THIRD DIVISION

[A.M. No. RTJ-25-103 (Formerly JIB FPI No. 22-112-RTJ). January 29, 2026]

ANONYMOUS, COMPLAINANT, VS. HON. KATHLEEN ROSARIO D. DELA CRUZ-ESPINOSA, PRESIDING JUDGE; ATTY. CHARISSE ANN D. ALVARO, CLERK OF COURT V; KRISTINE BLESS A. DE GUZMAN, COURT LEGAL RESEARCHER II; MAILENE A. CAPARROSO, INTERPRETER III; MADONNA L. SEÑORIN, COURT STENOGRAPHER III; GINALYN S. CHU, COURT STENOGRAPHER III; EDNA P. DIONISIO, COURT STENOGRAPHER III; JONATHAN A. ABARCAR, SHERIFF IV; SHERNALYN M. CARIAN, CLERK III; GERELYN M. GABRIEL, CLERK III; VIRGILIO V. MAGAT, PROCESS SERVER; ALEJANDRO M. BATILES, UTILITY WORKER I, ALL OF BRANCH 91, REGIONAL TRIAL COURT, QUEZON CITY, RESPONDENTS.

D E C I S I O N

GAERLAN, J.:

The controversy arose from an anonymous Complaint[1] dated February 2020 which alleged that anomalous weddings were being conducted at Branch 91 of the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Quezon City.

The complaint averred that applications for marriages were being brought by "fixers" directly to Branch 91 to be solemnized by Judge Wilfredo L. Maynigo (Judge Maynigo), instead of having the applicants file and pay the necessary fees to the Office of the Clerk of Court. In other words, Branch 91 was conducting civil weddings which were not raffled to the said court.[2]

One of the named 'fixers" was an employee known as "Maileen" who purportedly connived with another RTC employee and a freelance photographer known as "Kim." The anonymous complainant also claimed that it was impossible that the other court personnels of Branch 91 had no knowledge that the said anomalous transactions were happening in their branch. For this reason, the complainant prayed that all the court personnel in Branch 91 be subject to a fact-finding investigation.[3]

The following respondents were implicated m the alleged solemnization of unraffled marriages:

1. Presiding Judge Kathleen Rosario D. Dela Cruz-Espinosa (Judge Dela Cruz-Espinosa);

2. Clerk of Court V Atty. Charisse Ann D. Alvaro (Atty. Alvaro);

3. Court Legal Researcher II Kristine Bless A. De Guzman (De Guzman);

4. Interpreter III Mailene A. Caparroso (Caparroso);

5. Stenographer III Madonna L. Señorin (Señorin);

6. Stenographer III Ginalyn S. Chu (Chu);

7. Stenographer III Edna P. Dionisio (Dionisio);

8. Sheriff IV Jonathan A. Abarcar (Abarcar);

9. Clerk III Shernalyn M. Carian (Carian);

10. Clerk III Gerelyn M. Gabriel (Gabriel);

11. Process Server Virgilio V. Magat (Magat); and

12. Utility Worker I Alejandro M. Batiles (Batiles).

The charge against Judge Maynigo proceeded separately because of his compulsory retirement from the Judiciary on October 16, 2021. The case against him was docketed as JIB FPI No. 22-141-RTJ (*Anonymous v. Judge Maynigo*).[4]

On February 18, 2020, Executive Judge Cecilyn E. Burgos-Villavert (Judge Burgos-Villavert) transmitted the anonymous complaint to the Office of Court Administrator (OCA).[5] In a letter dated March 10, 2020, the OCA requested the Quezon City Civil Registrar for copies of marriage certificates issued since January 2019 where the solemnizing officer is Judge Maynigo.[6] Thereafter, the OCA ordered Judge Burgos-Villavert to conduct a discreet investigation on the allegations of the complaint.[7]

Pursuant to the said directive, Judge Burgos-Villavert wrote to the Quezon City Civil Registrar requesting the certified true copies of marriage contracts solemnized by RTC judges for the years 2019 to 2020. It was uncovered that Judge Maynigo, as Acting Presiding Judge of Branch 91, solemnized 12 marriages in 2019 and seven in 2020. However, based on the records of the Office of the Clerk of Court, the total marriage applications that were raffled to Branch 91 was only four in 2019 and two in 2020. Thus, in a Report dated March 17, 2021, Judge Burgos-Villavert confirmed that Judge Maynigo solemnized unraffled marriages in 2019 and 2020.[8]

The Office of the General Counsel (OGC) found that the allegations in the anonymous complaint were verified and substantiated by the records of the Quezon City Civil Registrar and the Office of the Clerk of Court.[9] Based on said evidence, the OGC recommended that despite Judge Maynigo's compulsory retirement from the Judiciary, he should still be held accountable for solemnizing marriages which were not assigned to his *sala* by raffle.[10] Thus, in a complaint dated March 22, 2022, the OGC charged Judge Maynigo for gross misconduct as well as violation of Administrative Order No. 125-2007 (Re: Guidelines on the Solemnization of Marriage by Members of the Judiciary), in connection with OCA Circular No. 87-2008.

