

SECOND DIVISION

[A.C. No. 6713, December 08, 2008]

**ZENAIDA B. GONZALES, PETITIONER, VS. ATTY. NARCISO
PADIERNOS, RESPONDENT.**

DECISION

BRION, J.:

Before the Court is the Complaint for Disbarment of Atty. Narciso Padiernos (*respondent*) filed on May 12, 2003 by Ms. Zenaida B. Gonzales (*complainant*) with the Commission on Bar Discipline of the Integrated Bar of the Philippines (IBP). Commissioner Milagros V. San Juan conducted the fact-finding investigation on the complaint.

Commissioner San Juan submitted a Report and Recommendation^[1] dated September 10, 2004 to the IBP Board of Governors who approved this Report and Recommendation in a resolution dated November 4, 2004.

In a letter^[2] dated March 14, 2005, IBP Director for Bar Discipline Rogelio A. Vinluan transmitted to the Office of Chief Justice Hilario G. Davide, Jr. (retired) a Notice of Resolution^[3] and the records of the case.

The Factual Background

The complainant alleged in her complaint for disbarment that on three (3) separate occasions the respondent notarized the following documents: (1) a Deed of Absolute Sale^[4] dated July 16, 1979 which disposed of her property in Jaen, Nueva Ecija in favor of Asterio, Estrella and Rodolfo, all surnamed Gonzales; (2) a Subdivision Agreement^[5] dated September 7, 1988 which subdivided her property among the same persons; and (3) an affidavit of Non-Tenancy^[6] dated March 3, 1988 which certified that her property was not tenanted. All three documents were purportedly signed and executed by complainant. All three documents carried forged signatures and falsely certified that the complainant personally appeared before the respondent and that she was "known to me (the respondent) to be the same person who executed the foregoing and acknowledged to me that the same is her own free act and voluntary deed." The complainant claimed that she never appeared before respondent on the dates the documents were notarized because she was then in the United States.

The respondent filed his Answer^[7] on June 16, 2003. He admitted that he notarized the three documents, but denied the "unfounded and malicious imputation" that the three documents contained the complainant's forged signatures. On the false certification aspect, he countered that "with the same or identical facts obtained in the instant case, the Highest Tribunal, the Honorable Supreme Court had this to say

- That it is not necessary to know the signatories personally, provided he or she or they signed in the presence of the Notary, alleging that they are the same persons who signed the names."

On October 13, 2003, the respondent moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of verification and notification of the date of hearing.^[8]

On December 19, 2003, complainant amended her complaint.^[9] This time, she charged respondent with gross negligence and failure to exercise the care required by law in the performance of his duties as a notary public, resulting in the loss of her property in Jaen, Nueva Ecija, a 141,497 square meters of mango land covered by TCT NT-29578. The complainant claimed that because of the respondent's negligent acts, title to her property was transferred to Asterio Gonzales, Estrella Gonzales and Rodolfo Gonzales. She reiterated that when the three documents disposing of her property were notarized, she was out of the country. Estrella Gonzales Mendrano, one of the vendees, was also outside the country as shown by a certification issued by the Bureau of Immigration and Deportation (BID) on September 14, 1989.^[10] She likewise claimed that Guadalupe Ramirez Gonzales (the widow of Rodolfo Gonzales, another vendee) executed an affidavit describing the "Deed of Absolute Sale and Subdivision Agreement" as spurious and without her husband's participation.^[11] The affidavit further alleged that the complainant's signatures were forged and the respondent did not ascertain the identity of the person who came before him and posed as vendor despite the fact that a large tract of land was being ceded and transferred to the vendees.

The complainant prayed for the revocation of the respondent's notarial commission and his suspension from the practice of law due to "his deplorable failure to hold the importance of the notarial act and observe [with] utmost care the basic requirements in the performance of his duties as a notary public which include the ascertainment that the person who signed the document as the very person who executed and personally appeared before him."

On May 3, 2004, the complainant moved that the case be considered submitted for resolution in view of respondent's failure to answer the amended complaint.^[12]

The IBP Findings

In her report to the IBP Board of Governors,^[13] Commissioner San Juan categorically noted the respondent's admission that he notarized the three documents in question - the Deed of Absolute Sale on July 16, 1979; the Subdivision Agreement on September 7, 1988 and the affidavit of Non-Tenancy on March 3, 1988. Commissioner San Juan also noted that the complainant's documentary evidence supported her claim that she never executed these documents and never appeared before the respondent to acknowledge the execution of these documents. These documentary evidence consisted of the certification from the BID that complainant did not travel to the Philippines on the dates the documents were allegedly notarized;^[14] and the affidavit of Guadalupe Ramirez Gonzales described above.^[15]