THIRD DIVISION

[A.M. NO. MTJ-04-1565 [FORMERLY OCA IPI NO. 04-1545-MTJ], August 16, 2006]

ROLANDO GASPAR, COMPLAINANT, VS. JUDGE LUISITO T. ADAOAG, MUNICIPAL CIRCUIT TRIAL COURT, GERONA, TARLAC, RESPONDENT.

R E S O L U T I O N

TINGA, J.:

This is an administrative complaint filed by complainant Rolando Gaspar (Gaspar) against Judge Luisito T. Adaoag of the Municipal Circuit Trial Court (MCTC) of Gerona-Ramos-Pura, Tarlac, for violation of Section 3(e) of Republic Act No. 3019 and Canon 2 of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

In a Complaint-Affidavit[1] dated 29 January 2004, complainant alleges that he was the elected and duly proclaimed chairman of Barangay Pance, Ramos, Tarlac during the 15 July 2002 elections. However, an election protest was filed against him by Anastacio Bonifacio before the MCTC of Gerona-Ramos-Pura, Tarlac where respondent judge presides. The election case entitled "Anastacio Bonifacio v. Rolando Gaspar," was docketed as Election Case No. 02-07.[2]

While the election case was pending, respondent Judge was suspended by the First Division of the Court in a Resolution[3] dated 4 August 2003, which reads in part:

> *"Administrative Matter No. MTJ-03-1503 (National Bureau of Investigation vs. Acting Presiding Judge Luisito T. Adaoag, MCTC, Gerona-Ramos-Pura, Tarlac) [Formerly Administrative Matter OCA IPI No. 03-1436-MTJ (Re: Report of the National Bureau of Investigation [NBI] on the entrapment set up against Acting Presiding Judge Luisito T. Adaoag, MCTC, Gerona-Ramos-Pura, Tarlac)].* " The Court Resolves to:

> x x x x

> (d) **SUSPEND** Judge Luisito T. Adaoag pending final outcome of the criminal proceedings against him considering the evidence is prima facie strong or until further orders from this Court; and

> x x x x [4]

Complainant next contends that even while under suspension, respondent judge rendered a Decision[5] on 25 November 2003 in the election case holding that Anastacio Bonifacio was the duly elected Punong Barangay of Pance, Ramos, Tarlac. In said decision, respondent judge further ordered complainant to vacate the position and deliver the same to Bonifacio in a peaceful manner.[6]

Complainant maintains that respondent judge should be held liable for criminal and administrative charges for rendering the decision while under suspension.[7]

In his Comment[8] dated 29 March 2004, respondent judge claims that he rendered the decision in the election case in good faith. He argues that the Court's use of the word "or" in its Resolution dated 4 August 2003 indicates two alternatives with regard to the period of his suspension.[9] Under the first alternative, he believed that his suspension had been lifted with the dismissal of the criminal action against him,[10] thus enabling him to render the decision in the election case. Under the second alternative, he believed that the Court must issue a resolution or order further suspending him even after the dismissal of the criminal complaint. In the absence of this, he resumed his functions as presiding judge.[11]

Respondent judge further narrates that in a missive[12] dated 13 October 2003, addressed to the First Division of the Court, he requested clarification on the status of his suspension in view of the dismissal of the criminal action. In response, the Court reiterated respondent judge's suspension until further orders. Henceforth, respondent Judge discontinued his judicial functions.[13]

The Office of the Court Administrator (OCA) in its Report dated 19 July 2004 submitted that respondent judge violated Canons 1 and 2 of the Code of Judicial Conduct when he failed to accord respect and obedience to the Court's Resolution dated 4 August 2003.[14] The OCA stated that respondent judge cannot feign good faith as the dismissal of the criminal action is provisional and would thus not result in the automatic lifting of his suspension.[15] The order of the Ombudsman dismissing the case against respondent judge was clearly without prejudice to the outcome of the administrative investigation by this Court upon the referral of the case to the latter. Such dismissal, as the OCA correctly noted, was not by reason of the absence of probable cause against respondent judge, but in deference to the Supreme Court's authority over its employees.[16]

The OCA also noted the fact that he had rendered the decision in the election case before he received the Court's response to his letter dated 13 October 2003. The OCA opined that if respondent judge indeed was in good faith, he should have prudently awaited the Court's pronouncement on the status of his suspension before promulgating the decision.[17] The OCA recommended that respondent judge be fined in the amount of Ten Thousand Pesos (P10,000.00) with a stern warning that a repetition of the same or similar acts in the future will be dealt with more severely.[18]

The Court in a Resolution[19] dated 3 April 2006, referred the instant case to the Executive Judge of the Regional Trial Court of Tarlac City for investigation, report and recommendation.

Executive Judge Arsenio P. Adriano, in an undated report,[20] found that respondent judge wilfully violated the Court's Resolution suspending the latter until further orders from the Court.[21] The Executive Judge observed that respondent judge's interpretation of the Court's Resolution proceeds from an erroneous reasoning.