

THIRD DIVISION

[G.R. NO. 157851, June 29, 2007]

ATTY. ANDREA UY AND FELIX YUSAY, PETITIONERS, VS. ARLENE VILLANUEVA AND NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS COMMISSION, RESPONDENTS.

D E C I S I O N

NACHURA, J.:

This appeal on *certiorari* under Rule 45 of the Rules of Court seeks the nullification of the February 28, 2002 Resolution and the February 27, 2003 Resolution denying the motion for reconsideration thereof of the Former Tenth Division of the Court of Appeals (CA) in CA-G.R. SP No. 68680.

The antecedents of the case are as follows:

Countrywide Rural Bank of La Carlota, Inc. (Countrywide Bank) is a private banking corporation engaged in rural banking and other allied services through its branches nationwide.

Sometime in 1998, Countrywide Bank experienced liquidity problems and its treasury department was unable to comply with its branches' demands for fresh funds. Its various branches eventually experienced bank runs.^[1]

Several of the bank's depositors were alarmed at the prospect of losing their deposits and investments. A group of depositors, holding about 70% of the bank's deposit accounts, met and agreed to organize themselves into a "Committee of Depositors." Petitioner Felix Yusay was elected by the Committee as Chairman of the Interim Board of Directors, while petitioner Atty. Andrea Uy was designated Secretary. According to petitioners, the Committee was formed for the purpose of protecting their collective interests and to increase their chances of recovering their deposits.^[2]

With the consent and approval of the incumbent Board of Directors, the Committee of Depositors assumed temporary administrative control of the remaining operations of the bank.^[3] The incumbent Board of Directors informed the Committee that some employees had tendered courtesy resignations, while some had expressed their willingness to resign upon official request. The Committee then accepted some of the courtesy resignations.^[4]

The Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (BSP) subsequently placed the bank under receivership and appointed a liquidator. Meanwhile, the Philippine Deposit Insurance System (PDIC) commenced the processing of claims for return of deposits.^[5]

Realizing that their bid to rehabilitate the bank had failed, the Committee of Depositors disbanded.^[6]

Eventually, three cases for illegal dismissal were filed against Countrywide Bank before the National Labor Relations Commission (NLRC). These were filed by Amalia Bueno (NLRC Case No. RAB-XI-01-50037-99), Amelia Valdez and Lyn Villa (NLRC Case No. RAB-XI-01-20039-99), and herein private respondent Arlene Villanueva (NLRC Case No. RAB-XI-01-50043-99).^[7]

Private respondent Villanueva avers that she was a regular employee of Countrywide Bank's Marbel, South Cotabato branch. On December 7, 1998, she received a memorandum from the Interim Board of Directors accepting her courtesy resignation. She, however, denies that she submitted a written courtesy resignation.^[8]

On November 16, 1999, Labor Arbiter Arturo P. Gamolo of NLRC Sub-Regional Arbitration Branch No. XI, General Santos City rendered a Decision in RAB-XI-01-50043-99, the dispositive portion of which reads:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, respondent Country Wide Rural Bank of La Carlota, Inc. and Individual Respondents Atty. Andrea Uy and Felix Yusay are solidarily liable to pay complainant Arlene Villanueva the sum PESOS: ONE HUNDRED THIRTEEN THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED FORTY (P113,640.00) ONLY representing her monetary awards and attorney's fees.^[9]

On January 21, 2000, Villanueva filed a Motion for Execution of Judgment^[10] to which Countrywide Bank, through the PDIC, filed an Opposition.^[11]

Thereafter, Labor Arbiter Gamolo rendered a Resolution and Order for all three cases against Countrywide Bank, the dispositive portion of which reads:

Wherefore, finding the PDIC's opposition to complainants' motion for execution meritorious, complainants are hereby directed to file their respective money claims as adjudged in the decisions rendered in the above-entitled cases before the liquidation court for the latter's approval of inclusion in the Bank's Distribution Plan.

