

POLI

A supervening event that resolves the core issue renders a case moot and beyond the Court's review.— *Secretary of Finance v. Muñoz* (2022, Resolution)

TAX

An informal tax settlement, through voluntary payment and non-pursuit by the BIR, binds both parties and precludes a refund claim.— *CIR v. Toledo Power Company* (2023)

CIV

An agent authorized to sell lacks the authority to revoke the sale without explicit permission.— *AFP Retirement and Separation Benefits System v. Plastic King Industrial Corp.* (2023)

LABOR

Labor tribunals have jurisdiction over employment bond claims arising from the employer-employee relationship.— *Comscentre Phils., Inc. v. Rocio* (2020)

CRIM

Circumstantial evidence, such as repeated clandestine meetings and hotel records, can suffice for an adultery conviction.— *Valencia v. People* (2024)

REM

A voluntary and factual confession, even if relayed by another, is admissible as an exception to the hearsay rule.— *People v. Catacutan y Mortera* (2023)

1

The Bureau of Internal Revenue issued Revenue Regulation 13-2013, subjecting other sugar types to Value-Added Tax (VAT). The Alliance of Sugar Growers challenged this regulation in court for violating due process and uniformity of taxation. The trial court issued an injunction against the regulation. Subsequently, RR 8-2015 was issued, restoring the VAT exemption for raw sugar. Despite this, the Alliance of Sugar Growers petitioned the Supreme Court to rule that the injunction was invalid, citing the “no injunction rule” under the Tax Code. **Should the Supreme Court still rule on the petition?**

Suggested answer: No. The case is moot.

In *Secretary of Finance v. Muñoz*, the Supreme Court ruled that when a supervening event resolves a conflicting issue, so that a declaration thereon would be of no practical value, the case becomes moot. The courts will no longer decide. Here, the issuance of RR8-2015 is a supervening event that rendered the case moot.

2

VoltGen Corp. received a Preliminary Assessment Notice (PAN) for deficiency VAT. Without waiting for a Formal Letter of Demand or Final Assessment Notice, it voluntarily paid ₱6.97 million. Later, it filed a claim for refund, arguing that the payment was erroneous since the sale should have been zero-rated. The BIR denied the claim, treating the payment as an informal settlement. **Is VoltGen entitled to a refund?**

Suggested answer: No. VoltGen is not entitled to a refund.

In *CIR v. Toledo Power Company*, the Supreme Court ruled that the CIR may compromise or abate tax liabilities under the Tax Code, even informally. Toledo Power’s voluntary payment, made without awaiting a formal assessment, and the BIR’s decision not to pursue further collection, amounted to an informal but binding settlement. Likewise, VoltGen’s voluntary payment is binding and precludes the it from later claiming a refund on the ground of erroneous payment.

3

GoldRock Realty, through a Special Power of Attorney (SPA), authorized its Vice President, Eva Ferrer, to sell certain parcels of land in Taguig on its behalf. In 2003, Eva executed a Contract to Sell a Taguig lot in favor of SteelPro Corporation. Years later, Eva signed a letter revoking the contract. SteelPro challenged the revocation, arguing that Eva had no authority to revoke the sale. **Was the revocation of the contract of sale made through agent Eva valid?**

Suggested answer: No. The revocation of the contract was not valid.

In *AFP Retirement and Separation Benefits System v. Plastic King*, the Supreme Court ruled that an agent’s authority to sell does not include the authority to revoke the sale unless clearly stated. Eva’s authority was limited to selling the property. Since there was no special authority to revoke the contract, the revocation she signed was not valid.

4

Zenith Solutions hired Nova as a Network Engineer. After four months, Nova resigned. She was told she had to pay an ₱80,000 “employment bond” under her contract if she resigned within two years. Before her resignation took effect, Nova was preventively suspended for alleged misconduct. She filed a complaint for unfair labor practices and illegal suspension. The Labor Arbiter ruled in her favor but ordered the ₱80,000 bond deducted from her award. Nova argued that the bond claim should be heard by regular courts. **Is Nova correct?**

Suggested answer: No. Nova is incorrect.

In *Comscentre Phils., Inc. v. Rocio*, the Supreme Court held that labor tribunals have jurisdiction over claims like an “employment bond” if there is a reasonable causal connection with the employer-employee relationship, even if based on civil law. As long as there’s a clear link to the employer-employee relationship, the claim belongs before labor tribunals, not regular courts.

5

Nestor Castro discovered his wife Isabel in a hotel room with her alleged lover, Emilio Santiago. Nestor filed a complaint for adultery. During the trial, Isabel argued that the prosecution failed to prove that she and Emilio engaged in sexual intercourse. The prosecution relied on Nestor’s testimony and hotel records showing multiple check-ins by Isabel and Emilio. **Can Isabel be convicted of adultery based on these pieces of evidence?**

Suggested answer: Yes. Isabel can be convicted of adultery.

In *Valencia v. People*, the Supreme Court ruled that direct proof of sexual intercourse is not necessary for a conviction of adultery. Circumstantial evidence, such as the accused being found in a compromising situation and records indicating repeated meetings, can suffice. The Court held that such evidence, when taken together, can establish the fact of illicit relations beyond a reasonable doubt. Nestor’s testimony and hotel records in Isabel’s case are sufficient for conviction.

6

During a drinking session, Lance confessed to his friend Marco that he stabbed their neighbor, Xander, during a robbery attempt. At trial, Marco testified about what Lance told him. Lance objected, arguing that Marco’s testimony was hearsay. **Is Marco’s testimony admissible in evidence?**

Suggested answer: Yes. The statement is admissible as an admission against interest.

In *People v. Catacutan*, the Supreme Court ruled that a person’s voluntary, categorical, and factual statement admitting to the commission of a crime is admissible as an admission against interest, even if testified to by someone else. The Court clarified that this is an exception to the hearsay rule because the declarant is a party to the case, and people do not ordinarily make statements against their own interest unless true. Like in *Catacutan*, Lance’s detailed confession to Marco, made voluntarily, involving factual matters, and adverse to Lance’s legal interest, is admissible in court.