



REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
Supreme Court
Manila

EN BANC

January 26, 2016

A.C. No. 10868
[Formerly CBD Case No. 07-2041]

CHERYLE. VASCO-TAMARAY, Complainant,
vs.
ATTY. DEBORAH Z. DAQUIS, Respondent.

R E S O L U T I O N

PERCURIAM:

Pretending to be counsel for a party in a case and using a forged signature in a pleading merit the penalty of disbarment.

Cheryl E. Vasco-Tamaray (Vasco-Tamaray) filed a ComplaintAffidavit before the Integrated Bar of the Philippines on July 30, 2007, alleging that respondent Atty. Deborah Z. Daquis (Atty. Daquis) filed, on her behalf, a Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage without her consent and forged her signature on the Petition.¹ She also alleged that Atty. Daquis signed the Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage as "counsel for petitioner," referring to Vasco-Tamaray.²

Vasco-Tamaray stated that Atty. Daquis was not her counsel but that of her husband, Leomarte Regala Tamaray.³ To support her allegation, she attached the Affidavit⁴ of Maritess Marquez-Guerrero. The Affidavit states:

1. Sometime in October 2006, I accompanied Cheryl Tamaray in going to East Cafe at Rustan's Makati to meet with her husband Leomarte Tamaray;
2. We arrived at the said place at around 7:00 pm *and Leomarte introduced to us (Cheryl and I) Atty. Deborah Z. Daquis as his lawyer.* He further told us that Atty. Daquis' husband also worked in Japan and that's how he got to know the latter and got her services;
3. Among other things, Leomarte told Cheryl that the reason for that meeting and the presence of Atty. Daquis *was because he had decided to file a case to annul his marriage* with Cheryl;
4. Cheryl was shocked and just cried. After awhile [sic], Leomarte's brother arrived and shortly after, the group left;

5. The next instance that I saw Atty. Daquis was when we (Cheryl and I) went to McDonald's-Greenbelt where Atty. Daquis tried to convince her not to oppose Leomarte's decision to have their marriage annulled[.]⁵ (Emphasis supplied)

Vasco-Tamaray narrated that in December 2006, Atty. Daquis informed her "that a Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage was filed before the Regional Trial Court of Muntinlupa City."⁶ In February 2007, Atty. Daquis asked her to appear before the City Prosecutor's Office of Muntinlupa City.⁷

On March 5, 2007, Vasco-Tamaray appeared before the City Prosecutor's Office and met Atty. Daquis. She asked Atty. Daquis to give her a copy of the Petition but Atty. Daquis refused.⁸

Vasco-Tamaray stated that she obtained a copy of the Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage from Branch 207 of the Regional Trial Court of Muntinlupa City. She was surprised to see that the Petition was allegedly signed and filed by her.⁹

Vasco-Tamaray alleged that she did not file the Petition, that her signature was forged by Atty. Daquis, and that her purported community tax certificate appearing on the jurat was not hers because she never resided in Muntinlupa City.¹⁰ She attached a Certification issued by the Sangguniang Barangay of Putatan, Muntinlupa City stating that she was "never . . . a resident of #9 Daang Hari Street, Umali Compound, Summitville Subdivision, Barangay Putatan."¹¹ She also attached a Certification issued by Barangay Talipapa stating that she has been a resident of "#484-J Saguitarius St., Solville Subd., Barangay Talipapa, Novaliches, Quezon City... from 2000 till present."¹²

Vasco-Tamaray also alleged that the Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage was Atty. Daquis' idea, consented to by Leomarte Tamaray.¹³

She further alleged that she had never received any court process. The Petition states that her postal address is "09 Daang Hari St., Umali Comp., Summitville Subd., Putatan, Muntinlupa City[.]"¹⁴ which is the address of her husband's family. The return slips of the notices sent by the trial court were received by Encarnacion T. Coletraba and Almencis Cumigad, relatives of Leomarte Tamaray.¹⁵