SO ORDERED.^[12]

Petitioners then filed a Notice of Appeal with Memorandum of Appeal with the NLRC, 5th Division, Cagayan de Oro City.^[13] On November 27, 2000, the NLRC dismissed the appeal for being filed out of time.^[14] Petitioners filed a motion for reconsideration.^[15] The NLRC then recalled its November 27, 2000 Resolution and set the case for clarificatory hearing.^[16]

Petitioners, however, received the Resolution five days after the scheduled clarificatory hearing. They instead filed their memorandum in lieu of the clarificatory hearing.

On October 10, 2001, the NLRC rendered another Resolution reinstating its

November 27, 2000 Resolution.^[17]

Petitioners filed a petition for *certiorari* before the CA to nullify the NLRC's November 27, 2000 and October 10, 2001 Resolutions.

On February 28, 2002, the Tenth Division of the CA dismissed the petition for *certiorari* on technical grounds. In particular, the CA cited the following grounds for dismissal:

1. Failure to attach necessary pleadings and comments which are material portion of the records in able [sic] for this to [sic] judiciously evaluate the merit of the case such as:

- a.) memorandum of appeal filed by the petitioner on May 18, 2000;

- b.) Motion for Reconsideration of the petitioners dated December 21, 2000;

in violation of Section 3, Rule 46 of the 1997 Rules of Civil Procedure as amended;

2. Failure to attach certified photocopy copies [sic] of the assailed resolutions and decisions of the original documents in violation of the same rules; and

3. Failure to send copy of the resolution to the public respondent.^[18]

Petitioners filed a Motion for Reconsideration^[19] arguing that the failure to attach the abovementioned documents was merely a procedural lapse on their part. They, likewise, attached the documents to the motion.

Their motion for reconsideration having been denied,^[20] petitioners filed the present appeal on *certiorari*.

They argue that the CA's dismissal of their petition for *certiorari* on technical grounds deprived them of substantial justice. They assail the CA's Resolution dismissing their petition on technical grounds. They cite previous decisions of this Court where it held that technicalities can be relaxed in order to uphold the substantive rights of the parties.^[21]

They likewise allege that the Labor Arbiter ruled in favor of respondent Villanueva based only on the pleadings filed by the latter. They allege that they were not properly served summons and notices which led to their failure to file their position paper. They also argue that they cannot be held solidarily liable to private respondent because they were mere depositors of the bank and not stockholders. Even assuming that they were stockholders, they still cannot be held individually liable for the bank's obligations.

On the other hand, private respondent argues that the appeal on *certiorari* merely reiterated arguments and issues on questions of facts that have already been passed upon by competent authority.^[22] Having none of the circumstances that will warrant exemption from the requirement that a petition for review on *certiorari*

under Rule 45 shall only raise questions of law, the petition must be dismissed. Likewise, private respondent argues that the petition has no other purpose than to delay the final execution of the decision.

While this case was pending, petitioners filed a Manifestation^[23] on February 20, 2007, informing this Court that the case entitled *Atty. Andrea Uy and Felix Yusay v. Amalia Bueno*,^[24] docketed as G.R. No. 159119 and involving the same factual antecedents as the present case, was decided by this Court's Second Division on March 14, 2006 in this wise:

IN VIEW WHEREOF, the petition is **GRANTED**. The Court of Appeals Decision dated January 24, 2003 and Resolution dated May 26, 2003 in CA-G.R. SP No. 70672, which found petitioner Atty. Andrea Uy^[25] solidarily liable with Countrywide Rural Bank of [La] Carlota, Inc. in Marbel, Koronadal City, South Cotabato, are **REVERSED**. No costs.

