



REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES  
SUPREME COURT  
Manila

SECOND DIVISION

**NOTICE**

Sirs/Mesdames:

*Please take notice that the Court, Second Division, issued a Resolution dated **September 12, 2022** which reads as follows:*

**“A.M. No. MTJ-23-012 [Formerly OCA I.P.I No. 20-3120-MTJ] (NIANG NIANG LIM DONG, Complainant v. HON. RENE B. BACULI, PRESIDING JUDGE, MUNICIPAL TRIAL COURT IN CITIES, BRANCH 2, TUGUEGARAO CITY, CAGAYAN, Respondent).** — This resolves the Complaint-Affidavit<sup>1</sup> filed by complainant Niang Niang Lim Dong, charging Judge Rene B. Baculi (Judge Baculi) of gross ignorance of the law for taking cognizance of criminal cases which are not within the jurisdiction of the Municipal Trial Court in Cities (MTCC).

The antecedents follow.

The Special Investigators and Intelligence Officers of the Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR) charged complainant with violations of Sections 254 (Attempt to Evade or Defeat Tax), 266 (Failure to Obey Summons), 264 (Printing of Receipts or Commercial Invoices Without Authority from the BIR), and 258 (Unlawful Pursuit of Business) of the National Internal Revenue Code<sup>2</sup> (NIRC), as amended,<sup>3</sup> before the Tuguegarao City prosecutor. After receiving four resolutions, wherein the prosecutor found probable cause,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Rollo*, pp. 4–12.

<sup>2</sup> REPUBLIC ACT NO. 8424, entitled “AN ACT AMENDING THE NATIONAL INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, AS AMENDED, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES,” approved on December 11, 1997.

<sup>3</sup> REPUBLIC ACT NO. 10963, entitled “AN ACT AMENDING SECTIONS 5, 6, 24, 25, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34, 51, 52, 56, 57, 58, 74, 79, 84, 86, 90, 91, 97, 99, 100, 101, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 127, 128, 129, 145, 148, 149, 151, 155, 171, 174, 175, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 186, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 232, 236, 237, 249, 254, 264, 269, AND 288; CREATING NEW SECTIONS 51-A, 148-A, 150-A, 150-B, 237-A, 264-A, 264-B, AND 265-A; AND REPEALING SECTIONS 35, 62, AND 89; ALL UNDER REPUBLIC ACT NO. 8424, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE NATIONAL INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1997, AS AMENDED, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.” approved on December 19, 2017.

*per*

complainant filed motions for reconsideration, which were all denied.<sup>4</sup>

In accordance with the rules, complainant filed Petitions for Review before the Regional State Prosecutor with regard to the charges under Sections 258 and 266, and before the Department of Justice (DOJ) Secretary as regards the charges under Sections 254 and 264. On February 27, 2020, the Regional State Prosecutor denied complainant's petitions, so she filed Motions for Reconsideration and Inhibition.<sup>5</sup> Meanwhile, her petitions with the DOJ remained unresolved.<sup>6</sup>

On February 28, 2020, the city prosecutor filed four Information before the MTCC, docketed as: (1) Criminal Case No. 31632 for violation of Section 254 of the NIRC;<sup>7</sup> (2) Criminal Case No. 31633 for violation of Section 266 of the NIRC;<sup>8</sup> (3) Criminal Case No. 31634 for violation of Section 264 of the NIRC;<sup>9</sup> and (4) Criminal Case No. 31635 for violation of Section 258 of the NIRC.<sup>10</sup>

On March 5, 2020, Judge Baculi issued four warrants of arrest against complainant.<sup>11</sup> Bail was posted<sup>12</sup> and, thereafter, complainant filed two Motions to Quash Information and Recall Warrants of Arrest<sup>13</sup> in Criminal Case Nos. 31632 and 31634, arguing that the MTCC has no jurisdiction over violations of Sections 254 and 264 of the NIRC since these offenses are punishable with imprisonment exceeding six (6) years, jurisdiction of which is vested upon the Regional Trial Court (RTC). She also filed two Motions to Withdraw Information and Cancel Arraignment and Further Proceedings<sup>14</sup> in Criminal Case Nos. 31633 and 31635 in view of her pending Motions for Reconsideration and Inhibition with the Regional State Prosecutor, and petitions for review before the DOJ.

