

## EN BANC

**[ A.M. No. 10-1-13-SC, March 20, 2012 ]**

**RE: SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM DATED JANUARY 11, 2010 OF  
ACTING DIRECTOR ALEU A. AMANTE, PIAB-C, OFFICE OF THE  
OMBUDSMAN.**

**[A.M. NO. 10-9-9-SC]**

**RE: ORDER OF THE OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN REFERRING THE  
COMPLAINT OF ATTYS. OLIVER O. LOZANO AND EVANGELINE J.  
LOZANO-ENDRIANO AGAINST CHIEF JUSTICE REYNATO S. PUNO  
[RET.].**

### RESOLUTION

#### PER CURIAM:

We resolve the separate successive letter-petitions<sup>[1]</sup> of Atty. Oliver O. Lozano, addressed to the Supreme Court *en banc*, for the lifting of the indefinite suspension from the practice of law imposed by the Court in its Resolution of June 15, 2010.

In our Resolution of June 15, 2010, we found Atty. Lozano and Atty. Evangeline Lozano-Endriano guilty of grave professional misconduct when they misquoted or misused constitutional provisions in their pleadings<sup>[2]</sup> in order to impute unjust acts to members of this Court. Subsequently, we have reinstated Atty. Lozano-Endriano in our August 23, 2011 Resolution, because of circumstances indicating lesser culpability on her part.

Professional misconduct involving the misuse of constitutional provisions for the purpose of insulting Members of this Court is a serious breach of the rigid standards that a member of good standing of the legal profession must faithfully comply with. Thus, the penalty of indefinite suspension was imposed. However, in the past two years during which Atty. Lozano has been suspended, he has repeatedly expressed his willingness to admit his error, to observe the rules and standards in the practice of law, and to serve the ends of justice if he should be reinstated. And in these two years, this Court has not been informed of any act that would indicate that Atty. Lozano had acted in any unscrupulous practices unsuitable to a member of the bar.

While this Court will not hesitate to discipline its erring officers, it will not prolong a penalty after it has been shown that the purpose for imposing it had already been served. From Atty. Lozano's letters-petitions, we discern that his suspension had already impressed upon him the need for care and caution in his representations as an officer of this Court.

Under these circumstances, this Court decides to grant Atty. Lozano's letters-petitions with the expectation that he shall now avoid going to the extreme of