As for Judge Dela Cruz-Espinosa, the OGC recommended that the complaint against her be closed and terminated considering that she was appointed as Presiding Judge of Branch 91 only on March 11, 2020 or almost a month after the anonymous complaint was received by the Executive Judge.[11]

With respect to the other court personnel, the OGC recommended that the complaint against them be referred to the OCA for investigation, report and recommendation.[12]

The OCA then referred the Report of Judge Burgos-Villavert to the Judicial Integrity Board (JIB) for appropriate action. In due course, the JIB referred the anonymous complaint to the respondents for their respective comments.

In her Verified Comment, Atty. Alvaro, the Clerk of Court, claimed that she did not take part in the solemnization of unraffled marriages officiated by Judge Maynigo. Corroborating the allegations in the anonymous complaint, she averred that a photographer named "Kim" and Caparroso usually refer marriages for the solemnization of Judge Maynigo. She added that documents for these marriages were directly being brought to the judge. She also recalled that during one of their staff meetings, she told other court personnel that the practice of officiating unraffled marriages is illegal and anomalous and hence, they should not assist in the said activity. She noted that except for Caparroso, all the other court personnel agreed that the practice was illegal.[13]

Atty. Alvaro also narrated that sometime between December 2019 to February 2020, the solemnization of unraffled marriages and the continuous violation of Caparroso of office regulations became so rampant that she reported the matter to Judge Burgos-Villavert. To support her claim, she presented a photo she took of an unraffled marriage where it showed that no one from Branch 91, except for Caparroso, assisted in the activity. The photo also showed that "Kim" assisted a foreigner with his Filipina partner while they were seated in the court room.

To support her allegations, Atty. Alvaro presented the Certificate of Marriage of a certain Christian Paolo Cariño Merca (Merca) and Clyde Palatan Verzon (Verzon) where it showed the typewritten name of Caparroso and Señorin. Atty. Alvaro claimed, however, that Señorin was unaware that Caparroso indicated her name on the said document, as evidenced by the fact that there was no signature above Señorin's name. Atty. Alvaro then averred that the stroke and style of the signature of Caparroso and

another person who also signed the document appeared to be written by one and the same person. After Atty. Alvaro reported Caparroso for her involvement in the conduct of unraffled marriages, the latter allegedly concocted criminal and administrative charges against her.[14]

In relation to the same complaint, the JIB wrote to Atty. Alvaro directing her to show cause on why she should not be disciplined as a member of the Philippine Bar for violations of Canon 1 Rule 1.01, 1.02, Canon 10 Rule 10.01 and 10.03, and Canon 12 Rule 12.04.[15] In reply, Atty. Alvaro adopted the statements she made in her Verified Comment dated April 11, 2022.[16]

Despite her name appearing on the Certificate of Marriage of Merca and Verzon, Señorin insisted that she had no knowledge of the personal circumstances of the couples whose marriages were solemnized by Judge Maynigo. She also denied her participation in the preparation of any documents relative to said unraffled marriages. She claimed that the court personnel of their branch only learn that couples will be married by Judge Maynigo on the day that they arrive at Branch 91.[17]

For her part, Gabriel claimed that as clerk of Branch 91, she was usually the one recording and assisting all the wedding requests raffled to their branch. According to her, once the wedding requests were raffled, she would coordinate with the couples on their preferred schedule. She also confirmed the details in the certificates of marriage. She insisted, however, that she does not assist in unraffled marriage requests.[18]

Gabriel recalled that whenever she referred the wedding requests to Judge Maynigo, he would always ask her "*raffled ba yan*" and she would reply "*yes po Judge*," and the judge would retort, "*wala akong kita diyan.*" Gabriel also claimed that unraffled weddings were brought by "fixers"—one named "Susan," a court employee of Branch 215 and a photographer named "Kim." Gabriel further alleged that all the wedding documents were already prepared before the couples arrived at Branch 91.[19]