The city prosecutor also filed a Motion to Withdraw Information and Original Documents<sup>15</sup> in Criminal Case No. 31632, which was granted in an Order<sup>16</sup> dated June 5, 2020. Notably, Judge Baculi ordered the withdrawal of the Information and release of records, not only in Criminal Case No. 31632, but also in Criminal Case No. 31634 for lack of jurisdiction.<sup>17</sup> Complainant's motions scheduled for hearing that day were, however, not acted upon. This prompted complainant to file two Supplemental Motions to Dismiss<sup>18</sup> in

---

<sup>4</sup> *Rollo*, pp. 113.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 114.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 6.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* at 22–23.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 24–25.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 26–27.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 28–29.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at 30–33.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 14–21.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 34–41.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 42–49.

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* at 103–106.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.* at 56–57.

<sup>17</sup> Order dated June 5, 2020, *id.* at 108.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* at 50–55.

Criminal Case Nos. 31632 and 31634. In an Order<sup>19</sup> dated June 9, 2020, Judge Baculi ruled that the Supplemental Motions to Dismiss had already been mooted by its previous order allowing the withdrawal of the Information in Criminal Case Nos. 31632 and 31634, which also rendered the warrants of arrest *functus officio*, and the bail bond cancelled and released.<sup>20</sup>

Believing that Judge Baculi's actions constitute grave abuse of authority and gross ignorance of the law, complainant filed the instant administrative complaint. In the main, complainant argues that Judge Baculi's actions fell short of the competence and diligence required under Rule 3.01,<sup>21</sup> Canon 3 of the Code of Judicial Conduct<sup>22</sup> when he issued warrants of arrest despite lack of jurisdiction in Criminal Case Nos. 31632 and 31634, and despite prematurity in view of the pending appeals and motions before the Regional State Prosecutor and the DOJ.<sup>23</sup>

Judge Baculi counters that the issuance of the warrants of arrest were grounded upon the Information and attachments filed by the city prosecutor, which he found to be valid, legal, and substantial. The pending incidents with the Regional State Prosecutor and the DOJ, according to Judge Baculi, were beyond the court's jurisdiction; hence, he took cognizance of the cases. Finally, Judge Baculi argues that, in any case, his questioned actions were purely judicial in nature, and that the administrative complaint was filed merely to harass him as complainant still has pending cases before the Court.<sup>24</sup>

In the initial study of the case, it was found that the issuance of the warrants of arrest despite clear lack of jurisdiction over the cases clearly constitutes gross ignorance of the law/procedure, thus:

**IN VIEW OF THE FOREGOING**, it is respectfully submitted for the consideration of the Honorable [Judicial Integrity Board (JIB)] that the following recommendations be made to the Supreme Court, to wit:

- 1.) The instant administrative complaint be **RE-DOCKETED**; and
- 2.) [Judge Baculi] be found **GUILTY** of Gross Ignorance of the Law/Procedure and **FINED** in the amount of Twenty[-]One Thousand Pesos (₱21,000.00), payable within thirty (30) days from receipt, with a stern warning that a repeat of the same or similar offense shall warrant a more severe penalty from the Court.<sup>25</sup> (Emphasis in the original)

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* at 58.

<sup>20</sup> Order dated June 9, 2020, *id.* at 58.

<sup>21</sup> RULE 3.01 – A judge shall be faithful to the law and maintain professional competence.

<sup>22</sup> Approved on September 5, 1989.

<sup>23</sup> *Rollo*, pp. 4–12.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.* at 61–64.

<sup>25</sup> Report and Recommendation dated February 15, 2021 of James D.V. Navarette, Deputy Clerk of Court at-Large, Office of the Court Administrator and Acting Executive Director, Judicial Integrity Board, and Eduardo C. Tolentino, Acting SC Senior Chief Staff Officer, Research and Investigation Services, Judicial Integrity Board, *id.* at 113–118.