Atty. Daquis filed an Answer countering that her client was Vasco-Tamaray, complainant herself, and not complainant's husband. She alleged that Vasco-Tamaray knew of the Petition as early as October 2006, not December 2006.¹⁶

With regard to the community tax certificate, Atty. Daquis explained that when she notarized the Petition, the community tax certificate number was supplied by Vasco-Tamaray.¹⁷ Atty. Daquis' allegation was supported by the Joint Affidavit of her staff, Ma. Dolor E. Purawan (Purawan) and Ludy Lorena (Lorena).¹⁸

Purawan and Lorena detailed in their Joint Affidavit that they knew Vasco-Tamaray to be a client of Atty. Daquis and that they never saw Atty. Daquis forge Vasco-Tamaray's signature. Purawan stated that she typed the Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage and that the community tax certificate was provided by Vasco-Tamaray.¹⁹

Atty. Daquis alleged that Vasco-Tamaray wanted her to call and demand money from Leomarte Tamaray but she refused to do so.²⁰

Atty. Daquis argued that Vasco-Tamaray had a copy of the Petition. When Vasco-Tamaray requested another copy on March 5, 2007, Atty. Daquis was unable to grant her client's request because she did not have a copy of the Petition with her at that time.²¹

Atty. Daquis further alleged that Vasco-Tamaray conceived an illegitimate son with a certain Reuel Pablo Aranda. The illegitimate son was named Charles Dino Vasco. Reuel Pablo Aranda signed the Affidavit of Acknowledgment/ Admission of Paternity portion of the birth certificate.²²

The Commission on Bar Discipline required the parties to submit their position papers,²³ but based on the record, only Vasco-Tamaray complied.²⁴

The Commission on Bar Discipline recommended the dismissal of the Complaint because Vasco-Tamaray failed to prove her allegations. The Commission on Bar Discipline noted that Vasco-Tamaray should have questioned the Petition or informed the prosecutor that she never filed any petition, but she failed to do so.²⁵

The Board of Governors of the Integrated Bar of the Philippines adopted and approved the Report and Recommendation of the Commission on Bar Discipline in the Resolution dated September 27, 2014.²⁶

The issue for resolution is whether respondent Atty. Deborah Z. Daquis should be held administratively liable for making it appear that she is counsel for complainant Cheryl Vasco-Tamaray and for the alleged use of a forged signature on the Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage.

This court finds that respondent violated Canons 1, 7, 10, and 17 of the Code of Professional Responsibility. The charge against respondent for violation of Canon 15 is dismissed.

I

By pretending to be counsel for complainant, respondent violated Canon 1, Rule 1.01 of the Code of Professional Responsibility and failed to uphold her duty of doing no falsehood nor consent to the doing of any falsehood in court as stated in the Lawyer's Oath.²⁷

Canon 1, Rule 1.01 of the Code of Professional Responsibility provides:

CANON 1 - A lawyer shall uphold the constitution, obey the laws of the land and promote respect for law and for legal processes.

RULE 1.01 - A lawyer shall not engage in unlawful, dishonest, immoral or deceitful conduct.

In this case, respondent merely denied complainant's allegation that she was Leomarte Tamaray's counsel²⁸ but was unable to rebut the other allegations against her.

Respondent admitted that she met complainant in October 2006,²⁹ but did not refute³⁰ the statement in Maritess Marquez-Guerrero's Affidavit that Leomarte Tamaray introduced her as his lawyer.³¹ Likewise, respondent admitted that she met with complainant subsequently,³² but did not refute Maritess Marquez-Guerrero's statement that in one of the meetings, she tried to convince complainant not to oppose Leomarte Tamaray's decision to annul their marriage.³³

Respondent argued in her Answer that she was the counsel for complainant.³⁴ Yet, there is no explanation how she was referred to complainant or how they were introduced. It appears, then, that respondent was contacted by Leomarte Tamaray to file a Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage on the ground of bigamy. As stated in Maritess Marquez-Guerrero's Affidavit, "Leomarte told Cheryl that the reason for that meeting and the presence of Atty. Daquis was because *he had decided to file a case to annul his marriage with Cheryl*[.]"³⁵

Based on this, it seems Leomarte Tamaray intended to file the petition for declaration of nullity of marriage. However, respondent made it appear that complainant, not her client Leomarte Tamaray, was the petitioner. There is a probability that respondent did not want Leomarte Tamaray to be the petitioner because he would have to admit that he entered into a bigamous marriage, the admission of which may subject him to criminal liability.

