

THIRD DIVISION

[G.R. NO. 152651, August 07, 2006]

**ANDABAI T. ARIMAO, PETITIONER, VS. SAADEA P. TAHER,
RESPONDENT.**

DECISION

TINGA, J.:

Before us is a petition for review of the Decision and Order dated 16 October 2001 and 31 January 2002, respectively, of Branch 14 of the Regional Trial Court, 12th Judicial Region, Cotabato City, in SPL. Civil Case No. 660, entitled "Saadea P. Taher v. Gov. Nur Misuari, in his capacity as ARMM Regional Governor, Andabai T. Arimao and Bajunaid Kamaludin, Acting Director of TESDA-ARMM," which enjoined respondents therein, including petitioner Andabai T. Arimao, from carrying out the effects of the Memorandum dated 04 August 2000 issued by then Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) Governor Nur P. Misuari.

The facts of the case, as culled from the records, follow:

On 22 March 1995, petitioner was appointed as Director II, Bureau of Non-formal Education, Department of Education, Culture and Sports (DECS-ARMM). Thereafter, on 17 July 1995, respondent was appointed Education Supervisor II. Petitioner's appointment, however, was protested by a certain Alibai T. Benito, who claimed that said appointment did not pass through any evaluation by the personnel selection board.^[1] Petitioner's appointment was eventually disapproved by the Civil Service Commission-Field Office (CSC-FO), Cotabato City, for failure to meet the experience required for the position. On 02 May 1996, the CSC, through Resolution No. 96-3101, affirmed the findings of the CSC-FO and ordered petitioner to be reverted to her former position of Education Supervisor II.^[2] Petitioner sought reconsideration of the decision.

In the interim, petitioner applied for and was granted by the DECS-ARMM an academic scholarship with pay effective 30 October 1996 in her capacity as Education Supervisor II. The scholarship was limited to a period of one year.^[3]

Meanwhile, petitioner's motion for reconsideration of CSC Resolution No. 96-3101 was denied.^[4] Subsequently, she filed a petition for review of the two CSC Resolutions before the Court of Appeals^[5] which, however, denied due course to the petition on 10 June 1998.^[6] On 17 October 1998, the Court of Appeals issued an Entry of Judgment declaring the denial of the petition to be final and executory.^[7]

In the meantime, the position of Education Supervisor II being occupied by respondent was devolved from DECS-ARMM to the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA)- ARMM.

On 2 December 1998, petitioner informed the CSC Regional Office in Cotabato City that she was already allowed by the Director of TESDA-ARMM to report for duty, only that she and respondent are reporting to the same position.^[8] On 10 December 1998, the CSC Regional Director enjoined respondent from reporting to the TESDA-ARMM.^[9] It appears, however, that respondent continued to report as Education Supervisor II.

On 7 December 1998, respondent, unaware that petitioner was granted a study leave from October 1996 to October 1997, filed a complaint before the Regional Director, ARMM, relative to petitioner's continued absence. On 24 December 1998, upon the complaint filed by respondent, the Executive Secretary of ARMM, by authority of the ARMM Regional Governor and per his Memorandum of even date, declared petitioner to have been Absent Without Leave (AWOL) by reason of her failure to report to her office for at least a year after the expiration of her study leave and directed that she be dropped from the payroll.^[10] Petitioner appealed the said Memorandum to the Office of the ARMM Regional Governor. In Resolution No. 001-99 dated 17 March 1999, the said office denied the appeal, finding that from 30 October 1996 up to the opening of school year 1997-1998, first semester, petitioner failed to report to office despite the fact that she was not able to enroll immediately upon the approval of her study leave.^[11] Further, petitioner's act of enrolling in the second semester of school year 1997-1998 in the absence of an approved extension of her study leave is a clear violation of the implementing guidelines of Republic Act No. 4670, or the *Magna Carta for Public School Teachers*. The dispositive portion of the Resolution reads:

WHEREFORE, [p]remises considered, the instant letter of Mrs. Arimao to reconsider the action of the Executive Secretary in dropping her from the roll is hereby DENIED and is accordingly DISMISSED for lack of merit. Thus, the Memorandum Ordered [sic] of the Executive Secretary on Authority of the Regional Governor dated December 24, 1998 is hereby affirmed and remained [sic] undisturbed. Nonetheless, since the act of dropping one from the roll is non[-]disciplinary action on the ground of being guilty of the charge of Absence Without Approved Leave (AWOL) the respondent may be appointed to other position[s] in the Government service at the discretion of the appointing authority.

