

FIRST DIVISION

[G.R. No. 130328, May 31, 2000]

**UBS MARKETING CORPORATION AND JOHNNY K.H. UY,
PETITIONERS, VS. THE HONORABLE SPECIAL THIRD DIVISION
OF THE COURT OF APPEALS, BAN HUA U. FLORES, BAN HA U.
CHUA, AND ROLANDO M. KING, RESPONDENTS.**

D E C I S I O N

KAPUNAN, J.:

This petition for review on certiorari seeks to reverse the decision of the Court of Appeals (CA), dated 21 August 1997, in CA-G.R. SP No. 41198. In the assailed decision, the CA reversed and set aside the order of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) *en banc*, dated 21 December 1995, and resolution, dated 24 June 1996, ordering Ban Hua Uy-Flores et al. (respondents) to render a full accounting of all the assets, properties and receivables of Soon Kee Commercial, Inc. and UBS Marketing Corporation.

The factual background of this case, as established by this Court in its earlier decision^[1] involving the same parties, is as follows:

Petitioner Johnny K.H. Uy and private respondents Ban Hua Uy-Flores and Ban Ha Uy-Chua are brother and sisters. They belong to the Uy family of Bacolod City which owns several corporations, including UBS Marketing Corporation and the Soon Kee Commercial, Inc. All the three (3) above-named individuals, including other members of the Uy family, were interlocking stockholders and officers of the two (2) aforementioned corporations. Thus, private respondents Ban Hua Uy-Flores and Ban Ha Uy-Chua were the managing directors of the said corporations and were in custody of the corporate accounting and tax records as well as the funds of UBS Marketing Corporation and Soon Kee Commercial, Inc. Private respondent Roland King is the accountant of the said corporations and other allied Uy family enterprises.

Due to serious disagreements and conflicts, the members of the Uy family, through several conciliation meetings held before their selected Board of Mediators, agreed to divide the family business so that the UBS Marketing Corporation would go to petitioner Johnny K.H. Uy while the Soon Kee Commercial, Inc. would go to the rest of the Uy family, including herein private respondents Ban Hua Uy-Flores and Ban Ha Uy-Chua.

Accordingly, on 5 June 1987, several deeds of assignment were executed by the parties wherein all the stockholdings of petitioner Johnny K.H. Uy

and his wife, Magdalena Uy in Soon Kee Commercial, Inc. were assigned either to private respondents Ban Hua Uy-Flores, Ban Ha Uy-Chua or other members of the Uy family while all the stockholdings of private respondent Ban Hua Uy-Flores and Ban Ha Uy-Chua in UBS Marketing Corporation were assigned to petitioner Johnny K.H. Uy or the latter's wife. On 1 July 1987 the parties formalized this division of the family business as well as the other terms of the settlement.

On 6 April 1988, petitioners Johnny K.H. Uy and UBS Marketing Corporation filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission a complaint (petition) against the private respondents Ban Hua Uy-Flores, Ban Ha Uy-Chua, Roland King and Soon Kee Commercial, Inc. for the recovery of UBS Marketing Corporation's corporate books, books of account, and the accounting and turn over of the funds and properties belonging to UBS Marketing Corporation, docketed therein as SEC Case No. 033 28.^[2]

As likewise established by this Court, the petition in SEC Case No. 3328 (petition *a quo*) alleged that before the segregation of the family business, respondents Ban Hua Uy-Flores and Ban Ha Uy-Chua, aside from being stockholders and directors, were also officers of the UBS Marketing Corporation, who had custody, control and supervision of its records, property and funds; that respondent Roland King was the accountant of all the business concerns of the Uy family including UBS Marketing Corporation; that after the segregation, petitioner demanded for the turn over of the records of the UBS Marketing Corporation but which respondents refused without just cause; and that they held on and refused to account for funds and property, a portion of which should go to or benefit petitioners, in accordance with their settlement agreement made before the Board of Mediators.^[3]

Instead of filing an answer, respondents filed a motion to dismiss the complaint on the ground that the SEC had no jurisdiction over their person and over the nature of the action because there was no intra-corporate relationship between the parties to the suit. On 30 May 1998, the SEC Hearing Officer Josefina Pasay-Paz issued an order denying respondents' motion to dismiss. On appeal, the CA reversed and set aside the order of the SEC hearing officer ruling that the SEC had no jurisdiction over the controversy in SEC Case No. 3328.

