

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES SUPREME COURT Manila

SECOND DIVISION

NOTICE

Sirs/Mesdames:

Please take notice that the Court, Second Division, issued a Resolution dated **05 October 2020** which reads as follows:

"A.C. No. 10368 (Spouses Enrique Chua and Angelica Chua v. Atty. Michaela Uy Matammu-Sion). - Atty. Michaela U. Matammu-Sion. (Atty. Michaela) is being charged by Spouses Enrique Chua and Angelica Chua (Angelica; collectively Spouses Chua) with Grave Misconduct for allegedly filing malicious, flimsy and frivolous suits against them for the sole purpose of maligning their personal honor.

The Spouses Dr. Salud Uy Matammu (Dr. Salud) and Diosdado Matammu, Sr. (Diosdado, Sr.; collectively, Spouses Matammu) owned a 543-square meter (sqm) property with a two (2)-storey commercial building that was leased to BreadBasket Bakery and Yssabel's Fudhauz.

On May 8, 2012, Dr. Salud died. She was survived by Diosdado, Sr. and their children, namely Diosdado, Jr., Olivia, Neli, David, and two (2) grandchildren, representing their mother Carolyn, who died in June 2002.

The heirs of Dr. Salud, except for Olivia, agreed to maintain the lease contracts with their tenants in the two (2)-storey building. However, in July 2012, Olivia executed a Deed of Sale of a portion of Registered Land purportedly covering 239.48 sqm and a house built thereon with complainant Angelica, who in turn registered the 239.48 sqm portion in the names of the Spouses Chua based on the Deed of Donation allegedly executed by Dr. Salud.

As a consequence, several cases were filed against the Spouses Chua by the heirs of Dr. Salud, among which were the three (3) cases¹ wherein Atty. Michaela

10/10

¹ (a) Criminal Case No. 1345 for Grave Oral Defamation, entitled "People of the Philippines v. Angelica Tamayao Chua," before the Municipal Trial Court of Tuao, Cagayan. Atty. Matammu-Sion is the private complainant in the said case;

is either the private complainant or one of the party-plaintiffs therein. It was further alleged that Atty. Michaela persuaded and induced the therein complainants to file the other cases against the Spouses Chua.

Atty. Michaela denied all the charges against her.

Report and Recommendation of the Integrated Bar of the Philippines (IBP):

The Investigating Commissioner recommended the dismissal of the complaint for lack of merit. The three (3) cases filed against the Spouses Chua were not found to be flimsy or vexatious. On the contrary, Atty. Michaela was merely exercising her legal right to protect her interest in the subject property.

In its Resolution No. XXI-2015-541, the Board of Governors of the IBP resolved to adopt and approve the Report and Recommendation of the Investigating Commissioner to dismiss the complaint.

Our Ruling

We adopt the findings and approve the recommendation of the IBP to dismiss the complaint for lack of merit.

The factual milieu of the present case lacks evidence of any misconduct on the part of Atty. Michaela. Indeed, she was merely exercising her lawful rights as one of the heirs of the Spouses Matammu when she filed those cases against the Spouses Chua. Her filing of the three (3) cases against the Chuas did not involve any misconduct or manifest lack of moral character or render her unworthy to continue as an officer of the court. To rule otherwise would be tantamount to preventing any lawyer from instituting a case against anyone to protect her/his personal or proprietary interests.

⁽b) Civil Case No. 531 for Forcible Entry, entitled "Michaela Matammu Sion, David Matammu, and Diosdado Matammu vs. Spouses Enrique Chua and Angelica Tamayao Chua, before the Municipal Trial Court of Tuao, Cagayan; and

⁽c) Civil Case No. 594-T for Declaration of Nullity of Contracts; Cancellation of Certificate of Title, Partition, Legal Redemption and Damages, entitled "The Heirs of Dra. Salud Uy-Matammu, Diosdado Mamba Matammu, Diosdado Uy Matammu, Jr., Neil Uy Matammu, David Uy Matammu and Michaela Uy Matammu-Sion, Alethia and Grandiel Matammu Lampauog rep. By David U. Matammu vs. Olivia Matammu and Spouses Enrique and Angelica Chua, Atty. Alexander Simeon, Jr., Irene Cauilan, and Engr. Gilbert Fuggan, before the Regional Trial Court, Branch 11, Tuao, Cagayan.

It is well to remember that in administrative cases like this disbarment or suspension suit, the quantum of proof required is substantial evidence² and the burden of proof rests upon the complainant. In this case, the Spouses Chua failed to prove their allegations against Atty. Michaela with substantial evidence. Indeed, this Court will not shirk from its responsibility of imposing discipline upon erring members of the bench. At the same time, however, the Court should not hesitate to shield them from unfounded suits that only serve to disrupt rather than promote the orderly administration of justice. This Court could not be the instrument that would destroy the reputation of any member of the bench, by pronouncing guilt on mere speculation.³

WHEREFORE, the Complaint for Gross Misconduct against Atty. Michaela Matammu-Sion is hereby **DISMISSED** for lack of merit.

SO ORDERED." (Baltazar-Padilla, *J.*, on leave.)

By Authority of the Court:

TERESITA AQUINO TUAZON

Division Clerk of Court 6 10114

SPS. ENRIQUE CHUA AND ANGELICA CHUA (reg) Complainants Centro, Tuao, Cagayan

ATTY. MICHAELA UY MATAMMU-SION (reg) Respondent Unit 7, Lot 2, Sweet Pea Street Doña Manuela Subdivision Las Piñas City

INTEGRATED BAR OF THE PHILIPPINES (reg) Doña Julia Vargas Avenue Ortigas Center, 1605 Pasig City THE BAR CONFIDANT (x) Supreme Court, Manila

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE (x) LIBRARY SERVICES (x) [For uploading pursuant to A.M. No. 12-7-SC]

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ATTORNEY (x)
OFFICE OF THE REPORTER (x)
Supreme Court, Manila

Please notify the Court of any change in your address. AC10368. 10/05/2020(215)URES

² Aguirre v. Reyes, A.C. 4355, January 8, 2020.

³ Ong v. Rosete, 484 Phil. 102, 114-155 (2004).