

SECOND DIVISION

[G.R. No. 125221, June 19, 1997]

**REYNALDO M. LOZANO, PETITIONER, VS. HON. ELIEZER R. DE LOS SANTOS, PRESIDING JUDGE, RTC, BR. 58, ANGELES CITY;
AND ANTONIO ANDA, RESPONDENTS.**

D E C I S I O N

PUNO, J.:

This petition for *certiorari* seeks to annul and set aside the decision of the Regional Trial Court, Branch 58, Angeles City which ordered the Municipal Circuit Trial Court, Mabalacat and Magalang, Pampanga to dismiss Civil Case No. 1214 for lack of jurisdiction.

The facts are undisputed. On December 19, 1995, petitioner Reynaldo M. Lozano filed Civil Case No. 1214 for damages against respondent Antonio Anda before the Municipal Circuit Trial Court (MCTC), Mabalacat and Magalang, Pampanga. Petitioner alleged that he was the president of the Kapatirang Mabalacat-Angeles Jeepney Drivers' Association, Inc. (KAMAJDA) while respondent Anda was the president of the Samahang Angeles-Mabalacat Jeepney Operators' and Drivers' Association, Inc. (SAMAJODA); in August 1995, upon the request of the Sangguniang Bayan of Mabalacat, Pampanga, petitioner and private respondent agreed to consolidate their respective associations and form the Unified Mabalacat-Angeles Jeepney Operators' and Drivers' Association, Inc. (UMAJODA); petitioner and private respondent also agreed to elect one set of officers who shall be given the sole authority to collect the daily dues from the members of the consolidated association; elections were held on October 29, 1995 and both petitioner and private respondent ran for president; petitioner won; private respondent protested and, alleging fraud, refused to recognize the results of the election; private respondent also refused to abide by their agreement and continued collecting the dues from the members of his association despite several demands to desist. Petitioner was thus constrained to file the complaint to restrain private respondent from collecting the dues and to order him to pay damages in the amount of P25,000.00 and attorney's fees of P500.00.^[1]

Private respondent moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of jurisdiction, claiming that jurisdiction was lodged with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). The MCTC denied the motion on February 9, 1996.^[2] It denied reconsideration on March 8, 1996.^[3]

Private respondent filed a petition for *certiorari* before the Regional Trial Court, Branch 58, Angeles City.^[4] The trial court found the dispute to be intracorporate, hence, subject to the jurisdiction of the SEC, and ordered the MCTC to dismiss Civil Case No. 1214 accordingly.^[5] It denied reconsideration on May 31, 1996.^[6]

Hence this petition. Petitioner claims that:

"THE RESPONDENT JUDGE ACTED WITH GRAVE ABUSE OF DISCRETION AMOUNTING TO LACK OR EXCESS OF JURISDICTION AND SERIOUS ERROR OF LAW IN CONCLUDING THAT THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION HAS JURISDICTION OVER A CASE OF DAMAGES BETWEEN HEADS/PRESIDENTS OF TWO (2) ASSOCIATIONS WHO INTENDED TO CONSOLIDATE/MERGE THEIR ASSOCIATIONS BUT NOT YET [SIC] APPROVED AND REGISTERED WITH THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION."^[7]

The jurisdiction of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) is set forth in Section 5 of Presidential Decree No. 902-A. Section 5 reads as follows:

"Section 5. x x x [T]he Securities and Exchange Commission [has] original and exclusive jurisdiction to hear and decide cases involving:

(a) Devices or schemes employed by or any acts of the board of directors, business associates, its officers or partners, amounting to fraud and misrepresentation which may be detrimental to the interest of the public and/or of the stockholders, partners, members of associations or organizations registered with the Commission.

(b) Controversies arising out of intracorporate or partnership relations, between and among stockholders, members or associates; between any or all of them and the corporation, partnership or association of which they are stockholders, members, or associates, respectively; and between such corporation, partnership or association and the state insofar as it concerns their individual franchise or right to exist as such entity.

(c) Controversies in the election or appointment of directors, trustees, officers or managers of such corporations, partnerships or associations.

(d) Petitions of corporations, partnerships or associations to be declared in the state of suspension of payments in cases where the corporation, partnership or association possesses sufficient property to cover all its debts but foresees the impossibility of meeting them when they respect very fall due or in cases where the corporation, partnership or association has no sufficient assets to cover its liabilities, but is under the management of a Rehabilitation Receiver or Management Committee created pursuant to this Decree."

The grant of jurisdiction to the SEC must be viewed in the light of its nature and function under the law.^[8] This jurisdiction is determined by a concurrence of two elements: (1) the status or relationship of the parties; and (2) the nature of the question that is the subject of their controversy.^[9]

The first element requires that the controversy must arise out of intracorporate or