In addition, if it is true that complainant was respondent's client, then there appears to be no reason for respondent to advise her "not to oppose Leomarte's decision to have their marriage annulled."³⁶

The records of this case also support complainant's allegation that she never received any court process because her purported address in the Petition is the address of Leomarte Tamaray. The Petition states that complainant is "of legal age, Filipino citizen, married with postal address at 09 Daang Hari St., Umali Comp., Summitville Subd., Putatan, Muntinlupa City[.]"³⁷

The Certificate of Marriage of complainant and Leomarte Tamaray states that Leomarte's residence is at "Summitvil[l]e Subv [sic], Muntinlupa," while complainant's residence is at "Hermosa St. Gagalangin, Tondo, Manila."³⁸ Assuming that complainant lived with her husband after they were married, complainant most likely did not receive court processes because she left their home before the filing of the Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage. As written in the Minutes of the meeting before the Office of the City Prosecutor:

P[etitioner] & R[espondent] met sometime in 1993 through his secretary. They became sweethearts in 1993 and their relationship as steadies lasted until 1996;

During the 3 years of their union, petitioner knew respondent's family as she even sleeps in their house; Theirs was also a long distance relationship as respondent worked in Japan;

Upon respondents [sic] return to the Philippines they got married in Feb, 1996. They had no children, as respondent immediately left for Japan on March 11, 1996;

Respondent returned to the Philippines but unfortunately he brought another woman. *As a result, petitioner left their house.*³⁹ (Emphasis supplied)

Further, complainant cannot be faulted for her failure to inform the prosecutor that she did not file any petition for declaration of nullity of marriage because during the meeting on March 5, 2007, complainant had no knowledge that the Petition was filed in her name.⁴⁰ She obtained a copy of the Petition after the March 5, 2007 meeting.⁴¹

In *Yupangco-Nakpil v. Uy*,⁴² this court discussed Canon 1, Rule 1.01, as follows:

Rule 1.01, Canon 1 of the Code, as it is applied to the members of the legal professions, engraves an overriding prohibition against any form of misconduct, viz:

CANON 1 - A LAWYER SHALL UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION, OBEY THE LAWS OF THE LAND AND PROMOTE RESPECT FOR LAW AND LEGAL PROCESSES

Rule 1.01 - A lawyer shall not engage in unlawful, dishonest, immoral or deceitful conduct.

The gravity of the misconduct- determinative as it is of the errant lawyer's penalty- depends on the factual circumstances of each case .

. . . .

. . . Verily, members of the Bar are expected at all times to uphold the integrity and dignity of the legal profession and refrain from any act or omission which might lessen the trust and confidence reposed by the public in the fidelity, honesty, and integrity of the legal profession. By no insignificant measure, respondent blemished not only his integrity as a member of the Bar, but also that of the legal profession. In other words, his conduct fell short of the exacting standards expected of him as a guardian of law and justice.⁴³

When respondent filed the Petition as counsel for complainant when the truth was otherwise, she committed a falsehood against the trial court and complainant.

II

Respondent violated Canon 7, Rule 7.03 and Canon 10, Rule 10.01 when she allowed the use of a forged signature on a petition she prepared and notarized.⁴⁴

Complainant alleged that her signature on the Petition was forged.⁴⁵ Respondent merely denied complainant's allegation.⁴⁶

The Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage was signed by a certain "CVasco."⁴⁷ The records of this case show that complainant has used two signatures. In her identification cards issued by the University of the East, she used a signature that spelled out "CVasco."⁴⁸ In her Complaint-Affidavit against respondent, complainant used a signature that spelled out "CTamaray."⁴⁹

A comparison of the signatures appearing on the Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage and on complainant's identification cards show a difference in the stroke of the letters "c" and "o." Further, complainant's signatures in the documents⁵⁰ attached to the records consistently appear to be of the same height. On the other hand, her alleged signature on the Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage has a big letter "c."⁵¹ Hence, it seems that complainant's signature on the Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage was forged.

