

EN BANC

[A.M No. P-06-2200 [Formerly OCA IPI No. 06-2-51-MTCC], February 04, 2009]

**OFFICE OF THE COURT ADMINISTRATOR, COMPLAINANT, VS.
MARLON ROQUE, CLERK OF COURT, BRANCH 3, MTCC, ANGELES
CITY AND ANITA G. NUNAG, CLERK OF COURT, OCC, MTCC,
ANGELES CITY, RESPONDENTS.**

DECISION

CARPIO MORALES, J.:

By Resolution of June 26, 2006, this Court, in A.M. No. P-05-2140,^[1] dismissed Cashier I Aurelia C. Lugue (Aurelia) of the Angeles City Municipal Trial Court in Cities (MTCC) for dishonesty. In the same Resolution, the Court directed herein respondents

. . . Clerk of Court Marlon Roque, MTCC, Branch 3, as former OIC, MTCC; and Clerk of Court Anita G. Nunag, OCC, MTCC, Angeles City **to explain** in writing, within 10 days from receipt of herein resolution, **why they should not be disciplinary dealt with for failure to:**

1. exercise close supervision over the financial transactions of the court;
2. monitor the activities of Cashier I, Aurelia C. Lugue, relative to the proper handling of collections of legal fees; and
3. monitor the proper remittance of collections on time which resulted to many instances of delayed remittances^[2] (Emphasis and underscoring supplied),

and ordered "this administrative matter against Clerks of Court Roque and Nunag be given a separate docket number and re-raffled."^[3]

Hence, the present case against Marlon Roque (Roque) and Anita Nunag (Nunag).

Roque submitted his Compliance^[4] dated July 17, 2006 while Nunag submitted her Explanation^[5] dated July 18, 2006.

Roque, who acted as Officer-in-Charge (OIC) of the Office of the Clerk of Court of the Angeles City MTCC from December 26, 2002 up to August 15, 2003, proffers the following explanation:

When he assumed as OIC, he merely followed the procedures observed by his predecessor Jesus Miranda who retired on December 25, 2002, without prejudice to

the implementation of necessary changes or modifications. To the best of his knowledge and despite his limited background in accounting, he did his "very best" to closely supervise the financial transactions of the office. In the discharge of this duty, he never noted any discrepancy reflected in the Monthly Reports of Collections. And since the Auditors of the Commission on Audit (COA) did not find any shortages incurred by Aurelia, he had no reason to suspect that she was not remitting cash collections for the Fiduciary Fund.

Nunag, for her part, explained as follows:

When she assumed as Clerk of Court, she was not thoroughly familiar with accounting procedures and had no exposure to bookkeeping and accounting work. She continued the accounting procedures and the practice of Roque and Aurelia, confident that there was nothing irregular therewith, given that the COA audit conducted in April 2003 and on January 14, 2004 showed no adverse findings. She daily checked and physically counted the collections received by Aurelia, and at the end of each month, she counterchecked the entries in the Monthly Reports of Collections, bankbooks and books of accounts to determine if they tallied.

In its April 29, 2008 Memorandum,^[6] the Office of the Court Administrator (OCA) found respondents guilty of Simple Negligence in light of the following evaluation:

Respondents stand charged for negligence in their duty to monitor and supervise Cashier Aurelia Lugue in the management of court funds. Their failure to monitor the financial transactions of the Court had resulted in the shortage in the Fiduciary Fund (FF) account in the amount of P605,025.00.

. . . They failed to detect that Cashier Lugue was misappropriating her collections in the FF account through the "lapping technique". They failed to discover the modus operandi of Ms. Lugue because they have very limited knowledge in accounting and have no experience in detailed audit. Further, they both relied on the findings of the COA Auditors that there were no shortages incurred by Ms. Lugue.

In its Audit Report dated 03 February 2006, the OCA Audit Team stated that Cashier Lugue employed the "lapping technique" in delaying the remittance of the Fiduciary Fund. Official Receipts Nos. 15156288 to 15156433 totaling 145 official receipts indicated the total shortage of P605,025.00. The audit team noted that the remittances of almost all the collections in the Fiduciary Fund were delayed.

x x x x

The audit team observed that respondents **could have discovered** this machinations of Cashier Lugue **had they set in place a proper system of internal control** like routinely examining the details of collections and comparing the same with validated bank deposits slips; crosschecking the details of official receipts and matching them with the entries in the cash book; and reviewing bank statements for prior months to determine if the deposits tally with the collections. **Respondents merely relied on the fact that the amounts deposited were equal to the amounts**