

THIRD DIVISION

[G.R. No. 165471, July 21, 2008]

**EMETERIO O. PASIONA, JR., PETITIONER, COURT OF APPEALS,
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS COMMISSION, AND SAN MIGUEL
CORPORATION, RESPONDENTS.**

D E C I S I O N

AUSTRIA-MARTINEZ, J.:

This resolves the Petition for *Certiorari* under Rule 65 of the Rules of Court, seeking the nullification of the Decision^[1] of the Court of Appeals (CA) dated April 30, 2004 dismissing the petition for *certiorari* filed by Emeterio O. Pasiona, Jr. (petitioner).

The antecedent facts, as accurately summarized by the CA, are as follows.

Records show that petitioner Emeterio Pasiona, Jr. was employed by San Miguel Corporation (SMC) as Account Specialist on February 1, 1986. He was assigned at the Naga Sales Office of the SMC for three (3) years handling the Partido Area, particularly, Lagonoy, Tigaon, Goa and other adjacent municipalities, all of Camarines Sur and was receiving a monthly salary of P19,440.00 and an average monthly commission of P10,000.00.

On August 18, 1997, SMC, through Mr. Gil Guerrero, issued a Memorandum requiring petitioner to explain within 48 hours from receipt thereof why the following violations of company policies occurred in his area of responsibility, to wit:

1. Unauthorized check acceptance from Customer Gloria Cariaga for P5,218.00.
2. Unauthorized check acceptance from Troy Monasterio for P242,978.76 on SMB Check payable to SMB Warehousing Services operated by Troy Monasterio.
3. Indication of irregularities on transactions related to price rollback:
 - a. Pulled-out 40 cs. RPT - the partially unliquidated obligation of Mayor Melgarejo on the "Poronete" event was delivered to petitioner's brother Ike Pasiona the rebate of which after the price rollback was given to the latter by converting the amount of P1,800.00 to its equivalent of 8 cs. RH500;
 - b. Rebates amounting to P2,655.00 were converted to 9 cases PP320 in the name of Marcel Pan were likewise delivered to and signed by certain "Pasiona"; the SMC delivery team claimed that they were delivered and received by Mrs.

Pasiona;

- c. Questionable inventory counted by petitioner, i.e., 40 RPT, 10 RH330 and 70 RH500, since purchases showed a record of 150 cases last October 31, 1996, 1 rpt on March 21, 1997; and 70 RH500 on May 15, 197; this refers to the inventory of Marcel Pan as counted by the petitioner;
 - d. Rebates amounting to P6,075.00 were converted to 27 RH500 in the name of Vice Mayor Elias Pan of Goa, Camarines Sur but were likewise delivered to and signed by Ike Pasiona; and
 - e. Rebates amounting to P7,050.00 were converted to 30 cases PP1000 in the name of Ernesto Torres (not a regular customer), but were also delivered to and received by Mrs. Pasiona.
4. Non-compliance in affixing the customer's signature and AS signature on the space provided for in the rover-generated receipts.
 5. Vale issuances without approved vale request.

In accordance with the said Memorandum, petitioner wrote an explanation and submitted the same to the respondent SMC.

After due investigation, the management of SMC found petitioner guilty of gross negligence, withholding of funds due the company, and insubordination. Petitioner after notice, was subsequently terminated effective January 19, 1998.

Thus, on January 19, 1998, petitioner filed a complaint for illegal dismissal, praying for reinstatement without loss of seniority rights and other privileges, full back wages, inclusive of allowances, and other benefits or the monetary equivalent thereof. He further prayed that he be awarded P500,000.00 for moral damages and another P500,000.00 for exemplary damages, plus P50,000.00 as and by way of attorney's fees. The case was thereafter docketed as RAB 05-01-00009-98.

On November 24, 1999, after the parties had submitted their respective Position Papers and evidence, Labor Arbiter Rolando Bobis rendered a decision, the dispositive portion of which states:

"WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing, judgment is hereby rendered finding the dismissal of complainant by respondent to be illegal thereby ordering the latter as follows:

1. To reinstate complainant to his former position without loss of seniority rights within ten (10) days from receipt of this Decision. Should reinstatement be no longer feasible, to pay complainant separation pay equivalent to one-month salary for every year of his service commencing from the date of

dismissal to the supposed date of reinstatement. A fraction of six-months or more is equivalent to one-year.

2. To pay complainant backwages at the rate of P19,440.00 per month from the date of dismissal on January 19, 1998 up to the date of actual reinstatement, including monthly allowance of P10,000.00 per month as well as other benefits or its monetary equivalent, which as of this date of decision amounted to P677,120.00.

All other claims are hereby dismissed for lack of merit.

SO ORDERED.

Both parties appealed to the NLRC. On December 18, 2001, the NLRC rendered its assailed Decision, the dispositive portion of which states:

"WHEREFORE, consistent with our finding that complainant's dismissal is valid, the assailed Decision of the Arbiter dated November 29, 1999 is hereby, REVERSED by declaring complainant's termination from employment valid and legal. Respondent, however, is ordered to pay complainant an average monthly variable monthly commissions of P10,000.00 from the period December 1999 up to the promulgation of this Decision. The Order of the Labor Arbiter dated August 6, 2000 awarding complainant the sum of P19,440.00 representing the one-time gift given by Eduardo M. Cojuanco, Jr., is hereby AFFIRMED.