While there is no evidence to prove that respondent forged complainant's signature, the fact remains that respondent allowed a forged signature to be used on a petition she prepared and notarized.⁵² In doing so, respondent violated Canon 7, Rule 7.03 and Canon 10, Rule 10.01. These canons state:

CANON 7 - A lawyer shall at all times uphold the integrity and dignity of the legal profession, and support the activities of the integrated bar.

RULE 7.03 - A lawyer shall not engage in conduct that adversely reflects on his fitness to practice law, nor shall he, whether in public or private life, behave in a scandalous manner to the discredit of the legal profession.

. . . .

CANON 10 - A lawyer owes candor, fairness and good faith to the court.

RULE 10.01 -A lawyer shall not do any falsehood, nor consent to the doing of any in Court; nor shall he mislead or allow the Court to be misled by any artifice.

In *Embido v. Pe, Jr.*,⁵³ Assistant Provincial Prosecutor Salvador N. Pe, Jr. was found guilty of violating Canon 7, Rule 7.03 and was meted the penalty of disbarment for falsifying a court decision "in a non-existent court proceeding."⁵⁴ This court discussed that:

Gross immorality, conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude, or fraudulent transactions can justify a lawyer's disbarment or suspension from the practice of law. Specifically, the deliberate falsification of the court decision by the respondent was an act that reflected a high degree of moral turpitude on his part. Worse, the act made a mockery of the administration of justice in this country, given the purpose of the falsification, which was to mislead a foreign tribunal on the personal status of a person. He thereby became unworthy of continuing as a member of the Bar.⁵⁵

In a similar manner, respondent's act of allowing the use of a forged signature on a petition she prepared and notarized demonstrates a lack of moral fiber on her part.

Other acts that this court has found violative of Canon 7, Rule 7.03 are: engaging in a scuffle inside court chambers;⁵⁶ openly doubting paternity of his own son;⁵⁷ hurling invectives at a Clerk of Court;⁵⁸ harassing occupants of a property;⁵⁹ using intemperate language;⁶⁰ and engaging in an extramarital affair.⁶¹

Furthermore, allowing the use of a forged signature on a petition filed before a court is tantamount to consenting to the commission of a falsehood before courts, in violation of Canon 10.

In *Spouses Umaguig v. De Vera*,⁶² this court discussed the importance of Canon 10, Rule 10.01, as follows:

The Lawyer's Oath enjoins every lawyer not only to obey the laws of the land but also to refrain from doing any falsehood in or out of court or from consenting to the doing of any in court, and to conduct himself according to the best of his knowledge and discretion with all good fidelity to the courts as well as to his clients. Every lawyer is a servant of the law, and has to observe and maintain the rule of law as well as be an exemplar worthy of emulation by others. *It is by no means a coincidence, therefore, that the core values of honesty, integrity, and trustworthiness are emphatically reiterated by the Code of Professional Responsibility. In this light, Rule 10.01, Canon 10 of the Code of Professional Responsibility provides that "[a] lawyer shall not do any falsehood, nor consent to the doing of any in Court; nor shall he mislead, or allow the Court to be misled by any artifice."*⁶³ (Emphasis supplied)

III

This court further finds that respondent violated Canon 17, which states:

CANON 17 - A lawyer owes fidelity to the cause of his client and he shall be mindful of the trust and confidence reposed in him.

Respondent failed to protect the interests of her client when she represented complainant, who is the opposing party of her client Leomarte Tamaray, in the same case.

