

THIRD DIVISION

[G.R. No. 164181, September 14, 2011]

NISSAN MOTORS PHILS., INC., PETITIONER, VS. VICTORINO ANGELO, RESPONDENT.

D E C I S I O N

PERALTA, J.:

This is to resolve the Petition for Review^[1] dated July 10, 2004 of petitioner Nissan Motors Phils., Inc. (Nissan) assailing the Decision^[2] dated March 24, 2004 of the Court of Appeals (CA) and the latter's Resolution^[3] dated June 9, 2004.

The records contain the following antecedent facts:

Respondent Victorino Angelo was employed by Nissan on March 11, 1989 as one of its payroll staff. On April 7 to 17, 2000, respondent was on sick leave, thus, he was not able to prepare the payroll for the said period. Again, on April 27 and 28, 2000, respondent was on an approved vacation leave which again resulted in the non-preparation of the payroll for that particular period.

On May 8, 2000, respondent received a Memorandum^[4] from the petitioner containing the following:

This is to inform you that the Company is considering your dismissal from employment on the grounds of **serious misconduct, willful disobedience and gross neglect of duties.**

It appears that on April 10, 2000, Monday, which was the supposed cut-off date for payroll purposes for the April 15 payroll, you went home early without finishing your work and requested for a referral letter from the company clinic to E. Delos Santos Hospital claiming that you are not feeling well.

On April 11, Tuesday, you did not report for work, without any notice to the company or to any of your immediate superior section head, department head and division head. A phone call was made to your home, but the company could not make any contact.

On April 12, Wednesday, you reported for work but went home early claiming that you were again not feeling well. You were reminded of the coming payday on Friday, April 14, and you said you will be able to finish it on time and that you will just continue/finish your work the following day.

On April 13, Thursday, you again did not report for work without any notice to the company just like what you did last Tuesday. Your immediate superior, sensing that you did not finish your task, tried to contact you but to no avail, as you were residing in Novaliches and your home phone was not in order. So we decided to open your computer thru the help of our IT people to access the payroll program.

On April 14, Friday (payday), we were still doing the payroll thru IT because we could not contact you. Later in the day, the Company decided to release the payroll of employees the following day as we already ran out of time and the Company just based the net pay of the employees on their March 15 payroll. Naturally, the amount released to the employees were not accurate as some got more than (sic), while some got less than what they were supposed to receive.

Consequently, many employees got angry, as the Company paid on a Saturday, (in practice we do not release salary on a Saturday as it is always done in advance, *i.e.*, Friday) and majority got lesser amount than what they were supposed to receive. In addition, the employees were not given their payslip where they can base the net pay they received.

When you reported for work on Tuesday, April 18, we had a meeting and you were advised to transfer your payroll task to your immediate superior, which you agreed. The time table agreement was 2 payroll period, meaning April 30 and May 15 payroll.

Still on April 18, Tuesday, you filed an application for vacation leave due to your son's graduation on April 27 and 28. Because it is again payroll time, we advised that your leave will be approved on the condition that you will ensure that the payroll is finished on time and [you] will make a proper turn over to your immediate superior before your leave. You agreed and your leave was approved.

On April 24, Monday, you were reminded you should start on your payroll task because you will be on leave starting April 27, Thursday, you said yes.

On April 25, Tuesday, you were again reminded on finishing the payroll and the turn over again and you said yes.

On April 26, Wednesday, you were again reminded on the same matter and, in fact, Mr. AA del Rosario reminded you also on the matter about 5:30 p.m. And you promised him that the task will be finished by tomorrow (sic) and will just leave the diskette in your open drawer. You were left in the office until 6:00 p.m.

On April 27, Thursday, you were already on leave and your superior, Mr. M. Panela, found out that the diskette only contained the amount and name of employees, but not the account number. Likewise, the deductions from salaries was not finished, the salaries of contractuales, apprentices were also not finished. Since the bank only reads account numbers of employees, we experienced delay in the payroll processing.

You even promised to call the office *i.e.*, M Panela to give additional instructions not later than 12:00 noon on the same day, but you did not do so. In fact, the direct phone line of Mr. AA del Rosario was given to you by your officemate so you can call the office directly and not thru long distance.

On April 28, Friday, after exhaustive joint efforts done by Welfare Management Section and IT Division, we were able to finally release the payroll thru the bank, but many employees got lower amount than what they have expected, as in fact at least 43 employees out of 360 got salaries below P1,000.00, among them about 10 people got no salary primarily due to wrong deduction and computation done by you. Again, many people got angry to the management's inefficient handling of their payroll.

On May 2, Tuesday, you did not report for work, again you said you are not feeling well, but the information to us came very late at about noon time.

On May 3, Wednesday, you reported for work, and was instructed to finish the payslips for the payroll periods April 15 and April 30. You said yes, and you promised not to go home on that day without finishing the payslips. Later, you decided on your own to just compute the payslip on a monthly basis instead of the usual semi-monthly basis as is the customary thing to do. As a result thereof, an error in the tax withholding happened and again resulted in another confusion and anger among employees, as in fact for two (2) consecutive days, May 3 and May 4, the plant workers refused to render overtime.

As a consequence of all these, the manufacturing employees, numbering about 350 people or about 65% of [Nissan's total population], since April 16, have started to decline rendering overtime work, saying after their 15 days of work they received only less than P200 while some even received only P80.