SO ORDERED.^[26]

In the *Bueno* case, the Court found that, per the records of the case, petitioner Uy was a "mere depositor,"^[27] one of several depositors who formed themselves into a group or association indicating their intention to help rehabilitate Countrywide Rural Bank.^[28] It also found no evidence that the Committee of Depositors that elected petitioner Uy as Interim President and Corporate Secretary was recognized by the Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas, hence, had no legal authority to act for the bank.^[29] As such, the Court said:

Lacking this evidence, the act of petitioner Uy in dismissing the respondent cannot be deemed an act as an officer of the bank. Consequently, it cannot be held that there existed an employer-employee relationship between petitioner Uy and respondent Bueno when the former allegedly dismissed the latter. This requirement of employer-employee relationship is jurisdictional for the provisions of the Labor Code, specifically Book VI thereof, on Post-Employment, to apply. Since the employer-employee relationship between petitioner Uy and respondent Bueno was not established, the labor arbiter never acquired jurisdiction over petitioner Uy. Consequently, whether petitioner Uy was properly served summons is immaterial. Likewise, that she terminated the services of respondent Bueno in bad faith and with malice is of no moment. Her liability, if any, should be determined in another forum.^[30]

The Court noted the manifestation in a Resolution^[31] dated April 23, 2007.

We find the present petition meritorious.

At the outset, we note that Countrywide Bank did not appeal the NLRC's rulings. As to the bank, therefore, the NLRC Decision has become final and executory.

Rule 45 of the Rules of Civil Procedure provides that only questions of law shall be raised in an appeal by certiorari before this Court. This rule, however, admits of certain exceptions, namely, (1) when the findings are grounded entirely on speculations, surmises, or conjectures; (2) when the inference made is manifestly

mistaken, absurd, or impossible; (3) when there is a grave abuse of discretion; (4) when the judgment is based on misappreciation of facts; (5) when the findings of fact are conflicting; (6) when in making its findings, the same are contrary to the admissions of both appellant and appellee; (7) when the findings are contrary to those of the trial court; (8) when the findings are conclusions without citation of specific evidence on which they are based; (9) when the facts set forth in the petition as well as in the petitioner's main and reply briefs are not disputed by the respondent; and (10) when the findings of fact are premised on the supposed absence of evidence and contradicted by the evidence on record.^[32]

In this case, the CA committed grave abuse of discretion in dismissing the petition without first examining its merits. The policy of our judicial system is to encourage full adjudication of the merits of an appeal. In the exercise of its equity jurisdiction, this Court may reverse the dismissal of appeals that are grounded merely on technicalities.^[33]

In the past, the Court has held that technicalities should not be permitted to stand in the way of equitably and completely resolving the rights and obligations of the parties. Where the ends of substantial justice would be better served, the application of technical rules of procedure may be relaxed.^[34] Rules of procedure should indeed be viewed as mere tools designed to facilitate the attainment of justice.^[35]

Section 1, Rule 65 of the Rules of Court provides:

SECTION 1. *Petition for certiorari.* – When any tribunal, board or officer exercising judicial or quasi-judicial functions has acted without or in excess of its or his jurisdiction, or with grave abuse of discretion amounting to lack or excess of jurisdiction, and there is no appeal, or any plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law, a person aggrieved thereby may file a verified petition in the proper court, alleging the facts with certainty and praying that judgment be rendered annulling or modifying the proceedings of such tribunal, board or officer, and granting such incidental reliefs as law and justice may require.

The petition shall be accompanied by a certified true copy of the judgment, order or resolution subject thereof, **copies of all pleadings and documents relevant and pertinent thereto**, and a sworn certification of non-forum shopping as provided in the third paragraph of Section 3, Rule 46. (emphasis supplied)

Records show that in the petition for *certiorari*, filed before the CA, the petitioners attached photocopies of the assailed October 10, 2001 NLRC Resolution,^[36] the NLRC Resolution dated November 27, 2000,^[37] the Labor Arbiter's Decision dated November 16, 1999,^[38] and the Labor Arbiter's Resolution and Order dated April 17, 2000.^[39] Subsequently, when the CA dismissed the petition on technical grounds, petitioners filed a motion for reconsideration explaining the reason for the omission and attaching, in addition to the abovementioned documents, the other documents referred to in the CA Resolution.