391 Phil. 122

THIRD DIVISION

[A.C. No. 4218, July 20, 2000]

ROMEO H. SIBULO, COMPLAINANT, VS. ATTY. STANLEY R. CABRERA, RESPONDENT.

D E C I S I O N

PURISIMA, J.:

At bar is an administrative complaint against the respondent, Atty. Stanley Cabrera, for unethical practice/conduct.

The facts that matter are as follows:

In a case, entitled *"Brenda Sucaldito*[1] *versus Reynaldo Marcelo, et al.",* docketed as Civil Case No. 90-55209 before Branch 53 of the Regional Trial Court of Manila, defendant Reynaldo Marcelo retained the services of the herein respondent as his lawyer. Subsequently, however, the respondent also entered his appearance as counsel for plaintiff Brenda Sucaldito in the same case, without withdrawing his appearance as counsel for defendant Reynaldo Marcelo. In view of such development Atty. Reyes Geromo, former counsel of Brenda Sucaldito, filed with the Manila Regional Trial Court a motion to disqualify the respondent on the ground of unethical conduct.[2] Finding merit in the said motion, the trial court ordered the disqualification of respondent in the case.[3]

Complainant Romeo Sibulo, an intervenor in the aforementioned Civil Case No. 90-55209, brought the present administrative complaint against respondent, praying for the latter's removal from or suspension in the practice of law, on the ground of unethical practice/conduct.

In his Answer[4] to the Complaint, respondent denied the wrongdoing alluded to him; theorizing that "xxx I merely accepted a case from a plaintiff and at the same time I was the counsel as intervenor of one of the defendants xxx."

This case was referred to the Integrated Bar of the Philippines (IBP) for investigation, report and recommendation.[5]

Acting thereupon on April 7, 2000, the IBP came out with its Resolution No. XIV-000-163, which reads:

> **"RESOLUTION NO. XIV-000-163**
>
> **Adm. Case No. 4218**
> **Romeo E. Sibulo vs. Atty.**
> **Stanly Cabrera**