROM THE ROLLS OF MS. MARISSA M. NUDO, CLERK III, BRANCH 6, REGIONAL TRIAL COURT (RTC), MANILA.

RESOLUTION

PERLAS-BERNABE, J.:

This administrative case stems from a letter^[1] dated April 3, 2017 informing the Court that Ms. Marissa M. Nudo (Nudo), Clerk III of the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Manila, Branch 6, has been on absence without official leave (AWOL) since March 2017.

The Fact

The records of the Employees' Leave Division, Office of Administrative Services (OAS), Office of the Court Administrator (OCA), show that Nudo has not submitted her Daily Time Record (DTR) since March 2017 up to the present. She neither submitted any application for leave. Thus, she has been on AWOL since March 1, 2017.^[2]

Moreover, Atty. Rosette H. Abrenica (Atty. Abrenica), Clerk of Court V of the RTC, Branch 6, informed the OCA that Nudo, among others, failed to submit her DTR for the month of March 2017 because she has been absent since March 14, 2017 up to the present.^[3]

To date, Nudo has still not reported for work. Her salaries and benefits were withheld based on Memorandum WSB No. 5a_2017 dated May 2, 2017.^[4]

The OCA informed the Court of the following findings based on the records of its different offices: (a) Nudo is still in the *plantilla* of court personnel, and thus, considered to be in active service; (b) she has no application for retirement; (c) no administrative case is pending against her; and (d) she is not an accountable officer. [5]

In its report and recommendation^[6] dated July 11, 2017, the OCA recommended that: (*a*) Nudo's name be dropped from the rolls effective March 1, 2017 for having been absent without official leave for more than thirty (30) working days; (*b*) her position be declared vacant; and (*c*) she be informed about her separation from the service at 738 Magsaysay Road, San Antonio, San Pedro, Laguna, her last known address on record.^[7] The OCA added, however, that Nudo is still qualified to receive the benefits she may be entitled to under existing laws and may still be reemployed in the government.^[8]

The Court's Ruling