

## SECOND DIVISION

[ G.R. NO. 161871, July 24, 2007 ]

**INCON INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION, PETITIONER, VS. HON. COURT OF APPEALS, HON. DIONISIO C. SISON IN HIS CAPACITY AS PRESIDING JUDGE OF THE REGIONAL TRIAL COURT OF VALENZUELA CITY, BRANCH 75, FERMIN ABARRIENTOS, AND DELFINA V. ABARRIENTOS, RESPONDENTS.**

### RESOLUTION

**QUISUMBING, J.:**

For review on certiorari are the Resolutions dated March 27, 2003<sup>[1]</sup> and January 23, 2004<sup>[2]</sup> of the Court of Appeals, in CA-G.R. SP No. 71145, which had dismissed the petition for certiorari filed by herein petitioner assailing the Orders dated March 5, 2001<sup>[3]</sup> and May 22, 2002<sup>[4]</sup> of the Regional Trial Court of Valenzuela City, Branch 75.

The antecedent facts are as follows.

Precila V. Abarrientos worked for petitioner Incon Industrial Corporation as operator of a plastic-molding machine. However, petitioner assigned her to fill in as operator of a blowing machine on days when the operator assigned for the blowing machine was absent. Precila allegedly did so without any prior training. Precila, later, was fatally injured while operating the blowing machine.

On August 28, 2000, Precila's parents, Fermin and Delfina Abarrientos, filed a complaint<sup>[5]</sup> in the Regional Trial Court of Valenzuela City, Branch 75, for breach of contract and damages against petitioner.

Petitioner filed a motion to dismiss<sup>[6]</sup> on the grounds that (1) the trial court had no jurisdiction over the subject and nature of the action; (2) the Abarrientos spouses had already waived their claim; and (3) the spouses are guilty of forum shopping. The trial court denied the motion for lack of merit.<sup>[7]</sup> The parties were thus required to file their respective answers.

Petitioner filed a motion for reconsideration<sup>[8]</sup> instead. Petitioner stressed that the spouses' claims involved benefits under the Labor Code accruing to their daughter Precila. Hence, the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) had jurisdiction over the subject matter of the case. Again, the trial court denied the motion.<sup>[9]</sup>

Undeterred, petitioner filed with the Court of Appeals a petition for certiorari alleging that the trial court's dismissal of its aforesaid motion to dismiss and motion for reconsideration constituted grave abuse of discretion. The appellate court, however, found that the petition failed to: (1) include the trial court judge as respondent; and

(2) state the material dates showing the timeliness of its filing. Thus, the petition for certiorari was dismissed. Petitioner's motion for reconsideration of said dismissal was also denied.

Hence, the instant petition for review, raising the following as issues:

WHETHER OR NOT THE LOWER COURT (REGIONAL TRIAL COURT OF VALENZUELA CITY BRANCH 75) ERRED IN NOT DISMISSING THE COMPLAINT, AS THE COMPLAINT REFERS MAINLY TO CLAIM FOR MINIMUM WAGE, COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE, EMERGENCY ALLOWANCE, 13TH MONTH PAY, PRODUCTION SHARE BENEFITS, OVERTIME PAY, REST DAY HOLIDAY PAY (ART. 94) NIGHT SHIFT DIFFERENTIAL PAY, HENCE THE LOWER COURT (RTC) ERRED IN DISMISSING PETITIONER'S MOTION TO DISMISS;

WHETHER OR NOT THE LOWER COURT (HONORABLE COURT OF APPEALS) ERRED IN DISMISSING PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR CERTIORARI ON MINOR TECHNICALITIES.<sup>[10]</sup>

Petitioner contends that the cause of action in this case arises from an employer-employee relationship and hinges on alleged violation of the Labor Code. Thus, the complaint falls within the exclusive jurisdiction of the DOLE. Petitioner also alleges that the spouses' claim has already been settled as evidenced by an Order<sup>[11]</sup> issued by the DOLE Regional Director decreeing the closure of the case upon receipt by Precila's parents of financial assistance amounting to P105,000. Petitioner maintains the trial court thus erred in denying its motion to dismiss and assuming jurisdiction over the complaint. Petitioner also faults the Court of Appeals for dismissing its petition for certiorari on purely technical grounds.

The Abarrientos spouses, on the other hand, counter that the petition for certiorari filed with the Court of Appeals deserved outright dismissal for failure to comply with mandatory jurisdictional requirements. The spouses also stress that their claim for damages is based not on the employer-employee relationship between petitioner and their daughter, but on petitioner's imprudence or negligence leading to the death of their daughter.

We shall now discuss the issues seriatim.

*Who has jurisdiction over this case, the trial court or the Labor Arbiter?*

We agree with petitioner. The Labor Arbiter has jurisdiction.

Well-settled is the rule that the allegations in the complaint determine the nature of the action and, consequently, the jurisdiction of the proper court. The complaint filed by the Abarrientos spouses demanded the payment of night shift differential, overtime pay, rest day compensation, holiday pay, and service incentive leave pay, that their daughter allegedly failed to receive from petitioner. In addition, they prayed for actual, moral, and exemplary damages for the death of their daughter.

After carefully examining the aforesaid complaint, we are convinced that the allegations therein are in the nature of an action based on the employer-employee relationship between petitioner and their daughter. It is evident that the spouses