

EN BANC

**[A.C. No. 10240 [Formerly CBD No. 11-3241],
November 25, 2014]**

**ESTRELLA R. SANCHEZ, COMPLAINANT, VS. ATTY. NICOLAS C.
TORRES, M.D., RESPONDENT.**

DECISION

PER CURIAM:

Before us is a Complaint^[1] dated November 24, 2011 for disciplinary action against respondent Atty. Nicolas C. Torres (*Atty. Torres*) filed by Estrella R. Sanchez (*Sanchez*) with the Integrated Bar of the Philippines-Commission on Bar Discipline (*IBP-CBD*), docketed as CBD Case No. 11-3241, now A.C. No. 10240, for violation of *Batas Pambansa Bilang 22 (B.P. 22)* and non-payment of debt.

In her complaint, Sanchez claimed that she is a friend and close acquaintance of Atty. Torres. That in 2007, Atty. Torres asked Sanchez to lend him money in the amount of Two Million Two Hundred Thousand Pesos (P2,200,000.00), and convinced her that he will pay the said amount within a period of one (1) month, plus interest. On November 8, 2007, persuaded by Atty. Torres' promise that he will pay immediately, Sanchez was convinced and handed him the cash amounting to Two Million Two Hundred Thousand Pesos (P2,200,000.00), which Sanchez withdrew from the bank in Atty. Torres' presence. To bolster Sanchez's trust and confidence, Atty. Torres issued two (2) Allied Bank checks with check nos. 0109386 and 0109387, under Account No. 001941-01285-8, both dated November 8, 2007, amounting to P1,200,000.00 and P1,000,000.00, respectively, or in the total amount of P2,200,000.00^[2]

However, after one (1) month, Atty. Torres failed to pay his obligation as promised. When Sanchez called Atty. Torres over the phone, she was told that she could again deposit the check and assured her that the checks will be honored upon presentment for payment.

On May 2, 2008, Sanchez deposited the said checks to her account, but the same were returned due to "ACCOUNT CLOSED."

Despite repeated demands for the last three (3) years, Atty. Torres had yet to pay his obligation since then, and thus, complainant sought legal assistance. As a consequence, formal demand letters were sent by the complainant's lawyer which respondent received on August 14, 2008^[3] and November 17, 2008,^[4] respectively, and the same proved futile as Atty. Torres failed and refused to pay his obligation. Nonetheless, Atty. Torres, in his letter dated May 9, 2009,^[5] promised to pay anew the amount of P2,200,000.00 in cash on or before May 15, 2009 as replacement for the two checks he previously issued. But no payment whatsoever was made. Hence, the instant complaint filed on November 28, 2011.

On November 28, 2011, the IBP–Commission on Bar Discipline (CBD) required Atty. Torres to file an answer.^[6]

On December 29, 2011, Atty. Torres moved for extension of time to file an answer. He alleged that his bookkeeper was on a holiday leave and that the receipts of payments and audit report were in the custody of the bookkeeper which will be available only in the 1st week of January 2012.^[7] However, in an Order^[8] dated March 2, 2012, the IBP-CBD noted that Atty. Torres had yet to file his Answer to the complaint even after the expiration of the extension period earlier granted; thus, a final extension was given anew and the case was set for mandatory conference. Despite sufficient time for respondent Atty. Torres to file his answer, he failed to do so. Worse, he even failed to appear in the scheduled mandatory conference despite due notice.

Thus, in its Report and Recommendation^[9] dated June 15, 2012, the IBP-CBD found Atty. Torres guilty of willful dishonesty and unethical conduct for failure to pay just debt and for issuing checks without sufficient funds. It recommended that Atty. Torres be sanctioned with suspension from the practice of law for at least two (2) years.

On March 20, 2013, the IBP Board of Governors adopted and approved the Report and Recommendation of the IBP-CBD. Atty. Torres was ordered suspended from the practice of law for a period of two (2) years, and further ordered to return the amount of P2,200,000.00 to Sanchez, with legal interest.^[10]

On August 5, 2013, respondent, through counsel, filed a Manifestation with Motion for Extension of Time to File Motion for Reconsideration.^[11] He claimed that he had proof of receipts to show that he had already paid his obligation to Sanchez.^[12]

However, despite the lapse of considerable time after the receipt of notice to comply with the said Resolution, no motion for reconsideration was filed. Hence, in a Resolution dated January 21, 2014, the Court resolved to note the Report dated December 13, 2013, stating that records of the OBC showed that no motion for reconsideration or petition for review was filed by either party as of November 22, 2013.

RULING

We sustain the findings and recommendations of the IBP-CBD and the IBP-Board of Governors.

In the instant case, the existence of the loan obligation is undisputed. Sanchez was able to discharge her burden of proving that she loaned P2,200,000.00 to Atty. Torres as evidenced by the subject bank checks. Furthermore, backed by Atty. Torres' admission in his letter dated May 9, 2009, his promise to pay the amount of P2,200,000.00 in cash, as replacement for the two checks he previously issued, is more than sufficient to establish a valid obligation of Atty. Torres to Sanchez. Atty. Torres' admission of the loan he contracted and his failure to pay the same leave no room for interpretation. Likewise, other than his belated and empty claims of payment, Atty. Torres failed to discharge his burden of proving that he had indeed