In a Report<sup>26</sup> dated April 20, 2022, the Judicial Integrity Board (JIB) found Judge Baculi administratively liable for gross ignorance of the law and procedure in issuing warrants of arrest for offenses beyond its jurisdiction, and for his obstinate refusal to resolve and grant complainant's Motions to Quash the Information and Recall Warrants of Arrest. In its recommendation, the JIB applied the penalties prescribed under Rule 140 of the Rules of Court, as amended by A.M. No. 21-08-09-SC,<sup>27</sup> thus:

ACCORDINGLY, it is respectfully **RECOMMENDED** that:

- (1) [T]he instant administrative complaint against [Judge Baculi] x x be **RE-DOCKETED** as a regular administrative matter;
- (2) Judge Baculi be found **GUILTY** of Gross Ignorance of the Law and Procedure; and
- (3) Judge Baculi be ordered to pay a **FINE** of One Hundred Thousand Pesos (₱100,000.00), with a **STERN WARNING** that a repetition of the same or similar offense shall be dealt with more severely.<sup>28</sup> (Emphasis in the original)

Vested with the administrative supervision over judicial personnel,<sup>29</sup> We now rule upon whether Judge Baculi should be held administratively liable.

The confidence and trust of the people is the bedrock of the judiciary's existence. Without public faith in the legal system, relevance of the courts in the society as the primary administrators and dispensers of justice is bound to wither. Thus, "[t]o be able to render substantial justice and maintain public confidence in the legal system," judges must exude, not only independence and integrity, but also competence, *i.e.*, the ability to demonstrate mastery of the statutes and procedural rules, prevailing jurisprudence, and principles of the law and equity, and to discharge their duties accordingly.<sup>30</sup> Judge Baculi fell short of these exacting standards, warranting the affirmance of his administrative liability.

"In law, nothing is as elementary as the concept of jurisdiction, for the same is the foundation upon which the courts exercise their power of adjudication, and without which, no rights or obligation could emanate from any decision or resolution."<sup>31</sup> In order for the court or an adjudicative body to have authority to dispose of the case on the merits, it must foremost have jurisdiction over it.<sup>32</sup> Perforce, it is important that a court or tribunal should

<sup>26</sup> Report of Judicial Integrity Board, *id.* at 119–137.

<sup>27</sup> Entitled "Further amendments to Rule 140 of the Rules of Court," approved on February 22, 2022.

<sup>28</sup> *Id.* at 136.

<sup>29</sup> 1987 CONSTITUTION, Article VIII, SEC. 6. The Supreme Court shall have administrative supervision over all courts and personnel thereof.

<sup>30</sup> *See Re: Anonymous Letter Dated August 12, 2010, Complaining Against Judge Ofelia T. Pinto, Regional Trial Court, Branch 60, Angeles City, Pampanga*, 696 Phil. 21, 26 (2012) [*Per Curiam, En Banc*].

<sup>31</sup> *Foronda-Crystal v. Son*, 821 Phil. 1033, 1051 (2017) [*Per J. Reyes, Jr., Second Division*].

<sup>32</sup> *Id.* at 1042.

first determine whether or not it has jurisdiction over the subject matter presented before it, considering that any act that it performs without jurisdiction shall be null and void, and without any binding legal effects.<sup>33</sup> Here, records clearly show that Judge Baculi acted upon criminal cases beyond the MTCC's jurisdiction.

In Criminal Case No. 31632, complainant was charged with violation of Section 254 of the NIRC, as amended, which provides:

SEC. 254. *Attempt to Evade or Defeat Tax.* Any person who willfully attempts in any manner to evade or defeat any tax imposed under this Code or the payment thereof, shall, in addition to other penalties provided by law, upon conviction thereof, be punished with a fine not less than Five hundred thousand pesos ([P]500,000[.00]) but not more than Ten million pesos ([P]10,000,000[.00]) and **imprisonment of not less than six (6) years but not more than ten (10) years:** x x x (Emphasis supplied)

In Criminal Case No. 31634, complainant was charged with violation of Section 264 of the NIRC, as amended, which provides:

SEC. 264. *Failure or Refusal to Issue Receipts or Sales or Commercial Invoices, Violations Related to the Printing of such Receipts or Invoices and Other Violations.* —

x x x x

(b) Any person who commits any of the acts enumerated hereunder shall be penalized with a fine of not less than Five [H]undred [T]housand [P]esos ([P]500,000[.00]) but not more than Ten [M]illion [P]esos ([P]10,000,000[.00]), and **imprisonment of not less than six (6) years but not more than ten (10) years:**

(1) Printing of receipts or sales or commercial invoices without authority from the [BIR] x x x (Emphasis supplied)

The MTCC's jurisdiction in criminal cases is conferred by Batas Pambansa (BP) Blg. 129, as amended by Republic Act (RA) No. 7691, as follows:

