

THIRD DIVISION

[G.R. No. 180755, June 19, 2009]

**PEDIATRICA, INC., PETITIONER, VS. JOSELITO T. RAFAELES,
RESPONDENT.**

R E S O L U T I O N

NACHURA, J.:

Before this Court is a petition for review on *certiorari* under Rule 45 of the Rules of Court seeking the annulment of the June 26, 2007 Decision and November 13, 2007 Resolution of the Court of Appeals (CA) in CA-G.R. CEB SP No. 02058.

Respondent Joselito Rafaeles was employed by petitioner Pediatrica, Inc. as a Professional Service Representative (PSR), more commonly known as a medical representative. As a PSR, he was responsible for detailing petitioner's products to doctors. During the period material to this case, he was assigned at Cebu City.^[1]

In the course of his work, he was required to accomplish a Call Report Slip.^[2] This document is a record of, among others, the doctors' names, when the PSR called upon said doctor, and the items or products (physician's samples) issued to those doctors. As a matter of strict policy, the company requires that the integrity and accuracy of the Call Report Slip be maintained at all times since it contains valuable information to aid in the company's operations and administration of its personnel.

^[3] Thus, petitioner considers as a serious offense the submission of an inaccurate Call Report Slip or one that contains false information or forged doctors' signatures.

^[4]

On February 27, 2004, petitioner issued a Memorandum to respondent asking him to explain certain discrepancies in some of the Call Report Slips he had submitted; in particular, those where some of the doctors' signatures did not appear to be genuine. As evidence, petitioner attached several disclaimers written by the doctors to the effect that they did not sign the subject Call Report Slips.^[5]

In his written explanation, respondent alleged that he did not defraud petitioner of cash, stocks, and other properties, and that he did not falsify records, furnish false data, or commit dishonesty with deliberate intent to defraud the company. He claimed that, in their absence, the doctors authorized their respective clinic personnel to receive the samples. He also argued that since the disclaimers were not authenticated, these cannot be given credence.^[6] During the hearing that followed, respondent claimed that when doctors were in a hurry, or did not want to talk to a PSR, he would just leave the samples in the doctor's cabinet and the secretaries would sign on the doctor's behalf.^[7]

Subsequently, petitioner's Operations Director, Virgilio Marfori, personally inquired

into the accuracy of respondent's claim that doctors often allowed their secretaries to sign the Call Report Slips, and he allegedly found that the doctors did not allow their nurses or secretaries to sign for them. One of the doctors, Dr. Limchiu, issued an affidavit to that effect.^[8]

On April 29, 2004, respondent submitted a letter stating that he never said that the doctors allowed or instructed their secretaries or nurses to sign for them. He simply claimed that the secretaries or nurses signed for the doctors as proof that the doctors received the samples meant for them. He added that the doctors' denials did not negate the fact that their secretaries or nurses signed the Call Report Slips acknowledging receipt of the samples.

In a Memorandum dated May 8, 2004, petitioner advised respondent that it was terminating his employment for violation of the provisions of the Company Handbook and for loss of confidence.^[9]

Respondent filed a complaint for illegal dismissal, damages, and money claims against petitioner before the National Labor Relations Commission (NLRC), Regional Arbitration Branch No. VII, Cebu City.^[10] The Executive Labor Arbiter rendered a decision^[11] finding that respondent was illegally dismissed and ordered petitioner to reinstate complainant and pay him backwages and his money claims.

Petitioner appealed the decision. On January 25, 2006, the NLRC issued an Order^[12] dismissing the appeal on the ground that the same was not perfected because it appeared that of the three joint declarants (the employer, its counsel, and the bonding company) in support of the appeal bond, only one of them - the bonding company representative - swore before the notary public.

Petitioner filed a motion for reconsideration.^[13] It alleged that all three joint declarants swore before the notary public attaching, as proof thereof, a Certification from Notary Public Rogel R. Atienza that the representatives from Unilab (petitioner's parent company) and its counsel likewise appeared before the notary public and exhibited their respective Community Tax Certificates (CTC). The NLRC denied the motion saying that the *jurat* of the Joint Declaration indicated that only one exhibited his CTC before the notary public, confirming that the others did not so appear before the notary public.^[14]

Petitioner filed a special civil action for certiorari before the CA. On July 25, 2007, the CA issued the assailed Decision.^[15] It denied the petition and affirmed the NLRC decision. It ruled that petitioner did not comply with the requisites for appeal before the NLRC. The CA found that the Joint Declaration petitioner submitted was defective because the *jurat* portion did not contain the CTC numbers of the Unilab representatives and its counsel. Moreover, it found that the Joint Declaration was executed by Unilab, not by petitioner itself, which has a separate juridical personality. The CA brushed aside petitioner's contention that since Unilab was its parent company, the latter could post the bond on its behalf.

Petitioner's motion for reconsideration was denied in a Resolution dated November 13, 2007.^[16] It then filed this Petition for Review seeking the reversal of the questioned CA Decision. It argues that the CA ruled contrary to law and