The responsibilities of a lawyer under Canon 17 were discussed in *Penilla v. Alcid, Jr.*:⁶⁴

The legal profession dictates that it is not a mere duty, but an obligation, of a lawyer to accord the highest degree of fidelity, zeal and fervor in the protection of the client's interest. The most thorough groundwork and study must be undertaken in order to safeguard the interest of the client. The honor bestowed on his person to carry the title of a lawyer does not end upon taking the Lawyer's Oath and signing the Roll of Attorneys. Rather, such honor attaches to him for the entire duration of his practice of law and carries with it the consequent responsibility of not only satisfying the basic requirements but also going the extra mile in the protection of the interests of the client and the pursuit of justice[.]⁶⁵

Respondent is reminded of the duties and responsibilities of members of the legal profession, as discussed in *Tenoso v. Echaney*:⁶⁶

Time and again, this Court emphasizes that the practice of law is imbued with public interest and that "a lawyer owes substantial duties not only to his client, but also to his brethren in the profession, to the courts, and to the nation, and takes part in one of the most important functions of the State-the administration of justice-as an officer of the court." Accordingly, "[l]awyers are bound to maintain not only a high standard of legal proficiency, but also of morality, honesty, integrity and fair dealing."⁶⁷ (Citations omitted)

IV

This court notes that respondent may have violated Canon 15, Rule 15.03 when she entered her appearance as counsel for complainant⁶⁸ even though she was engaged as counsel by Leomarte Tamaray.⁶⁹ Canon 15, Rule 15.03 of the Code of Professional Responsibility provides:

CANON 15 - A lawyer shall observe candor, fairness and loyalty in all his dealings and transactions with his client.

. . . .

Rule 15.03 - A lawyer shall not represent conflicting interests except by written consent of all concerned given after a full disclosure of the facts.

The rationale for Canon 15 was discussed in *Samson v. Era*:⁷⁰

The rule prohibiting conflict of interest was fashioned to prevent situations wherein a lawyer would be representing a client whose interest is directly adverse to any of his present or former clients. In the same way, a lawyer may only be allowed to represent a client involving the same or a substantially related matter that is materially adverse to the former client only if the former client consents to it after consultation. The rule is grounded in the fiduciary obligation of loyalty. Throughout the course of a lawyer-client relationship, the lawyer learns all the facts connected with the client's case, including the weak and strong points of the case. Knowledge and information gathered in the course of the relationship must be treated as sacred and guarded with care. It behooves lawyers not only to keep inviolate the client's confidence, but also to avoid the appearance of treachery and double-dealing, for only then can litigants be encouraged to entrust their secrets to

their lawyers, which is paramount in the administration of justice. The nature of that relationship is, therefore, one of trust and confidence of the highest degree .

. . . .

. . . The spirit behind this rule is that the client's confidence once given should not be stripped by the mere expiration of the professional employment. . . . Even after the severance of the relation, a lawyer should not do anything that will injuriously affect his former client in any matter in which the lawyer previously represented the client. Nor should the lawyer disclose or use any of the client's confidences acquired in the previous relation. In this regard, Canon 17 of the *Code of Professional Responsibility* expressly declares that: "A lawyer owes fidelity to the cause of his client and he shall be mindful of the trust and confidence reposed in him."

The lawyer's highest and most unquestioned duty is to protect the client at all hazards and costs even to himself. The protection given to the client is perpetual and does not cease with the termination of the litigation, nor is it affected by the client's ceasing to employ the attorney and retaining another, or by any other change of relation between them. It even survives the death of the client.⁷¹

The test to determine whether conflict of interest exists was discussed in *Hornilla v. Salunat*:⁷²

There is conflict of interest when a lawyer represents inconsistent interests of two or more opposing parties. The test is "whether or not in behalf of one client, it is the lawyer's duty to fight for an issue or claim, but it is his duty to oppose it for the other client. In brief, if he argues for one client, this argument will be opposed by him when he argues for the other client." This rule covers not only cases in which confidential communications have been confided, but also those in which no confidence has been bestowed or will be used. *Also, there is conflict of interests if the acceptance of the new retainer will require the attorney to perform an act which will injuriously affect his first client in any matter in which he represents him and also whether he will be called upon in his new relation to use against his first client any knowledge acquired through their connection. Another test of the inconsistency of interests is whether the acceptance of a new relation will prevent an attorney from the full discharge of his duty of undivided fidelity and loyalty to his client or invite suspicion of unfaithfulness or double dealing in the performance thereof.*⁷³ (Emphasis supplied, citations omitted)