SEC. 32. *Jurisdiction of Metropolitan Trial Courts, Municipal Trial Courts and Municipal Circuit Trial Courts in Criminal Cases.* — Except in cases falling within the exclusive jurisdiction of Regional Trial Courts and of the Sandiganbayan, the Metropolitan Trial Courts, Municipal Trial Courts, and Municipal Circuit Trial Courts shall exercise:

x x x x

(2) Exclusive original jurisdiction over all offenses punishable with **imprisonment not exceeding six (6) years irrespective of the amount of fine, and regardless of other imposable accessory or other penalties**, including the civil liability arising from such offenses or predicated thereon,

<sup>33</sup> *Bilag v. Ay-ay*, 809 Phil. 236, 243 (2017) [ Per J. Perlas-Bernabe, First Division].

irrespective of kind, nature, value or amount thereof: Provided, however, [t]hat in offenses involving damage to property through criminal negligence, they shall have exclusive original jurisdiction thereof. (Emphasis supplied)

BP Blg. 129 vests the RTCs with jurisdiction over criminal cases, which prescribes imprisonment of more than six (6) years,<sup>34</sup> such as those punishable under Sections 254 and 264 of the NIRC. Thus, Judge Baculi gravely erred when he took cognizance of Criminal Case Nos. 31632 and 31634, and in issuing the corresponding warrants of arrest.

Judge Baculi's blunder demonstrated his lack of diligence in attending to the incidents brought before him for adjudication. He failed to determine whether the Court had jurisdiction before acting upon the criminal information filed before him. Judge Baculi further displayed lack of knowledge on the basic jurisdictional rules *vis-à-vis* the criminal laws pertinent to the subject cases. Undeniably, Judge Baculi is guilty of gross ignorance of the law, *i.e.*, the disregard or failure to apply basic rules and jurisprudence.<sup>35</sup> True, not every judicial error bespeaks ignorance of the law and that, if committed without bad faith or malice, such error does not warrant administrative sanction.<sup>36</sup> But "[w]here the law is straightforward and the facts so evident, [as in this case,] failure to know it or to act as if one does not know it constitutes gross ignorance of the law. x x x"<sup>37</sup> This is because of the exacting standard of competence expected from judges in the administration of justice.<sup>38</sup> Apropos is our pronouncement in *Department of Justice v. Judge Mislang*:<sup>39</sup>

x x x A judge is presumed to have acted with regularity and good faith in the performance of judicial functions. But a blatant disregard of the clear and unmistakable provisions of a statute, as well as Supreme Court circulars enjoining their strict compliance, upends this presumption and subjects the magistrate to corresponding administrative sanctions.

For liability to attach for ignorance of the law, the assailed order, decision or actuation of the judge in the performance of official duties must not only be found erroneous but, most importantly, it must also be established that he was moved by bad faith, dishonesty, hatred, or some other like motive. **Judges are expected to exhibit more than just cursory acquaintance with statutes and procedural laws. They must know the laws and apply them properly in all good faith. Judicial competence requires no less. Thus, unfamiliarity with the rules is a sign of incompetence. Basic rules must be at the palm of his hand. When a judge displays utter lack of familiarity with the rules, he**

<sup>34</sup> BATAS PAMBANSA BLG. 129, SEC. 20. *Jurisdiction in criminal cases*. — Regional Trial Courts shall exercise original jurisdiction in all criminal cases not within the exclusive jurisdiction of any court, tribunal or body, except those now falling under the exclusive and concurrent jurisdiction of the Sandiganbayan which shall hereafter be exclusively taken cognizance of by the latter.

<sup>35</sup> See *Department of Justice v. Judge Mislang*, 791 Phil. 219, 227 (2016) [*Per Curiam, En Banc*].

<sup>36</sup> *Id.*

<sup>37</sup> *Id.* at 224.

<sup>38</sup> See also *Morales, Sr. v. Judge Dumlao*, 427 Phil. 56, 60–61 (2002) [Per J. Ynares-Santiago, First Division].

<sup>39</sup> *Department of Justice v. Judge Mislang*, *supra* note 30.