In response to the allegations against her, Caparroso denied that she was a "fixer" who connived with another court employee and a photographer named Kim Brocka (Brocka). She likewise denied being a friend of Brocka or having any personal connection with her. She countered that she was a victim of "bullying and excessive lying" of her superiors. Caparroso argued that as court interpreter, she is not aware of the procedure for the solemnization of marriages. The same is purportedly handled by Gabriel and supervised by their immediate superior. Caparroso also named De Guzman, being the Officer-in-Charge, as the one who would take care of the activities in the *sala*. De Guzman was subsequently replaced by Atty. Alvaro when the latter was appointed as Clerk of Court.[20]

As to the solemnization of the marriage of Merca and Verzon, Caparroso averred that this had the consent and approval of Atty. Alvaro and Judge Maynigo. She recalled that Verzon entrusted the process of application to a court employee named Susan Tagros Pura (Pura). Caparroso allegedly paid the solemnization fees for Verzon's wedding with

her own money to repay Verzon for taking care of her son who was in critical condition. Caparroso narrated that Verzon, a nurse at the Philippine Heart Center, approached her to inquire how Caparroso can assist them in the solemnization of their civil wedding. In response, Caparroso asked Verzon to go to their office so she can be assisted by the proper court personnel. Sometime in December 2019, Caparroso introduced Verzon to Atty. Alvaro who granted the latter's request. Caparroso then referred her to Pura for the processing of necessary documents.[21]

To support her contentions, Caparroso attached the *Sinumpaang Salaysay* of Verzon who corroborated Caparroso's statement that she was introduced to Atty. Alvaro who scheduled the date of their marriage. Verzon claimed that they were later referred to Pura who prepared their marriage documents. Verzon supported Caparroso's allegation that the latter was the one who paid the necessary fees for their wedding. She denied ever giving money to Caparroso for the solemnization of her marriage.[22]

As for the other court personnel, Abarcar averred that as Sheriff IV of Branch 91, he is not tasked to handle the processing of application for solemnization of marriages. He denied ever processing or endorsing any application for solemnization.[23] Magat, who served as process server, likewise denied having assisted or prepared any documents related to said unraffled marriages.[24] Legal Researcher De Guzman denied being complicit to the anomalous scheme, also alleging that she, too, had no participation therein.[25] Court stenographers Dionisio and Chu[26] and utility worker Batiles also claimed that they never assisted in solemnizing marriages in their branch.[27] Lastly, clerk Carian averred that she was principally in charge of handling criminal cases and was never involved in the receiving or preparing documents related to the conduct of marriages.[28]

Report and Recommendation of the JIB

In its Report and Recommendation dated July 18, 2024, the Office of the Executive Director (OED) of the JIB found that out of the 12 marriages reflected in the Civil Registrar's Office, only three were actually raffled to Branch 91 in 2019. Thus, Judge Maynigo solemnized nine unraffled marriages that year. For 2020, of the seven marriages solemnized in Branch 91, none were raffled to the branch. In sum, from 2019 to 2020, Judge Maynigo solemnized a total of 16 unraffled marriages.[29]

With respect to Gabriel, the OED found that she directly assisted and communicated with Judge Maynigo on matters concerning marriage applications. She even admitted that she assisted in four requests for solemnization from March 14, 2019 to October 11, 2019, but of these requests, only two were raffled to Branch 91. However, considering that there was no proof of malice or evidence that she benefitted from the conduct of these unraffled marriages, the OED found that her act only constituted simple misconduct.[30]

For Caparroso, the OED found substantial evidence to hold her administratively liable for gross misconduct for having direct knowledge and active participation in the

anomalies involving the unraffled marriages solemnized by Judge Maynigo.[31]

Thus, the OED recommended that the administrative complaint be re-docketed as a regular administrative matter against Caparroso and Gabriel. As to the penalty, it recommended that Gabriel be fined PHP 18,000.00 for simple misconduct while Caparroso should be fined with PHP 51,000.00 for gross misconduct.

As for the other respondents, Acting Executive Director Eduardo C. Tolentino opined that the complaint against them should be dismissed for lack of merit and be considered closed and terminated.[32]

After an exhaustive review of the records of the case, the JIB adopted the Report and Recommendation of the OED in a Resolution dated May 22, 2025.[33]

Ruling of the Court

Jurisprudence is replete with pronouncements that the conduct and behavior of everyone connected with an office charged with the dispensation of justice, no matter the rank or position, should be circumscribed with the heavy burden of responsibility. As bearers of this duty, their actions, at all times, must not only be characterized by propriety and decorum but, above all else, must be beyond suspicion.[34]

To avoid suspicions of irregularity, court personnel are called to strictly observe—with utmost diligence—the rules, directives, and protocols issued by the Court for the performance of their official functions.

