

THIRD DIVISION

[G.R. No. 179799, September 11, 2009]

**ZENAIDA R. GREGORIO, PETITIONER, VS. COURT OF APPEALS,
SANSIO PHILIPPINES, INC., AND EMMA J. DATUIN,
RESPONDENTS.**

DECISION

NACHURA, J.:

This is a petition^[1] for *certiorari* under Rule 45 of the Rules of Court assailing the Decision^[2] of the Court of Appeals (CA) dated January 31, 2007 and its Resolution^[3] dated September 12, 2007 in CA-G.R. SP No. 63602, entitled "*Sansio Philippines, Inc., et al. v. Hon. Romulo SG. Villanueva, et al.*"

The case arose from the filing of an Affidavit of Complaint^[4] for violation of *Batas Pambansa Bilang* (B.P. Blg.) 22 (Bouncing Checks Law) by respondent Emma J. Datuin (Datuin), as Officer-in-Charge of the Accounts Receivables Department, and upon authority of petitioner Sansio Philippines, Inc. (Sansio), against petitioner Zenaida R. Gregorio (Gregorio) and one Vito Belarmino, as proprietors of Alvi Marketing, allegedly for delivering insufficiently funded bank checks as payment for the numerous appliances bought by Alvi Marketing from Sansio.

As the address stated in the complaint was incorrect, Gregorio was unable to controvert the charges against her. Consequently, she was indicted for three (3) counts of violation of B.P. Blg. 22, docketed as Criminal Case Nos. 236544, 236545, and 236546, before the Metropolitan Trial Court (MeTC), Branch 3, Manila.

The MeTC issued a warrant^[5] for her arrest, and it was served upon her by the armed operatives of the Public Assistance and Reaction Against Crime (PARAC) of the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG) on October 17, 1997, Friday, at around 9:30 a.m. in Quezon City while she was visiting her husband and their two (2) daughters at their city residence. Gregorio was brought to the PARAC-DILG Office where she was subjected to fingerprinting and mug shots, and was detained. She was released in the afternoon of the same day when her husband posted a bond for her temporary liberty.

On December 5, 1997, Gregorio filed before the MeTC a Motion^[6] for Deferment of Arraignment and Reinvestigation, alleging that she could not have issued the bounced checks, since she did not even have a checking account with the bank on which the checks were drawn, as certified by the branch manager of the Philippine National Bank, Sorsogon Branch. She also alleged that her signature was patently and radically different from the signatures appearing on the bounced checks.

The MeTC granted the Motion and a reinvestigation was conducted. In the course of

the reinvestigation, Datuin submitted an Affidavit of Desistance^[7] dated August 18, 1998, stating, among others, that Gregorio was not one of the signatories of the bounced checks subject of prosecution.

Subsequently, the assistant city prosecutor filed a Motion to Dismiss^[8] dated November 12, 1998 with respect to Criminal Case Nos. 236544-46. The MeTC granted the motion and ordered the B.P. Blg. 22 cases dismissed.^[9]

On August 18, 2000, Gregorio filed a complaint^[10] for damages against Sansio and Datuin before the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Branch 12, Ligao, Albay. The complaint, in part, reads —

4. That on or about December 15, 1995, defendant Emma J. Datuin filed with the Office of the City Prosecutor of Manila an "Affidavit of Complaint" wherein, among others, she alleged under oath that as an Officer In-charge of the Accounts Receivables Department of SANSIO PHILIPPINES, INC., she was duly authorized and empowered by said company to file cases against debtors, customers and dealers of the company;

x x x x

5. That while acting under authority of her employer namely the defendant SANSIO PHILIPPINES, INC., defendant EMMA J. DATUIN falsely stated in the "Affidavit of Complaint" (Annex "A"), among others, that plaintiff Zenaida R. Gregorio issued and delivered to their office the following checks, to wit:

- a. PNB Check No. C-347108 dated November 30, 1992 in the amount of P9,564.00;
- b. PNB Check No. C-347109 dated November 30, 1992 in the amount of P19,194.48; and
- c. PNB Check No. C-347104 dated December 2, 1992 in the amount of P10,000.00

and that the above-mentioned PNB Checks bounced when deposited upon maturity;

