SECOND DIVISION

[A.M. No. 17-11-131-MeTC, February 07, 2018]

RE: DROPPING FROM THE ROLLS OF MS. JANICE C. MILLARE, CLERK III, OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF COURT, METROPOLITAN TRIAL COURT, QUEZON CITY.

RESOLUTION

PERLAS-BERNABE, J.:

This administrative case stems from a letter^[1] dated August 3, 2017 informing the Court that Ms. Janice C. Millare (Millare), Clerk III, Office of the Clerk of Court, Metropolitan Trial Court (MeTC) of Quezon City, did not submit her Daily Time Records (DTRs) for July 2017^[2] and up to the present.

The Facts

The records of the Employees' Leave Division, Office of Administrative Services, Office of the Court Administrator (OCA), show that Millare has not submitted her DTRs since July 2017 up to the present. She neither submitted any application for leave. Thus, she has been on absence without official leave (AWOL) since July 17, 2017.[3]

On May 30, 2017, Millare applied for and was granted authority to travel to Saipan^[4] from June 5 to July 14, 2017. To date, she has still not reported for work.

[5] Her salaries and benefits were withheld based on Memorandum WSB No. 8a_2017 dated August 2, 2017.^[6]

The OCA informed the Court of the following findings based on the records of its different offices: (a) Millare 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. [7]

In its report and recommendation^[8] dated November 22, 2017, the OCA recommended that: (a) Millare's name be dropped from the rolls effective July 17, 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 or dropping from the rolls at 1312 Taurus Street, Carmel IV Subdivision, Tandang Sora, Quezon City, her last known address on record.^[9] The OCA added, however, that Millare is still qualified to receive the benefits she may be entitled to under existing laws and may still be reemployed in the government.^[10]

The Court's Ruling