Respondent was engaged by Leomarte Tamaray to be his counsel.⁷⁴ When the Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage was filed, respondent signed the Petition as counsel for complainant.⁷⁵ If respondent was indeed engaged as counsel by complainant, then there is conflict of interest, in violation of Canon 15, Rule 15.03.

However, there is nothing on record to show that respondent was engaged as counsel by complainant. Hence, this court finds that respondent did not commit conflict of interest.

V

On a final note, Rule 139-B has been amended by Bar Matter No. 1645 dated October 13, 2015. Section 12 of Rule 139-B now provides that:

Rule 139-B. Disbarment and Discipline of Attorneys

. . . .

Section 12. Review and recommendation by the Board of Governors.

(a) Every case heard by an investigator shall be reviewed by the IBP Board of Governors upon the record and evidence transmitted to it by the Investigator with his report.

(b) After its review, the Board, by the vote of a majority of its total membership, shall recommend to the Supreme Court the dismissal of the complaint or the imposition of disciplinary action against the respondent. The Board shall issue a resolution setting forth its findings and recommendations, clearly and distinctly stating the facts and the reasons on which it is based. The resolution shall be issued within a period not exceeding thirty (30) days from the next meeting of the Board following the submission of the Investigator's report.

(c) The Board's resolution, together with the entire records and all evidence presented and submitted, shall be transmitted to the Supreme Court for final action within ten (10) days from issuance of the resolution.

(d) Notice of the resolution shall be given to all parties through their counsel, if any.⁷⁶

Under the old rule, the Board of Governors of the Integrated Bar of the Philippines was given the power to "issue a decision"⁷⁷ if the lawyer complained of was exonerated or meted a penalty of "less than suspension or disbarment."⁷⁸ In addition, the case would be deemed terminated unless an interested party filed a petition before this court.⁷⁹

The amendments to Rule 139-B is a reiteration that only this court has the power to impose disciplinary action on members of the bar. The factual findings and recommendations of the Commission on Bar Discipline and the Board of Governors of the Integrated Bar of the Philippines are recommendatory, subject to review by this court.⁸⁰

WHEREFORE, respondent Atty. Deborah Z. Daquis is found **GUILTY** of violating Canon 1, Rule 1.01, Canon 7, Rule 7.03, Canon 10, Rule 10.01, and Canon 17 of the Code of Professional Responsibility.

The charge for violation of Canon 15, Rule 15.03 against respondent Atty. Deborah Z. Daquis is **DISMISSED**.

The penalty of **DISBARMENT** is imposed upon respondent Atty. Deborah Z. Daquis. The Office of the Bar Confidant is directed to remove the name of Deborah Z. Daquis from the Roll of Attorneys.

Let a copy of this Resolution be furnished to the Office of the Bar Confidant to be appended to respondent's personal record as attorney, to the Integrated Bar of the Philippines, and to the Office of the Court Administrator for dissemination to all courts throughout the country for their information and guidance.

This Resolution takes effect immediately.

SO ORDERED.

MARIA LOURDES P.A. SERENO
Chief Justice

ANTONIO T. CARPIO
Associate Justice

PRESBITERO J. VELASCO, JR.
Associate Justice

TERESITA J. LEONARDO-DE CASTRO
Associate Justice

ARTURO D. BRION
Associate Justice

DIOSDADO M. PERALTA
Associate Justice

LUCAS P. BERSAMIN
Associate Justice

MARIANO C. DEL CASTILLO
Associate Justice

JOSE PORTUGAL PEREZ
Associate Justice

JOSE CATRAL MENDOZA
Associate Justice

BIENVENIDO L. REYES
Associate Justice

ESTELA M. PERLAS-BERNABE
Associate Justice

MARVIC M.V.F. LEONEN
Associate Justice

FRANCIS H. JARDELEZA
Associate Justice

On official leave
ALFREDO BENJAMIN S. CAGUIOA*
Associate Justice

CERTIFIED XEROX COPY:
FELIPA B. ANAMA
CLERK OF COURT, EN BANC
SUPREME COURT

Footnotes

* On official leave.