**betrays the confidence of the public in the courts. Ignorance of the law is the mainspring of injustice. Judges owe it to the public to be knowledgeable, hence, they are expected to have more than just a modicum of acquaintance with the statutes and procedural rules; they must know them by heart.** When the inefficiency springs from a failure to recognize such a basic and elemental rule, a law or a principle in the discharge of his [or her] functions, a judge is either too incompetent and undeserving of the position and the prestigious title he [or she] holds or he [or she] is too vicious that the oversight or omission was deliberately done in bad faith and in grave abuse of judicial authority. x x x<sup>40</sup> (Citations omitted and emphasis supplied)

Our reminder in *Morales, Sr. v. Judge Dumlao*<sup>41</sup> is also instructive, viz.:

x x x [J]udges must be conversant with basic legal principles. Indeed, the Code of Judicial Conduct enjoins judges to “be faithful to the law and maintain professional competence.” Respondent judge owes it to the public and the legal profession to know the law he is supposed to apply to a given controversy. x x x

x x x x

While we do not expect judges to have an encyclopedic recollection of applicable laws, jurisprudence or administrative circulars we issue periodically in the discharge of their responsibilities, they nevertheless have the bounded duty to keep abreast with the law and the changes therein as well as the decisions of this Court. As a trial judge, respondent is the visible representation of the law and justice. x x x

Inefficient[, incompetent, and dishonest] judges are equally impermissible in the Judiciary x x x. Any of them tarnishes the image of the judiciary and brings it to the public contempt, dishonor or disrespect and must then be administratively dealt with and punished accordingly.<sup>42</sup> (Citations omitted)

Gross ignorance of the law is classified as a serious charge under A.M. No. 21-08-09-SC with the following sanctions:

- (a) Dismissal from service, forfeiture of all or part of the benefits as the Supreme Court may determine, and disqualification from reinstatement or appointment to any public office, including government-owned or -controlled corporations. *Provided, however*, that the forfeiture of benefits shall in no case include accrued leave credits.
- (b) Suspension from office without salary and other benefits for more than six (6) months but not exceeding one (1) year; or
- (c) A fine of more than [P]100,000.00 but not exceeding [P]200,000.00.<sup>43</sup>

However, in a number of cases, the Court has refrained from imposing

<sup>40</sup> *Id.* 227–228.

<sup>41</sup> *Supra* note 38.

<sup>42</sup> *Id.* at 60–62.

<sup>43</sup> A.M. No. 21-08-09-SC, SEC. 17.

the actual penalties in the presence of mitigating factors.<sup>44</sup> Indeed, while the Court is duty-bound to sternly wield a corrective hand to discipline its errant employees and to weed out those who are undesirable, we also have the discretion to temper the harshness of the judgment with mercy.<sup>45</sup> We have consistently held that “whe[n] a penalty less punitive would suffice, whatever missteps may be committed by labor ought not to be visited with a consequence so severe.”<sup>46</sup> This compassion extended by the Court is not without legal basis. Section 19 of A.M. No. 21-08-09-SC provides that mitigating circumstances such as first offense, length of service of at least ten (10) years with no previous disciplinary record where respondent was meted with an administrative penalty, exemplary performance, humanitarian considerations, and *other analogous circumstances*, may be considered by the Court in its discretion in determining the appropriate penalty.

In the present case, the Court finds it apt to consider in determining the proper penalty the following attendant circumstances: Judge Baculi’s advanced age of 64 years old;<sup>47</sup> 18 years of service as judge;<sup>48</sup> the fact that this is his first serious offense in those years of service;<sup>49</sup> the absence of any indication of malice or some corrupt motive behind his actions;<sup>50</sup> and also humanitarian considerations in relation to the adverse economic effects of the Corona Virus pandemic.<sup>51</sup> With these, the Court finds the penalty of a fine amounting to Fifty Thousand Pesos (₱50,000.00) commensurate to Judge Baculi’s lapse.<sup>52</sup>

**FOR THESE REASONS, Judge Rene B. Baculi is FINED in the**

<sup>44</sup> See *Re: Reports on the E-Raffle Procedure in the Regional Trial Court, Manila*, A.M. No. 18-07-142-RTC, February 15, 2022; See *Office of the Court Administrator v. Judge Chavez*, 815 Phil. 41 (2017) [*Per Curiam, En Banc*]; See *Office of the Court Administrator v. Viesca*, 819 Phil. 582, 585 (2017) [*Per Curiam, En Banc*]; See *Office of the Court Administrator v. Judge Aguilar*, 666 Phil. 11, 23 (2011) [Per J. Leonardo-De Castro, *En Banc*]; See *Concerned Taxpayer v. Doblada, Jr.*, 507 Phil. 222, 226 (2005) [*Per Curiam, En Banc*]; See *In Re: Petition for the Dismissal from Service and/or Disbarment of Judge Baltazar R. Dizon*, 255 Phil. 623 (1989) [*Per Curiam, En Banc*].

