

POLI

Even if GOCC property is taxable due to beneficial use by private entities, the property itself cannot be levied or sold, only private lessees are liable.— *Philippine Heart Center v. Quezon City Local Government* (2020)

COM

Acquittal under BP 22 also extinguishes civil liability if the corporate officer personally signed the check solely on behalf of the corporation, even if the signatory's position is not named in the Corporation Code.— *Rebujio v. Dio Implant Philippines Corp.* (2025)

CIV

Under the regime of conjugal partnership of gains, property acquired during marriage is presumed conjugal, even if titled in one spouse's name, unless clearly proven to be exclusively owned.— *Cali Realty Corp. v. Enriquez* (2023)

LABOR

Relaxed rules of evidence in labor cases do not excuse violations of due process: late evidence must be justified, and the other party must be allowed to rebut.— *Agapito v. Aeroplus Multi-Services, Inc.* (2022)

CRIM

Psychological abuse under RA 9262 must be clearly linked to specific acts, and committed with intent to inflict emotional harm.— *XXX261920 v. People* (2023)

REM

A child's hearsay statement may be admitted if made spontaneously to a trusted adult and bears sufficient indicia of reliability.— *People v. BBB* (2022)

1

San Gabriel Heart Institute, a government hospital and GOCC, owns 11 properties in New Alabang. Four are leased to private businesses; the rest are used for hospital operations. Due to non-payment of real property taxes, the City Assessor levied and auctioned off all 11 lots. San Gabriel claimed the sale was void, arguing the properties are of public dominion. The City countered that the four leased lots were taxable and validly levied since their beneficial use had been granted to private taxable entities.

Who is correct?

Suggested answer: San Gabriel is correct. The four lots retain their public character and cannot be levied, even if taxable.

In *Philippine Heart Center v. Quezon City Local Government*, the Supreme Court ruled that, while GOCC properties may be subject to real property tax if their beneficial use is granted to private entities, only the private lessees are liable. The properties themselves, being of public dominion, are exempt from levy, encumbrance, or sale, even if taxable. Allowing their confiscation would impair essential public services. LGUs must thus pursue the private lessees, instead of levying on government property. Accordingly, the City's levy and sale of all 11 lots were void.

2

Drake Salvador, finance officer of BrightSmile Dental Group, issued a ₱280,000 corporate check to SmileLine Dental Supplies for materials ordered. The check was dishonored for insufficient funds, and Drake was charged with violating BP 22. The trial court convicted him. The Court of Appeals acquitted Drake but upheld his civil liability. It held that the rule extinguishing the civil liability of an acquitted corporate officer did not apply to Drake, since he was not among the corporate officers enumerated in Section 24 of the Corporation Code, and because he admitted to signing and issuing the check. **Was the appellate court correct?**

Suggested answer: No. The appellate court was not correct.

In *Rebujio v. People*, the Supreme Court reiterated that if a corporate officer is acquitted of a BP 22 violation for signing a check on behalf of a corporation, his civil liability is likewise extinguished. This rule is not limited to the officers enumerated in Section 24 but applies to corporate officers who actually signed the check. To hold Drake liable despite the acquittal will also violate the doctrine of separate juridical personality. Thus, the appellate court erred in holding Drake civilly liable.

3

Johan and Dianne were married in 1939. After Dianne died in 1995, Johan transferred several parcels of land to Goldenfield Corp., a company he co-founded with four of his five children. The properties were acquired from 1960 to 1983 and were titled solely in Johan's name. Carey, the daughter not part of the corporation, claimed her one-sixth share from her mother's estate, arguing that the properties formed part of the conjugal partnership. Johan's other heirs insisted the properties were Johan's exclusive inheritance. **How should the court rule?**

Suggested answer: The court should rule in favor of Carey.

In *Cali Realty v. Enriquez*, the Supreme Court held that properties acquired during the marriage are presumed conjugal, even if titled in only one spouse's name, unless proven exclusively owned by one spouse, such as through inheritance or donation. Since Johan and Dianne were married before the Family Code took effect, the default regime is the conjugal partnership of gains. The properties were acquired during the marriage, and no clear proof was shown that they belonged solely to Johan. Thus, the court should recognize Carey's claim to her share of her mother's conjugal portion.

4

Alfred, a housekeeper at SkyServe Janitorial Agency, was suspended after he questioned his supervisor's inconsistent disciplinary policies in a meeting. Upon return, the HR officer told him he was dismissed and ordered him to leave. Alfred filed a complaint for illegal dismissal. The Labor Arbiter ruled in his favor. On appeal, SkyServe submitted for the first time, affidavits of its HR officer and supervisor denying the dismissal. The NLRC admitted the affidavits and reversed the ruling, reasoning that technical rules do not apply in labor cases and that the affidavits shifted the burden to Alfred to prove dismissal. **Was the NLRC correct?**

Suggested answer: No. The NLRC was not correct.

In *Agapito v. Aeroplus*, the Supreme Court ruled that while labor tribunals are not bound by strict technical rules of evidence, the relaxation of rules does not justify disregard of due process, fair play, and justice. Any delay in the submission of evidence should be adequately explained and should adequately prove the allegations sought to be proven. Here, the NLRC erred in admitting and relying on belated affidavits submitted by SkyServe only after an adverse ruling was rendered against it, without valid explanation and without giving Alfred a reasonable opportunity to rebut them.

5

Roman and Lucia are married and living with their daughter. In May 2017, after a heated argument over household expenses, Roman ordered Lucia and their daughter to leave the family home. Lucia then filed a complaint for violation of the Anti-Violence Against Women and Their Children Act, alleging that Roman caused her psychological and emotional anguish and failed to provide adequate financial support. She submitted a psychological assessment diagnosing her with Major Depressive Disorder, citing a general pattern of abuse and neglect but without reference to any specific incident. **Should Roman be held guilty?**

Suggested answer: No. Roman should not be held guilty.

In *XXX261920 v. People*, the Supreme Court ruled that psychological or emotional anguish under RA 9262 must be clearly linked to the specific acts complained of. Lucia's psychological report referred only to a general pattern of abuse but did not attribute her condition to the May 2017 incident. Moreover, there was no showing that Roman intentionally withheld financial support or ejected his family to inflict emotional harm. The incident arose from a dispute over household expenses, without showing any malicious intent. Hence, Roman must be acquitted.

6

Nine-year-old Bea told her mother that she was sexually abused by her uncle, Marco. The disclosure was made spontaneously and tearfully just minutes after the incident, and the mother testified that Bea had no history of fabricating stories. During the trial, Bea became too traumatized to testify. The prosecution offered the mother's testimony. Marco objected, claiming it was inadmissible hearsay. **Is the mother's testimony admissible?**

Suggested answer: Yes. The mother's testimony is admissible.

In *People v. BBB*, the Supreme Court ruled that under the rules on child witness testimony, hearsay statements made by a child may be admissible if there are sufficient guarantees of trustworthiness, such as spontaneity, consistency, and the child's relationship to the listener. The Court emphasized that protecting child victims includes allowing trusted adults to recount the child's disclosure when the child is unable to testify. This does not violate the rights of the accused. Here, Bea's disclosure to her mother was made spontaneously and immediately after the incident. Her mother's testimony is therefore admissible.