¹ *Rollo*, pp. 2-3, Complaint-Affidavit.

² *Id.* at 5-7, Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage, Annex "A" of Complaint-Affidavit.

³ *Id.* at 2, Complaint-Affidavit.

⁴ *Id.* at 68. Vasco-Tamaray stated that Maritess Marquez-Guerrero is her and her husband's friend. (*Id.* at 77, TSN, May 22, 2008).

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.* at 2, Complaint-Affidavit.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ Id.

⁹ Id. at 58-59, Complainant's Position Paper.

¹⁰ Id. at 2-3, Complaint-Affidavit.

¹¹ Id. at 66. Certification issued by the Sangguniang Barangay of Putatan, Muntinlupa City.

¹² Id. at 67, Barangay Clearance/Certification issued by Barangay Talipapa, Novaliches, Quezon City.

¹³ Id. at 60, Complainant's Position Paper.

¹⁴ Id. at 5, Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage, Annex "A" of Complaint-Affidavit.

¹⁵ Id. at 60, Complainant's Position Paper.

¹⁶ Id. at 15, Answer.

¹⁷ Id. at 16.

¹⁸ Id. at 22-23.

¹⁹ Id.

²⁰ Id. at 15, Answer.

²¹ Id. at 16.

²² Id.

²³ Id. at 52, Order of the Commission on Bar Discipline dated May 22, 2008.

²⁴ Id. at 58-62.

²⁵ Id. at 108-111, Report and Recommendation of the Commission on Bar Discipline, penned by Commissioner Maria Editha A. Go-Binas.

²⁶ Id. at 107, Notice of Resolution.

²⁷ The Lawyer's Oath states:

I, _____, do solemnly swear that I will maintain allegiance to the Republic of the Philippines; I will support its Constitution and obey the laws as well as the legal orders of the duly constituted authorities therein; I will do no falsehood, nor consent to the doing of any in court; I will not wittingly or willingly promote or sue any groundless, false or unlawful suit, nor give aid nor consent to the same. I will delay no man for money or malice, and will conduct myself as a lawyer according to the best of my knowledge and discretion with all good fidelity as well to the courts as to my clients; and I impose upon myself this voluntary obligation without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion. So help me God.

²⁸ *Rollo* p. 14, Answer.

²⁹ *Id.* at 15.

³⁰ *Id.* at 14-19.

³¹ *Id.* at 68, Maritess Marquez-Guerrero's Affidavit.

³² *Id.* at 15, Answer.

³³ *Id.* at 14-19.

³⁴ *Id.* at 14-15.

³⁵ *Id.* at 68, Affidavit of Maritess Marquez-Guerrero.

³⁶ *Id.*

³⁷ *Id.* at 5, Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage, Annex "A" of Complaint-Affidavit.

³⁸ *Id.* at 45.

³⁹ *Id.* at 24.

⁴⁰ *Id.* at 2. The Complaint-Affidavit states that Vasco-Tamaray obtained a copy of the Petition on March 15, 2007.

⁴¹ *Id.* at 58-59, Complainant's Position Paper.

⁴² A.C. No. 9115, September 17, 2014, 735 SCRA 239 [Per J. Perlas-Bernabe, First Division].

⁴³ *Id.* at 243-245.

⁴⁴ *Rollo*, p. 7, Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage, Annex "A" of Complaint-Affidavit.

⁴⁵ *Id.* at 3, Complaint.

⁴⁶ *Id.* at 14, Answer.

⁴⁷ *Id.* at 7, Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage, Annex "A" of Complaint-Affidavit.

⁴⁸ *Id.* at 69, Photocopies of Cheryl E. Vasco-Tamaray's identification cards.

