

**[ ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER NO. 103, October 04, 1949 ]**

**REINSTATING MR. ASAAD USMAN IN THE SERVICE AS JUSTICE OF THE PEACE OF SIASI AND TAPUL, PROVINCE OF SULU, WITH THE RIGHT TO COLLECT HIS SALARY DURING THE PERIOD OF HIS SUSPENSION.**

This is an administrative case against Mr. Asaad Usman, Justice of the Peace of Siasi and Tapul, province of Sulu, on the following charges:

1. That through deceit and preconceived intent to exploit the persons accused before the justice of the peace court of Siasi, he demanded money from the accused and their relatives, promising to acquit said accused or to dismiss the cases against them upon payment of the amount demanded;
2. That he settles criminal cases pending in his court by imposing fines extrajudicially and that he profits therefrom;
3. That motivated by revenge, he willfully promised to dismiss a criminal case, provided the accused would sign an affidavit implicating the chief of police of Siasi in a bribery case, thus inducing persons to make false statements;
4. That he maliciously delayed the trial or preliminary hearing of criminal cases for several months for the purpose of exploiting the accused or their relatives;
5. That he falsely stated in his order, dated June 26, 1947, in criminal case No. 90 that the prosecuting officer and the accused were present and introduced evidence, when in fact the prosecuting officer (the chief of police) was never notified of the trial and was never present when the case was tried and that the accused pleaded guilty without any trial;
6. That he is keeping a woman in his house by the name of Emma Gonzales whom he holds out as his wife, when in fact his wife by the name of Dominga Usman is in Manila; and
7. That he is ignorant of the law and maliciously approved the bail bond of the accused charged with robbery in band with murder in the amount of only P3,000 notwithstanding the circular of the Department of Justice on the matter.

Charges Nos. 2 and 4 were withdrawn during the hearing, in view of which the investigation was limited to Charges Nos, 1, 3, 5, 6 and 7. After a careful consideration of the evidence adduced, this Office finds that Charges Nos. 1, 3, 5 and 6 have not been established.

With respect to Charge No. 7, it appears that in criminal case No, 66 for robbery in