<sup>45</sup> See *Baculi v. Ugale*, 619 Phil. 686, 692 (2009) [Per J. Peralta, Third Division].

<sup>46</sup> See *Arganosa-Maniego v. Salinas*, 608 Phil. 334, 349 (2009) [Per J. Chico-Nazario, Third Division].

<sup>47</sup> Per verification with the Office of the Court Administrator – Office of the Administrative Services. Judge Baculi was born on September 26, 1957. See *Re: Reports on the E-Raffle Procedure in the Regional Trial Court, Manila*, A.M. No. 18-07-142-RTC, February 15, 2022.

<sup>48</sup> Per verification with the Office of the Court Administrator – Office of the Administrative Services. Judge Baculi was first appointed as MTC judge in Alcala, Cagayan on November 10, 2004, and appointed in MTCC-Tuguegarao, Cagayan on March 12, 2007.

<sup>49</sup> Per verification with the Judicial Integrity Board, charges against Judge Baculi for gross ignorance of the law and misconduct (20-3120-MTJ), ignorance of the law and grave misconduct (08-2042-MTJ), bigamy and immorality (95-15-P), and grave misconduct [P-97-1233 (96-121-P)] were all dismissed. He was merely found guilty of a light offense under Rule 140 (conduct unbecoming of judge and misconduct) and suspended for four months therefor [MTJ-15-1856 (12-2458-MTJ)].

<sup>50</sup> See *Re: Reports on the E-Raffle Procedure in the Regional Trial Court, Manila*, A.M. No. 18-07-142-RTC, February 15, 2022.

<sup>51</sup> *Id.*

<sup>52</sup> A.M. No. 21-08-09-SC, SEC. 20. *Manner of Imposition*. — If one (1) or more aggravating circumstances and no mitigating circumstances are present, the Supreme Court may impose the penalties of suspension or fine for a period or amount not exceeding double of the maximum prescribed under this Rule.

If one (1) or more mitigating circumstances and no aggravating circumstances are present, the Supreme Court may impose the penalties of suspension or fine for a period or amount not less than half of the minimum prescribed under this Rule.

If there are both aggravating and mitigating circumstances present, the Supreme Court may offset each other. (Emphasis supplied)



amount of Fifty Thousand Pesos (₱50,000.00) for gross ignorance the law. He is STERNLY WARNED that repetition of the same or similar acts shall be dealt with more severely.

**SO ORDERED.”** (Leonen, J., on official leave; Lazaro-Javier, J., acting Chairperson per Special Order No. 2909 dated September 9, 2022).

By authority of the Court:

TERESITA AQUINO TUAZON  
Division Clerk of Court

By:



MA. CONSOLACION GAMINDE-CRUZADA  
Deputy Division Clerk of Court

29 MAR 2023

hm  
3/20

HON. RAUL B. VILLANUEVA (x)  
Office of the Court Administrator  
HON. DEPUTY COURT ADMINISTRATOR  
Jenny Lind Aldecoa-Delorino (x)  
Leo T. Madrazo (x)  
ASSISTANT COURT ADMINISTRATOR  
Hon. Lilian C. Baribal-Co (x)  
Hon. Maria Regina Adoracion  
Filomena M. Ignacio (x)  
Legal Office (x)  
Court Management Office (x)  
Financial Management Office (x)  
Docket & Clearance Division (x)  
Office of Administrative Services (x)  
Office of the Court Administrator  
Supreme Court, Manila

NIANG NIANG LIM DONG (reg)  
Complainant  
Lakandula Street, San Gabriel,  
Tuguegarao City, Cagayan

HON. RENE B. BACULI (reg)  
Presiding Judge  
Municipal Trial Court in Cities, Branch 2  
Tuguegarao City, Cagayan

\*CASH DIVISION (x)  
Office of the Court Administrator  
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)  
PHILIPPINE JUDICIAL ACADEMY (x)  
Supreme Court, Manila

\*For this resolution only  
Please notify the Court of any change in your address.  
AM MTJ-23-012. 09/12/2022(210[b])URES