⁴⁹ *Id.* at 3, Complaint-Affidavit.

⁵⁰ *Id.* See *also* the signatures on Barangay Certification issued by Barangay Talipapa, Quezon City (*Id.* at 9), Birth Certificate of Charles Dino Vasco (*Id.* at 21), Minutes of the meeting at the Office of the City Prosecutor, Muntinlupa City (*Id.* at 24), Minutes of the Hearing at the Commission on Bar Discipline dated October 4, 2007 (*Id.* at 27),

Complainant's Position Paper (Id. at 61), Photocopies of VascoTamaray's identification cards issued by the University of the East (Id. at 69), and Notice of Change of Address (Id. at 70).

⁵¹ Id. at 7, Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage, Annex "A" of Complaint-Affidavit.

⁵² Id.

⁵³ A.C. No. 6732, October 22, 2013, 708 SCRA 1 [Per J. Bersamin, En Banc].

⁵⁴ Id. at 9.

⁵⁵ Id. at 10.

⁵⁶ *Campos v. Campos*, A.C. No. 8644, January 22, 2014, 714 SCRA 347 [Per J. Reyes, First Division].

⁵⁷ Id.

⁵⁸ *Dallong-Galicinao v. Castro*, 510 Phil. 478 (2005) [Per J. Tifiga, Second Division].

⁵⁹ *Alitagtag v. Garcia*, 451 Phil. 420 (2003) [Per Curiam, En Banc].

⁶⁰ *Noble v. Ailes*, A.C. No. 10628, July 1, 2015
<<http://sc.judiciary.gov.ph/pdf/web/viewer.html?file=/jurisprudence/2015/july2015/10628.pdt>>
[Per J. Perlas-Bernabe, First Division].

⁶¹ *Guevarra v. Eala*, 555 Phil. 713 (2007) [Per Curiam, En Banc].

⁶² A.C. No. 10451, February 4, 2015
<<http://sc.judiciary.gov.ph/pdf/web/viewer.html?file=/jurisprudence/2015/february2015/10451.pdt>> [Per J. Perlas-Bernabe, First Division].

⁶³ Id. at 5-6.

⁶⁴ A.C. No. 9149, September 4, 2013, 705 SCRA 1 [Per J. Villarama, Jr., First Division].

⁶⁵ Id. at 14-15.

⁶⁶ A.C. No. 8384, April 11, 2013, 696 SCRA 1 [Per J. Leonen, En Banc].

⁶⁷ Id. at 6.

⁶⁸ *Rollo*, p. 7, Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage, Annex "A" of Complaint-Affidavit.

⁶⁹ Id. at 68, Affidavit of Maritess Marquez-Guerrero.

⁷⁰ A.C. No. 6664, July 16, 2013, 701 SCRA 241 [Per J. Bersamin, En Banc].

⁷¹ Id. at 251-253.

⁷² 453 Phil. 108 (2003) [Per J. Ynares-Santiago, First Division].

⁷³ Id. at 111-112.

⁷⁴ *Rollo*, p. 68, Affidavit of Maritess Marquez-Guerrero.

⁷⁵ Id. at 7, Petition for Declaration of Nullity of Marriage, Annex "A" of Complaint-Affidavit.

⁷⁶ Bar Matter No. 1645. Re: Amendment of Rule 139-B (2015) [En Banc].

⁷⁷ Rule 139-B, sec. 12(c), prior to the amendments introduced by Bar Matter No. 1645.

⁷⁸ Rule 139-B, sec. 12(c), prior to the amendments introduced by Bar Matter No. 1645.

⁷⁹ Rule 139-B, sec. 12(c), prior to the amendments introduced by Bar Matter No. 1645.

⁸⁰ *Ramirez v. Buhayang-Marga/lo*, A.C. No. 10537, February 3, 2015
<<http://sc.judiciary.gov.ph/pdf/web/viewer.html?file=/jurisprudence/2015/february2015110537.pdf>> [Per J. Leonen, En Banc].