SO ORDERED.^[12]

On 20 July 2000, Datu Guimid P. Matalam, Regional Vice Governor/Acting Regional Governor, ordered petitioner to reassume her former position as Education Supervisor II, and revoked the ARMM Executive Secretary's Resolution dated 24 December 1998.^[13] However, on 1 August 2000, the same Acting Regional Governor issued the following order:

In the interest of the service and considering the need to observe fairness and justice in dealing with our personnel, you are hereby directed to implement the above mentioned resolution rendered by the Regional Solicitor General on March 17, 1999.

As such, you are likewise directed to maintain STATUS QUO on the part

of Ms. **SAADEA P. TAHER**, Education Supervisor II with permanent status duly approved by the Civil Service Commission.

This Memorandum Order takes effective [sic] immediately and supersede/ revokes all previous order inconsistent herewith.^[14]

However, on 4 August 2000, ARMM Regional Governor Misuari issued a Memorandum^[15] to the TESDA-ARMM, ordering petitioner's reinstatement, presumably in accordance with CSC Resolution No. 96-3101 and CSC-ARMM directive dated 26 July 2000.

Respondent thus filed a Petition for Prohibition before the Regional Trial Court of Cotabato City, claiming that she has no other plain, speedy and adequate remedy, as she stands to suffer grave injustice and irreparable injury if she is removed from the office which she has held for more than five years.^[16] On 21 August 2000, the trial court issued a writ of preliminary injunction commanding ARMM Regional Governor Misuari and the TESDA-ARMM to desist from carrying out the said Memorandum.^[17]

On 16 October 2001, the trial court rendered the assailed Decision,^[18] holding that the 04 August 2000 Memorandum of the ARMM Regional Governor could no longer be implemented because the CSC resolutions ordering petitioner's reinstatement, relied upon by ARMM Regional Governor Misuari, were superseded by the CSC resolutions finding petitioner on AWOL and dropping her from the payroll. According to the trial court, this controversy has to be resolved by the CSC, which has the exclusive jurisdiction over disciplinary cases and cases involving personnel actions affecting employees in the public service. The trial court thus ordered:

WHEREFORE, as prayed for, the respondents are ordered to cease and desist in prosecuting or carrying out the effects of the August 4, 2000 [M]emorandum and for respondents to cease and desist from continuance of any act which will be in violation of the right of petitioner with respect to the subject matter of the action or proceeding so as not to render the judgment ineffectual.

SO ORDERED.^[19]

Petitioner filed a motion for reconsideration but the motion was denied on 31 January 2002.^[20]

On 31 October 2000, petitioner moved for the issuance of a writ of execution of CSC Resolution No. 96-3101 (ordering her reinstatement to her former office). CSC issued Resolution No. 01-0132,^[21] dated 15 January 2001, ordering the concerned officials of the DECS-ARMM to implement CSC Resolution No. 96-3101.

Meanwhile, on 22 May 2002, the CSC, acting on the letter of the Regional Solicitor General of the ARMM regarding the implementation of CSC Resolution No. 96-3101, issued Resolution No. 020743.^[22] According to the CSC, it issued Resolution No. 01-0132 because petitioner did not inform the Commission that she had been declared on AWOL and dropped from the rolls since 24 December 1998.^[23] ARMM Regional Governor Misuari's Memorandum dated 04 August 2000 ordering petitioner's

reinstatement is rendered moot and academic because prior to the said date she was already separated from the service, the CSC added.^[24]