6. That as a result of the filing of the "Affidavit of Complaint" (Annex "A") wherein defendant Emma J. Datuin falsely charged the plaintiff with offenses of Estafa and/or violation of B.P. Blg. 22 on three (3) counts, the Office of the City Prosecutor of Manila issued a Resolution dated April 1, 1996 finding the existence of a probable cause against the plaintiff for violation of Batas Pambansa Blg. 22 on three counts;

x x x x

7. That in the "MEMO OF PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION" attached hereto as Annex "C," signed by defendant Emma J. Datuin she falsely indicated the address of plaintiff to be at No. 76 Peñaranda Street, Legaspi City

when the truth of the matter is that the latter's correct address is at Barangay Rizal, Oas, Albay;

8. That as a consequence of the foregoing false and misleading indication of address, plaintiff was therefore not duly notified of the charges filed against her by defendant Emma J. Datuin; and more, she was not able to controvert them before the investigating prosecutor, finally resulting in the filing in court of three (3) informations accusing her of violating B.P. 22;

x x x x

9. That as pernicious result of the unwarranted and baseless accusation by the defendants which culminated in the filing of three (3) informations in the Metropolitan Trial Court of Manila, Branch 3 indicting the plaintiff on three counts of the offense of violating B.P. 22, the said court issued a Warrant of Arrest on July 22, 1996 ordering the arrest of the plaintiff;

x x x x

10. That taking extra effort to expedite the apprehension of plaintiff, defendants' retained private prosecutor managed to obtain the Warrant for the Arrest of said plaintiff from the Court as evidenced by the copy of the letter of lawyer Alquin B. Manguerra of Chua and Associates Law Office (Annex "H") so much so that in the morning of October 17, 1997, while plaintiff was visiting her husband Jose Gregorio and their two daughters at their city residence at 78 K-2 Street, Kamuning, Quezon City, and without the slightest premonition that she was wanted by the law, armed operatives of the Public Assistance and Reaction Against Crime (PARAC) of DILG suddenly swooped down on their residence, arrested the plaintiff and brought her to the PARAC DILG Office in Quezon City where she was fingerprinted and detained like an ordinary criminal;

x x x x

11. That feeling distraught, helpless and hungry (not having eaten for a whole day) the plaintiff languished in her place of confinement until the late afternoon of October 17, 1997 when her husband was able to post a bond for her temporary liberty and secure an order of release (Annex "J") from the court. It was providential that a city judge was available in the late afternoon of October 17, 1997 which was a Friday, otherwise plaintiff would have remained in confinement for the entire weekend;

12. That because of her desire to prove and establish her innocence of the unjustified charges lodged against her by the defendants, the plaintiff was thus compelled to retain the services of counsel resulting in the filing of a Motion for Deferment of Arraignment and Reinvestigation (Annex "K") which was granted by the court; the filing of a Request for Reinvestigation with the prosecutor's office (Annex "L"); and the submission of a Counter-Affidavit to the investigating prosecutor. All of these culminated in the filing by the investigating prosecutor of a Motion to Dismiss (Annex "M") the three criminal cases as a consequence of

which the Court issued an Order dated June 1, 1999 (Annex "N") dismissing Criminal Cases No. 236544, No. 236545 and No. 236546, copy of which was received by plaintiff only on July 7, 2000;

13. That previous to the filing of the above-mentioned Motion to Dismiss by the prosecutor and having been faced with the truth and righteousness of plaintiff's avowal of innocence which was irrefutable, defendants had no recourse but to concede and recognize the verity that they had wrongly accused an innocent person, in itself a brazen travesty of justice, so much so that defendant Emma J. Datuin had to execute an Affidavit of Desistance (Annex "O") admitting that plaintiff is not a signatory to the three bouncing checks in question, rationalizing, albeit lamely, that the filing of the cases against the plaintiff was by virtue of an honest mistake or inadvertence on her (Datuin's) part;

14. Be that as it may, incalculable damage has been inflicted on the plaintiff on account of the defendants' wanton, callous and reckless disregard of the fundamental legal precept that "every person shall respect the dignity, personality, privacy and peace of mind of his neighbors and other persons" (Art. 26, Civil Code of the Philippines);