This Court, upon petition for review filed by the SEC and petitioners, declared that the controversy subject of SEC Case No. 3328 is an intra-corporate controversy which falls within the original and exclusive jurisdiction of the SEC under Section 5(b) of PD No. 902-A, as amended.^[4]

When the above decision of this Court became final and executory, petitioners filed with the SEC hearing officer a motion for ex-parte reception of evidence. Said motion was granted and petitioners presented testimonial and documentary evidence to support their claims. On 3 May 1995, SEC Hearing Officer Enrique L. Flores, Jr. rendered a judgment by default, the dispositive portion of which reads:

WHEREFORE, considering the foregoing, judgment^[.] is hereby rendered as follows:

1. Commanding the respondents to produce and immediately turn over

to petitioners the Books of Account of Soon Kee Commercial, Inc. and UBS Marketing Corporation from 1981 to 1987;

2. Commanding the respondents to immediately render a full and complete accounting of all the assets, properties and moneys and the receivables for both Soon Kee (from 1981-1991) and UBS (from 1981 to 1987) respectively;

3. Commanding the respondents to pay the petitioners ten percent (10%) of the entire actual income (from 1988 to 1993) of Soon Kee Commercial, Inc., in the amount of P13 Million as damages;

4. To grant and pay petitioners the amount of P48 Million equivalent to 31.183 percent of the actual income from (1981-1987).

5. Cancelling and annulling the Transfer Certificate of Titles in the name of Soon Kee Commercial, Inc. if any, the Certificate of Titles in the name of SK Realty, Inc. if any, and the Certificate of Titles in the name of New Challenge Resources, Inc. if still there is, and all the properties formerly belonging to and in the name of UBS; presently totalling (8) lots TCT No. T-141057, TCT No. T-141058, TCT No. T-141059, TCT No. T-141060, TCT No. T-141061, TCT No. T-141062, TCT No. T-141063, TCT No. T-141064 and reverting them back to UBS Marketing Corporation.

6. Ordering the respondents to return and/or execute the Deed of Conveyance of all the properties in the name of Soon Kee Commercial, Inc., SK Realty Inc., New Challenge Resources, Inc. which was previously in the name of UBS in favor of the latter/Johnny KH Uy.

7. Ordering the respondents to pay the separation pay of Johnny KH Uy plus interest amounting to P946,455.31.

8. Ordering the respondents to return/pay the petitioners contingency fund representing 31.183 % of P3M plus interest in the amount of P1,957,280.86.

9. Ordering the respondents to turn over to the petitioners the Nissan or Isuzu Truck in good condition or the value thereof in the amount of P500,000.00.

10. Ordering respondent Ban Hua Flores to return to petitioner Johnny KH Uy the Hongkong property in Northpoint Metropole Flat 1121 previously owned by Johnny KH Uy.

11. Ordering respondents to pay P600,000.00 as attorney's fees.

12. Making the Writ of Preliminary Mandatory Injunction permanent.

SO ORDERED.^[5]

Respondents appealed to the SEC *en banc* which set aside the decision of the SEC hearing officer save for paragraph number 2 of the dispositive portion thereof. In

effect, the SEC *en banc* directed respondents to render a full and complete accounting of all the assets, properties and receivables of Soon Kee Commercial, Inc. and UBS Marketing Corporation.^[6] Respondents moved for partial reconsideration of the aforesaid order but it was denied by the SEC *en banc* in its resolution of 24 June 1996.^[7]

The CA, on appeal by respondents, reversed and set aside the order of the SEC *en banc*. The dispositive portion of the assailed CA decision reads:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the SEC *En Banc's* order of December 21, 1995 is REVERSED AND SET ASIDE insofar as it affirmed paragraph 2 of the dispositive portion of the decision of the Hearing Officer, dated May 3, 1995, ordering and commanding petitioners to render a full and complete accounting of all the assets, properties and moneys and the receivables for both Soon Kee (from 1981-1991) and UBS (from 1981 to 1987). The decision, dated May 3, 1995 of the Hearing Officer and the resolution, dated June 24, 1996 of the SEC *En Banc* are REVERSED AND SET ASIDE in their entirety. There is no pronouncement as to costs.

SO ORDERED.^[8]

Petitioners now come to this Court alleging that the CA committed reversible errors, to wit:

1. When it gave due course to the petition without the required Affidavit of Material [d]ates attached to the petition;
2. When it sustained private respondents' repetitious claim that the acts complained of in the petition are in the nature of an action for specific performance which must be filed with the Regional Trial Court;
3. When it applied Section 6, Rule 43 of the 1997 Rules on Civil Procedure;
4. When it reversed the decision of the SEC *En Banc* requiring the parties to render a full and complete accounting.^[9]

Preliminarily, the procedural issues raised by petitioner, i.e., paragraph numbers 1 and 3 of the assignment of errors, are without merit. There is no showing that petitioners seasonably raised before the CA the matter of respondents' failure to state the verified material dates in their petition. It is thus too late in the day for petitioners to raise the same at this time. Moreover, contrary to petitioners' allegation, respondents correctly did not implead the SEC in their petition for review before the CA. Section 6 of Administrative Circular No. 1-95 (Revised Circular 1-91), the rule then governing respondents' petition for review, expressly provided that the lower court or agency which rendered the appealed judgment or order shall not be impleaded either as petitioner or respondent.^[10]

This Court, however, finds merit in the other assignment of errors raised by petitioners, i.e., paragraph numbers 3 and 4. In granting respondents' petition for review, the CA basically ruled that the SEC *en banc* erred when it ordered respondents "to render a full and complete accounting of all the assets, properties and receivables of Soon Kee Commercial, Inc. and UBS Marketing Corporation"