Petitioner now comes before us, arguing that a writ of prohibition does not lie to enjoin the implementation of the directive of the ARMM Governor implementing the CSC Resolution reinstating her to her former position.^[25] She claims that the trial court gravely erred in taking cognizance of the petition for prohibition filed by respondent, and failed to observe the doctrine of primary jurisdiction, considering that the case, as declared by the trial court itself, involved personnel actions which are within the CSC's exclusive jurisdiction.^[26] In addition, petitioner contends that by virtue of the disapproval of her appointment, respondent's appointment to Education Supervisor II was invalidated, and thus both of them are automatically restored to the their former positions by operation of law. She further claims that the AWOL Order of the CSC was previously revoked on 20 July 2000 by then Acting Regional Governor Matalam, and that the same Memorandum revoked the 24 December 1998 Memorandum of the Executive Secretary, Atty. Randolph C. Parcasio.^[27] Finally, petitioner argues that it is not known which position she was being declared AWOL—when she was declared on AWOL, she was ordered to revert to her former position as Education Supervisor II, which position was already occupied by respondent who refused to yield the position, and she was also prevented from functioning as Director II.^[28]

In her Comment,^[29] respondent claims that since no appeal was taken from the AWOL order, it has become final and executory and thus cannot be revoked by mere issuance of a Memorandum.^[30] She argues that the doctrine of primary jurisdiction does not apply to the case a quo because it raises a purely legal question, that is, the propriety of petitioner's assumption of her former position despite having been declared on AWOL and dropped from the rolls. Due to the urgency of the situation and the immediacy of the problem, recourse through the same officials who issued the assailed memoranda would be futile.^[31]

The Court is thus tasked to resolve the following issues:

1. Whether a writ of prohibition lies to enjoin the directive of the ARMM Governor to reinstate petitioner to the position of Education Supervisor II despite petitioner's having been declared on AWOL and dropped from the roll;
2. Whether the trial court erred in taking cognizance of the petition for prohibition and whether the filing of the petition for prohibition violated the doctrine of primary jurisdiction;
3. Whether the AWOL order against petitioner validated respondent's occupancy of the position of Education Supervisor II;
4. Who, as between petitioner and respondent, is entitled to the position of Education Supervisor II.

The petition must be denied.

Petitioner cannot be reinstated by mere directive of the ARMM Regional Governor

The assailed Memorandum issued by ARMM Regional Governor is reproduced in full, thus:

TO : TESDA - ARMM
Cotabato City

SUBJECT : Implementation of CSC Resolution
No. 96-3101, and CSC-ARMM
Directive Order Dated July 26, 2000

DATE : August 4, 2000

In the highest interest of public service and consistent with the legal and constitutional precept of promoting social justice, the above-captioned resolutions are hereby implemented.

As such, you are hereby directed to re-instate **ANDABAI T. ARIMAO** to her former position as Education Supervisor II pursuant to the foregoing resolution and the provisions of Sec. 13, Rule VI, Book V of E.O. No. 292 which are further buttressed by the series of communication of CSC Regional Office No. XII dated September 10, 1998, October 20, 1998, November 03, 1998 and December This [M]emorandum shall take effect immediately and shall take precedence over all memoranda, orders and other issuances [sic] inconsistent herewith.

(Signed)
PROF. NUR P. MISUARI
Regional Governor^[32]

Even a cursory look at the Memorandum shows that the order of petitioner's reinstatement was made in reliance on, or in implementation of, CSC Resolution No. 96-3101 and CSC-ARMM Directive Order dated 26 July 2000, both of which ordained her reinstatement. However, these directives relied upon by ARMM Regional Governor Misuari were rendered *functus officio* by no less than the CSC itself per its Resolution No. 020743, which, as previously noted, ruled that the TESDA-ARMM is not under legal obligation to reinstate petitioner because she was already dropped from the rolls effective 24 December 1998. CSC Resolution No. 01-0132, ordering the implementation of CSC Resolution No. 96-3101, was issued because petitioner purposely concealed and withheld from the CSC the information that she had been declared AWOL and dropped from the rolls.^[33] With Resolution No. 020743, CSC Resolution No. 01-0132 was effectively revoked.

Likewise, with the finality of the AWOL order and her having been dropped from the rolls, petitioner legally lost her right to the position of Education Supervisor II. In any case, she has already received from the DECS-ARMM her salaries as Education Supervisor II for the period October 1996 to 1997, or the period corresponding to the time the position was still with the said department.^[34]

Petitioner argues that the 24 December 1998 Memorandum finding her to be on AWOL was revoked and rendered moot by subsequent issuances. We are not persuaded. While it is true that then Acting Regional Governor Matalam revoked the 24 December 1998 order of the ARMM Executive Secretary, he recalled the