

FIRST DIVISION

[G.R. No. 229228, January 26, 2021]

**TORM SHIPPING PHILIPPINES, INC., TORM S/A, PETITIONERS,
VS. PAMFILO A. ALACRE, RESPONDENT.**

DECISION

GAERLAN, J.:

Before this Court is a Petition for Review on *Certiorari* under Rule 45 of the Rules of Court seeking to annul and set aside the Decision^[1] of the Court of Appeals (CA) in CA-G.R. SP No. 138700 dated July 13, 2016 and its Resolution^[2] dated January 11, 2017, denying the motion for reconsideration thereof. The assailed Decision granted the petition for *certiorari* filed by the petitioner, annulled and set aside the Decision and Resolution dated August 29, 2014 and October 31, 2014, respectively, of the National Labor Relations Commission (NLRC), and reinstated the Decision dated February 21, 2014 issued by the Labor Arbiter (LA).

The Antecedent Facts

Respondent Pamfilo A. Alacre was hired by petitioner TORM Shipping Philippines, Inc. for its principal, TORM.^[3]

Under the employment contract, respondent was hired as a Fitter on board the vessel Torm Kristina for a period of six months with a basic monthly salary of US\$648.00. Prior to his embarkation on March 12, 2012, the respondent underwent Pre-Employment Medical Examination and was declared fit to work.^[4]

Sometime in July 2012, while working on board the vessel, respondent felt pain on his right shoulder. He sought medical help and was diagnosed by the doctor to be suffering from "Right shoulder sprain, right hand joint sprain."^[5]

Respondent was repatriated to the Philippines on July 8, 2012. He was referred to the company-designated physician, Dr. Amado Regino of the NGC Medical Specialist Clinic, Inc. (NGC Clinic) for post-employment medical examination.^[6]

Thereafter, the respondent underwent a series of treatments from July 10, 2012 up to October 24, 2012, as evidenced by Medical Reports^[7] issued by the NGC Clinic.

On October 29, 2012, the NGC Medical Clinic issued a Medical Report^[8] finding that based on the respondent's medical condition, his interim disability grading is "Grade 10 – inability to raise arm more than halfway from horizontal to perpendicular."^[9]

Thereafter, the respondent continued therapy due to the persistent pain on his right shoulder as advised by the company-designated physician.^[10]

As there appeared to be no improvement of his condition, the respondent decided to consult another doctor, Dr. Venancio P. Garduce, Jr. (Dr. Garduce), an Orthopedic Specialist at St. Luke's Medical Center and San Juan De Dios Hospital and a Professor in Orthopedics at the University of the Philippines-College of Medicine. Dr. Garduce concluded that it would be impossible for the respondent to work as a seaman and recommended a Grade 3 disability grading.^[11]

On February 13, 2013, respondent underwent surgery on his right shoulder. Respondent was discharged on February 16, 2013, but was advised to continue his physical therapy.^[12]

As his condition failed to improve, respondent filed a Complaint before the LA against the petitioners for recovery of permanent total disability benefits with claims for moral and exemplary damages and attorney's fees.^[13]

On February 21, 2014, LA Jaime M. Reyno rendered his Decision^[14] finding merit in the respondent's complaint, the dispositive portion of which reads:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, judgment is hereby rendered ordering respondents, to pay, jointly and severally, complainant Pamfilo A. Alacre the amount of SIXTY THOUSAND US DOLLARS (US\$60,000.00) representing total permanent disability benefits, plus ten percent (10%) thereof as and for attorney's fees.

All other claims are dismissed for lack of merit.

SO ORDERED.^[15]

The Labor Arbiter held that the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) no longer applies since it covers only the period of February 1, 2008 to January 31, 2010. Thus, applying the provisions of the Philippine Overseas Employment Agency-Standard Employment Contract (POEA SEC), the LA awarded respondent the maximum disability compensation of US\$60,000.00. The basis of the award is the failure of the company-designated physician to issue a final assessment, and the inability of respondent to work for more than 120 days which, thus, rendered his disability total and permanent.^[16]

Petitioner appealed to the NLRC, which rendered its Decision^[17] on August 29, 2014, granting the appeal and reversing the Decision of the Labor Arbiter, viz.:

WHEREFORE, the appeal is GRANTED. The Labor Arbiter's Decision promulgated on 21 February 2014 is REVERSED AND SET ASIDE and the complaint DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE to its refiling after the resolution of the claim pending before the Danish National Board of Industrial Injuries.