The manufacturing operation was hampered completely in the month of April and the first week of May because of these several incidents. In sum, the company has suffered massive loss of opportunity to sell because of failure to produce in the production area due to non-availability of workers rendering overtime, high absenteeism rate among plant direct workers primarily due to the payroll problem. It came at a time when NMPI sales [are] just starting to pick up due to the introduction of the new model Sentra Exalta. The loss is simply too overwhelming.

Accordingly, you are hereby given a period of three (3) days from receipt hereof to submit your written answer.

In the meantime, you are hereby placed on preventive suspension effective immediately.

A hearing will be conducted by Mr. AA del Rosario, on May 13, 2000 at 9:00 a.m. at the Company's conference room (Fairlady).

Respondent filed a Complaint^[5] for illegal suspension with the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) on May 12, 2000.

Petitioner conducted an investigation on May 13, 2000, and concluded that respondent's explanation was untrue and insufficient. Thus, on June 13, 2000, petitioner issued a Notice of Termination.^[6]

Respondent amended his previous complaint against petitioner on June 22, 2000, to include the charge of illegal dismissal.^[7] On September 29, 2000, the Labor Arbiter rendered a Decision^[8] dismissing respondent's complaint for lack of merit. Undaunted, respondent brought the case to the National Labor Relations Commission (NLRC), which eventually rendered a Resolution^[9] dated February 14, 2002 dismissing the appeal and affirming the Labor Arbiter's Decision. Respondent's motion for reconsideration of the NLRC resolution was subsequently denied on May 13, 2002.^[10]

Aggrieved, respondent filed a petition for *certiorari*^[11] under Rule 65 of the Rules of Court with the CA and the latter granted the same petition in its Decision dated March 24, 2004, the dispositive portion of which reads:

WHEREFORE, the petition is GRANTED. The assailed resolutions dated February 14, 2002 and May 13, 2002 are REVERSED and SET ASIDE. The petitioner is hereby reinstated and the private respondents are ordered to pay him backwages from the time of his illegal dismissal.

SO ORDERED.

Unsatisfied with the decision of the CA, Nissan filed a motion for reconsideration, which was denied by the same court in a Resolution dated June 9, 2004.

Thus, the present petition, to which the petitioner cites the following grounds:

A

THE COURT OF APPEALS COMMITTED A SERIOUS ERROR OF LAW WHEN IT OVERTURNED THE FACTUAL FINDINGS OF BOTH THE LABOR ARBITER AND THE NLRC WHICH ARE BASED ON SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE.

B

THE COURT OF APPEALS COMMITTED A SERIOUS ERROR OF LAW WHEN IT DISREGARDED PRIVATE RESPONDENT'S SERIOUS MISCONDUCT AND INSUBORDINATION, AND DECIDED THE CASE ONLY ON THE CHARGE OF GROSS AND HABITUAL NEGLIGENCE.

THE COURT OF APPEALS COMMITTED SERIOUS ERROR OF LAW IN IGNORING PRIVATE RESPONDENT'S MISCONDUCT WHICH, IF EVER IT DOES NOT JUSTIFY DISMISSAL BECAUSE OF HIS 11-YEAR SERVICE NONETHELESS LIMITS THE AWARD OF BACKWAGES.^[12]

The petition is meritorious.

Petitioner argues that the factual findings of the Labor Arbiter and the NLRC should have been accorded respect by the CA as they are based on substantial evidence. However, factual findings of administrative agencies are not infallible and will be set aside if they fail the test of arbitrariness.^[13] In the present case, the findings of the CA differ from those of the Labor Arbiter and the NLRC. The Court, in the exercise of its equity jurisdiction, may look into the records of the case and re-examine the questioned findings.^[14]

The Labor Code provides that an employer may terminate the services of an employee for a just cause.^[15] Petitioner, the employer in the present case, dismissed respondent based on allegations of serious misconduct, willful disobedience and gross neglect.

One of the just causes enumerated in the Labor Code is serious misconduct. Misconduct is improper or wrong conduct.^[16] It is the transgression of some established and definite rule of action, a forbidden act, a dereliction of duty, willful in character, and implies wrongful intent and not mere error in judgment.^[17] Such misconduct, however serious, must nevertheless be in connection with the employee's work to constitute just cause for his separation.^[18] Thus, for misconduct or improper behavior to be a just cause for dismissal, (a) it must be serious; (b) it must relate to the performance of the employee's duties; and (c) it must show that the employee has become unfit to continue working for the employer.^[19]

Going through the records, this Court found evidence to support the allegation of serious misconduct or insubordination. Petitioner claims that the language used by respondent in his Letter-Explanation is akin to a manifest refusal to cooperate with company officers, and resorted to conduct which smacks of outright disrespect and willful defiance of authority or insubordination. The misconduct to be serious within the meaning of the Labor Code must be of such a grave and aggravated character and not merely trivial or unimportant.^[20] The Letter-Explanation^[21] partly reads:

Again, it's not negligence on my part and I'm not alone to be blamed. It's negligence on your part [Perla Go] and A.A. Del Rosario kasi, noong pang April 1999 ay alam ninyo na hindi ako ang dapat may responsibilidad ng payroll kundi ang Section Head eh bakit hindi ninyo pinahawak sa Section Head noon pa. Pati kaming dalawa sa payroll, kasama ko si Thelma. Tinanggal nyo si Thelma. Hindi nyo ba naisip na kailangan dalawa ang tao sa payroll para pag absent ang isa ay may gagawa. Dapat noon nyo pa naisip iyan. Ang tagal kong gumawa ng trabahong hindi ko naman dapat ginagawa.