SO ORDERED.^[2]

From such adverse judgment, petitioner elevated his case to the CA *via* a petition for *certiorari*. On April 30, 2004, the CA promulgated the assailed Decision affirming the National Labor Relations Commission (NLRC) ruling, stating thus:

In the case at bar, there is no dispute that **the petitioner is a regular employee of SMC and is occupying a position which calls for a high degree of trust and confidence**. As such employee, petitioner is expected to recognize the rules and regulations of the company which have not been declared to be illegal or improper by competent authorities for the purpose of maintaining the viability of its business. Despite knowledge thereof, **petitioner did some acts in direct violation of the company's policies**, thus, justifying the company's act of losing its confidence towards the petitioner. **Whatever may be the purpose behind the violation is immaterial. What matters is that petitioner knowingly violated the company's rules and regulations which constitutes a betrayal of the company's trust and confidence**

towards him. Definitely, this constitutes just cause for termination of employment.^[3] (Emphasis supplied)

The dispositive portion of the CA Decision reads as follows:

WHEREFORE, finding no merit to the instant petition, the same is hereby ordered **DISMISSED**. Consequently, the December 18, 2001 Decision and the March 26, 2002 Order of the National Labor Relations Commission, in CA No. 022470-00, are **AFFIRMED**.

SO ORDERED.^[4]

No motion for reconsideration was filed by either party, hence, the Decision became final and executory and Entry of Judgment^[5] was made by the CA on May 29, 2004.

Almost five months later, or on October 18, 2004, petitioner, a resident of Naga City, Camarines Sur, filed the present petition for *certiorari*, alleging that despite his inquiries with his former counsel, Atty. Apolinario N. Lomabao, regarding the status of his case with the CA, said counsel never informed him of the CA Decision and the non-filing of a motion for reconsideration thereof. It was only on August 18, 2004, upon coming to Manila to get his Bar Examination Permit from the Supreme Court, when he discovered that a CA Decision had already been promulgated on April 30, 2004. When he asked Atty. Lomabao why no motion for reconsideration was filed, said counsel allegedly answered that "the case will be dismissed by the Supreme Court anyway."^[6] Petitioner then obtained the services of his present counsel of record and filed the instant petition.

Petitioner asserts that he should be allowed to avail of the remedy of *certiorari* because he was denied due process due to the recklessness and gross negligence of his former counsel and there is no other plain, speedy, and adequate remedy available to him in the ordinary course of law. **He prays for the Court to consider him to have received a copy of the CA Decision only on August 18, 2004**, when he personally obtained a copy thereof, instead of May 13, 2004, when his former counsel received a copy of the same.

Petitioner then alleges that the CA and the NLRC committed grave abuse of discretion amounting to lack or excess of jurisdiction in finding that there was just cause for the dismissal of petitioner and in affirming the said dismissal when a lesser penalty would have served the purpose.

Private respondent, on the other hand, insists that the proper remedy of an aggrieved party from a decision of the CA is a petition for review on *certiorari* under Rule 45 of the Rules of Court, not a petition for *certiorari* under Rule 65 of the same Rules. Private respondent further lays emphasis on the fact that the CA Decision had actually become final and executory as shown by the CA's Entry of Judgment.

The petition fails for lack of merit.

The Court re-emphasizes the doctrine of finality of judgment. In *Alcantara v. Ponce*,^[7] the Court, citing its much earlier ruling in *Arnedo v. Llorente*,^[8] stressed the importance of said doctrine, to wit:

It is true that it is the purpose and intention of the law that courts should decide all questions submitted to them "as truth and justice require," and that it is greatly to be desired that all judgments should be so decided; but controlling and irresistible reasons of public policy and of sound practice in the courts demand that **at the risk of occasional error**, judgments of courts determining controversies submitted to them should become final at some definite time fixed by law, or by a rule of practice recognized by law, so as to be **thereafter beyond the control even of the court which rendered them** for the purpose of correcting errors of fact or of law, into which, in the opinion of the court it may have fallen. The very purpose for which the courts are organized is to put an end to controversy, to decide the questions submitted to the litigants, and to determine the respective rights of the parties. With the full knowledge that courts are not infallible, **the litigants submit their respective claims for judgment, and they have a right at some time or other to have final judgment on which they can rely as a final disposition of the issue submitted, and to know that there is an end to the litigation.**^[9] (Emphasis supplied)

Then, in *Juani v. Alarcon*,^[10] it was held thus:

This doctrine of finality of judgment is grounded on fundamental considerations of public policy and sound practice. In fact, nothing is more settled in law than that **once a judgment attains finality it thereby becomes immutable and unalterable. It may no longer be modified in any respect, even if the modification is meant to correct what is perceived to be an erroneous conclusion of fact or law, and regardless of whether the modification is attempted to be made by the court rendering it or by the highest court of the land.**^[11] (Emphasis supplied)

Again, in *Dinglasan v. Court of Appeals*,^[12] the Court declared that:

After the judgment or final resolution is entered in the entries of judgment, the case shall be laid to rest. x x x

x x x x

The finality of decision is a jurisdictional event which cannot be made to depend on the convenience of the party. To rule otherwise would completely negate the purpose of the rule on completeness of service, which is to place the date of receipt of pleadings, judgment and processes beyond the power of the party being served to determine at his pleasure.^[13] (Emphasis and underscoring supplied)

It should also be borne in mind that the right of the winning party to enjoy the finality of the resolution of the case is also an essential part of public policy and the orderly administration of justice. Hence, such right is just as weighty or equally important as the right of the losing party to appeal or seek reconsideration within the prescribed period.^[14]

In the present case, private respondent has the right to fully rely on the