15. That the plaintiff, being completely innocent of the charges against her as adverted to in the preceding paragraphs, was socially humiliated, embarrassed, suffered physical discomfort, mental anguish, fright, and serious anxiety as a proximate result of her unjustified indictment, arrest and detention at the PARAC headquarters - all of these ordeals having been exacerbated by the fact that plaintiff is a woman who comes from a respected family in Oas, Albay, being the wife of an executive of the Philippine National Construction Corporation, the mother of two college students studying in Manila, a pharmacist by profession, a businesswoman by occupation, and an incumbent Municipal Councilor (Kagawad) of Oas, Albay, at the time of her arrest and detention; and that she previously held the following positions:

- (a). President, Philippine Pharmaceutical Association (Albay Chapter);
- (b). Chairman of the Board, Albay Pharmaceutical Marketing Cooperative (ALPHAMAC);
- (c). Charter Secretary, Kiwanis Club of Oas;
- (d). Chairman, Polangui Ladies Multi-Purpose Cooperative, Polangui, Albay;
- (e). Vicarial Regent, Daughters of Mary Immaculate International, District IX;
- (f). Chapter President and Municipal Coordinator, Albay Women Volunteers Association, Inc., Legaspi City;
- (g). Regent, Daughters of Mary Immaculate International Virgo Clemens Circle, Oas, Albay;
- (h). Secretary, Girl Scout of the Philippines District Association; and
- (i). Director, Albay Electric Cooperative (ALECO),

not to mention the undue aspersion cast upon her social, professional and business reputation because of defendants' tortious act of accusing

her of Estafa and/or issuing bouncing checks - even without a scintilla of evidence;

16. That to compound the foregoing travails and sufferings of the plaintiff she had to devote and spend much of her time, money and efforts trying to clear her tarnished name and reputation, including traveling to and from Manila to confer with her lawyer, attend the hearings at the prosecutor's office and at the Metropolitan Trial Court;

17. By and large, defendants' fault or, at the very least, their reckless imprudence or negligence, in filing the three (3) criminal cases against the plaintiff unequivocally caused damage to the latter and because of defendants' baseless and unjustified accusations, plaintiff was constrained to retain the services of a lawyer to represent her at the Metropolitan Trial Court and at the Office of the City Prosecutor at Manila in order to establish her innocence and cause the dismissal of the three (3) criminal cases filed against her, reason for which she spent P20,000.00; and in order to institute this instant action for the redress of her grievances, plaintiff have to pay the sum of P50,000.00 as attorney's fees and incur litigation expenses in the amount of P35,000.00;

18. That by reason of all the foregoing and pursuant to the provision of law that "whoever by act or omission causes damage to another, there being fault or negligence, is obliged to pay for the damage done," (Article 2176, Civil Code of the Philippines), the plaintiff is entitled to and hereby claims the following items of damages:

- a. P3,000,000.00 as moral damages
- b. P50,000.00 as actual damages
- c. P50,000.00 as nominal damages
- d. P70,000.00 as attorney's fees
- e. P35,000.00 as litigation expenses

19. That defendants herein are jointly and solidarily liable for the payment of the above items of damages being co-tortfeasors. Moreover, defendant SANSIO PHILIPPINES, INC. is vicariously liable as the employer of defendant Emma J. Datuin who patently acted within the scope of her assigned tasks (Vide: Art. 2180, Civil Code of the Philippines).^[11]

Sansio and Datuin filed a Motion to Dismiss^[12] on the ground that the complaint, being one for damages arising from malicious prosecution, failed to state a cause of action, as the ultimate facts constituting the elements thereof were not alleged in the complaint. Gregorio opposed^[13] the Motion. Sansio and Datuin filed their Reply^[14] to the Opposition. Gregorio, in turn, filed her Rejoinder.^[15]

On October 10, 2000, the RTC issued an Order^[16] denying the Motion to Dismiss. Sansio and Datuin filed a Motion for Reconsideration^[17] of the October 10, 2000 Order, but the RTC denied the same in its Order^[18] dated January 5, 2001.