SO ORDERED.^[18]

The NLRC refused to rule on the disability claim of respondent finding that the CBA remained effective as pursuant to its provisions, the absence of prior notice of its termination extends its period of coverage beyond January 31, 2010. Following the CBA, the NLRC held that the respondent's complaint is dismissible pending result of the National Board Industrial Industries (NBII) under the Danish Industrial Injuries

Act (DIIA). This however does not deprive the respondent of the right to proceed against the petitioner in accordance with the POEA-SEC, but the remedy should be after the claim under the Danish Act is settled.^[19]

Respondent filed a motion for reconsideration of the NLRC Decision but the same was denied by the NLRC in its October 31, 2014 Resolution.^[20] In the said Resolution, the NLRC added that the "setting off" provision under the CBA means that it is the award under Danish law that should be deducted from the amount respondent is found to be entitled under the POEA-SEC.^[21]

Respondent then filed a petition for *certiorari* with the CA alleging that the NLRC committed grave abuse of discretion in dismissing the complaint on the ground that it is premature, and in not awarding damages and attorney's fees.^[22]

On July 13, 2016, the CA rendered the herein assailed Decision^[23] which granted the petition for *certiorari* filed by respondent, the *fallo* of which reads:

FOR THESE REASONS, the instant petition is hereby GRANTED. The assailed Decision dated 29 August 2014 and Resolution dated 31 October 2014 rendered by the Fifth Division of the NLRC in NLRC LAC No. OFW-M-04-000315-14 (NLRC NCR Case No. (M) 06-09042-13) are ANNULLED and SET ASIDE. The Decision of the Labor Arbiter dated 21 February 2014 is hereby REINSTATED.

SO ORDERED.^[24]

The CA agreed with the findings of the LA that the CBA remained effective at the time relevant to the respondent's disability claims. It also affirmed the LA's findings that respondent's disability lapsed into a total and permanent disability on account of the failure of the company-designated physician to render a final and definitive assessment within the required 240- day period. Similarly owing to such failure, the CA held that "the third-doctor-referral provision did not find application."^[25]

Finally, with respect to the disability claim filed before the NBII, the CA noted that the NBII had already rendered its Decision granting the respondent of disability benefits and loss of earning capacity. In this light, there is no need to refile the complaint as the NLRC ruled. The amount awarded by the NBII shall be offset against the amount adjudged by the LA.^[26]

Petitioners sought reconsideration of the July 13, 2016 Decision, but the CA denied in its Resolution^[27] dated January 11, 2017.

In this Petition for Review on *Certiorari*, petitioners attribute the following errors committed by the CA:

THE HONORABLE COURT OF APPEALS COMMITTED SERIOUS, REVERSIBLE AND GROSS ERROR OF LAW BASED ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS:

1. In annulling the judgment of the NLRC and allowing the claim of the Respondent to prosper notwithstanding incontrovertible evidence that he has no cause of action for permanent total disability benefits under the POEA SEC at the time that he filed the complaint against the Petitioners.

2. In sustaining the Labor Arbiter's award of USD60,000.00 as permanent total disability benefits.
3. In failing to include in the dispositive portion of the Decision its ruling on off-setting thereby leaving room for debate, dispute and interpretation on the proper execution of the judgment.
4. In blindly affirming the Labor Arbiter's award of attorney's fees despite lack of reasonable ground to award the same.^[28]

Petitioners submit that prior to his filing of the complaint before the Labor Arbiter on June 24, 2013, respondent had already interposed a claim for recovery before the Danish Shipowner Accident Insurance Association. This rendered the complaint before the LA premature.^[29]

Likewise, petitioners averred that on the 234th day or on March 1, 2013, the company-designated physician advised respondent to continue further treatment. However, respondent did not comply with the directive. Thus, the CA should have limited the Grade 10 interim disability rating of the company-designated physician.^[30] At any rate, petitioners argue that the CBA provides for the offsetting of the amount that a seafarer is entitled to receive under the Danish Industrial Injuries and the POEA-SEC. As the amount awarded by the NBII and paid for by petitioners had already exceeded the maximum disability benefit payable which is USD60,000.00, there was no longer any obligation on the part of petitioners to compensate the respondent.^[31]

In his Comment,^[32] respondent argues that disability should be judged not on its "medical significance but on the loss of earning capacity." In this case, respondent avers that his condition clearly shows that he can no longer work as a seafarer. As such, he is entitled to permanent and total disability benefits.^[33]

In their Reply,^[34] petitioners essentially reiterated their arguments in their petition for review.

The Court's Ruling

The petition is ***meritorious***.

Preliminarily, it must be stated that there is no issue as to the compensability of respondent's illness as the parties do not dispute that it is work-related. The issues presented in this petition whether or not the parties' CBA remains effective and applicable in resolving this controversy and the disability grading of respondent's illness.

The entitlement of seafarers to disability is a matter governed not only by medical findings but also by contract and by law. By contract, the POEA-SEC under Department Order No. 4, series of 2000, of the Department of Labor and Employment and the parties' CBA. By law, the Labor Code provisions on disability applies.^[35]

On the first issue, the Court agrees with the NLRC. The CBA should be applied in determining the rights of the parties in this case as it remained effective even after its expressed duration. As succinctly explained by the NLRC in its Decision: