POLI

Requiring professionals to submit appointment books violates the constitutional right to privacy under the due process clause.— *IBP v. Secretary of Finance (2023)*

COMM

A lender cannot unilaterally impose new conditions not stipulated in the loan agreement and then foreclose based on those unmet, extraneous terms.— *DBP v. Togle (2021)*

CIV

An absolutely simulated sale of agrarian land, lacking genuine intent and violating PD 27, is void, affirming that heirs are rightful co-owners by hereditary succession.— *Dela Cruz v. Dumasig (2023)*

LABOR

Employees of non-chartered GOCCs are covered by the Labor Code, not the Civil Service Law, and enjoy labor law protection, including security in established benefits. — *PNCC v. NLRC (2021)*

CRIM

Illegal recruitment and estafa are separate offenses, one under special law, the other under the Penal Code, and a single act can validly result in convictions for both.— *People v. Marzan (2022)*

REM

A judgment rendered without jurisdiction over an indispensable party is void and may be annulled to uphold due process.— *Ortigas v. Court of Appeals (2024)*

1

The Bureau of Internal Revenue ordered Atty. Maria Santos, a self-employed lawyer, to submit an affidavit detailing her professional fees and to register her appointment book containing client names and meeting schedules. She claims this violates her right to privacy and the confidentiality of the attorney-client relationship. **Was Atty. Santos's right to privacy violated?**

Suggested answer: Yes. Atty. Santos's right to privacy was violated.

In *Integrated Bar of the Philippines v. Secretary of Finance,* the Supreme Court ruled that requiring self-employed professionals to disclose fee details and client appointment books violates the constitutional right to privacy under the Bill of Rights. The Court held that such requirements are intrusive and unreasonable, affecting not just the professional but also the clients' expectation of privacy. The state's interest in tax collection does not justify violating private communication without sufficient safeguards.

2

AgriPrime Corporation took a ₱5 million loan from Masagana Rural Bank to build poultry houses. The bank initially released ₱3 million. After partial compliance, AgriPrime requested another ₱500,000, but the bank denied it, citing AgriPrime's failure to infuse matching equity, a condition not stated in the loan agreement. The bank then declared AgriPrime in default and foreclosed on the property. **Was Masagana Bank justified in foreclosing based on an unstated condition?**

Suggested answer: No. Masagana Bank was not justified.

In *DBP v. Togle,* the Supreme Court ruled that a bank cannot impose loan conditions not found in the contract. Masagana Bank's refusal to release funds based on extraneous requirements was a breach of contract. The foreclosure was void because AgriPrime was not in valid default.

3

Mr. and Mrs. Torres mortgaged their land to Alto Rural Bank. Their daughter, Hannah, paid the loan, and in return, the spouses executed a Deed of Sale with Assumption of Mortgage in her favor. However, the spouses continued to possess and cultivate the land until they died. Later, Hannah mortgaged the land to Alex, who took possession. When Hannah's siblings found out, they demanded the land's return. **Should Alex return the land to the heirs?**

Suggested answer: Yes, Alex should return the land to the heirs.

In *Dela Cruz v. Dumasig,* the Supreme Court ruled that a sale where the sellers continue to possess the land shows no real intent to transfer ownership, making the sale simulated and void. Thus, the land remains part of the estate, co-owned by all heirs. Any later transactions, like Hannah's mortgage to Alex, are also invalid.

4

Northbridge, a government-owned and controlled corporation incorporated under the Corporation Code and 90% government-owned, discontinued the mid-year bonus it had consistently given since 1992. It claimed that under the GOCC Governance Act, such bonuses now required presidential approval. Employees filed a complaint for illegal diminution of benefits under Article 100 of the Labor Code. Northbridge argued that, as a GOCC, its employees fall under Civil Service rules, not the Labor Code. **Is Northbridge correct?**

Suggested answer: No. Northbridge is incorrect. The Labor Code applies to its employees.

In *Philippine National Construction Corp. v. NLRC,* the Supreme Court ruled that GOCCs without original charters but incorporated under the Corporation Code are covered by the Labor Code, not the Civil Service Law. The Constitution limits Civil Service coverage to GOCCs with original charters. Since Northbridge is a non-chartered GOCC, its employees are entitled to labor law protection, including security in long-standing benefits.

5

Mario recruited ten individuals, including his neighbors and relatives, promising them overseas jobs as factory workers in South Korea. He collected ₱100,000 as placement fees from each but failed to secure valid employment contracts. It was later discovered that Mario had no license or authority from the Department of Migrant Workers to recruit workers. He is charged with both illegal recruitment in large scale and estafa. **May Mario be convicted of both crimes?**

Suggested answer: Yes. Mario may be convicted of both crimes.

In *People v. Marzan,* the Supreme Court ruled that illegal recruitment and estafa are distinct offenses, and a person may be convicted of both even if they arise from the same acts. Illegal recruitment violates special laws, while estafa punishes deceit under the Revised Penal Code. Like Marzan, Mario falsely promised jobs abroad without a license and collected money, constituting illegal recruitment and independently, estafa through deceit.

6

Francis mortgaged a parcel of land to Josie, and the Deed was annotated on the title. Years after Josie died, her heirs found that Francis failed to pay the loan, but that the land had already been foreclosed and sold at public auction to Jaime. Further, the trial court cancelled the mortgage annotation in a case filed against Josie, who had then been dead for nearly nine years. Her heirs were not notified or included. **Was the trial court's decision valid?**

Suggested answer: No. The trial court's decision is void for lack of jurisdiction and violation of due process.

In *Ortigas v. Court of Appeals,* the Supreme Court held that a court cannot acquire jurisdiction over a deceased person, and any judgment rendered without proper notice to the heirs is void and can be annulled.