Supreme Court Administrative Order No. 125-2007 provides for the guidelines on the solemnization of marriage by the members of the Judiciary." The pertinent portions of Administrative Order No. 125-2007 are reproduced below:

> SECTION 2. *Raffle of Requests for Solemnization of Marriages in Multiple-Sala Courts*. — **Requests for solemnization of marriages submitted to first and second level courts in stations with two or more branches shall be governed by the rules and procedures in the raffle of cases** prescribed by existing resolutions and issuances. Raffle of requests shall be effected upon payment of the appropriate legal fees.
>
> . . . .
>
> SECTION 21. *Facilitation of Marriage Ceremony*. — **Any judge or employee of the court who**, alone or with the connivance of other court personnel or third persons not employed by the court, intervenes so that the marriage of contracting parties is facilitated or performed despite lack of or without the necessary supporting documents, or performs other acts that tend to **cause the solemnization of the marriage with undue haste, shall be subjected to appropriate administrative disciplinary proceedings**.
>
> . . . .

> SECTION 24. *Violations of the Guidelines*. — **Violations of any of the provisions of the Guidelines shall be ground for the appropriate administrative disciplinary proceedings**. (Emphasis supplied)

OCA Circular No. 87-2008, which was later issued by the Court, ordered the strict observance by judges in multiple *sala* courts of the raffling of requests for solemnization of marriage. This issuance was made in response to numerous anomalies discovered in the solemnization of marriage during various judicial audits in the lower courts.

In this case, there was a clear deviation from procedure when several marriages were solemnized by Judge Maynigo despite the fact that they were not raffled to Branch 91. Hence, persons who facilitated these anomalous proceedings should be held accountable.

In *Keuppers v. Murcia*,[35] the Court found the respondent judge guilty of gross misconduct for flagrantly disregarding the rules for the solemnization of marriage, viz.:

> Misconduct consists in the transgression of some established and definite rule of action, or, more particularly, in an unlawful behavior or gross negligence by the public officer. It implies wrongful intention, and must not be a mere error of judgment. Respondent Judge was guilty of grave, not simple, misconduct because he had at the very least the wilful intent to violate the Family Code on the venue of a marriage solemnized by a judge, and to flagrantly disregard the relevant rules for such solemnization set forth in the law. The office of solemnizing marriages should not be treated as a casual or trivial matter, or as a business activity. For sure, his act, although not criminal, constituted grave misconduct considering that crimes involving moral turpitude are treated as separate grounds for dismissal under the Administrative Code. It is relevant to observe, moreover, that his acts of grave misconduct and conduct prejudicial to the best interest of the service seriously undermined the faith and confidence of the people in the Judiciary.[36]

In another case, We held that a judge's repeated disregard of the rules for the solemnization of marriage amounts not only to gross ignorance of the law but also to gross misconduct, viz.:

> Based on the foregoing jurisprudence and the justifications provided by Judge Justalero, we agree with the Office of the Court Administrator that the infractions he committed do not only amount to gross ignorance of the law and procedure, but also constitute gross misconduct. Judge Justalero repeatedly disregarded the rules which have been established to enable the solemnizing authorities of the Judiciary to secure and safeguard the sanctity of marriage as a social institution.[37]

It must be emphasized that under Administrative Order No. 125-2007, not only the solemnizing officers can be held liable for facilitating the conduct of anomalous or irregular wedding ceremonies. Section 21 thereof states that employee of the court who, alone or with the connivance of other court personnel or third persons, may be held administratively liable for performing acts that tend to cause the solemnization of the marriage with undue haste.

Based on the findings of the JIB, Judge Maynigo solemnized a total of 16 unraffled marriages from 2019 to 2020. Among which was the wedding ceremony of Merca and Verzon whose marriage certificate showed the names of respondents Caparroso and Señorin. These marriages did not go through the standard process of filing and paying the necessary fees with the Office of the Clerk of Court. They were brought directly by so-called "fixers" to Branch 91 instead of being raffled to the other branches of the RTC. Such acceptance of marriage requests and the conduct of wedding ceremonies without having the same raffled unduly rushes the solemnization process, in clear circumvention of the guidelines set forth under Administrative Order No. 125-2007 and OCA Circular No. 87-2008.

Liability of Caparrosa and Gabriel

Misconduct is a transgression of some established and definite rule of action, more particularly, unlawful behavior or gross negligence by the public officer. The misconduct must imply wrongful intention and not a mere error of judgment. It must also have a direct relation to the performance of the public officer's official duties amounting either to maladministration or willful, intentional neglect, or failure to discharge the duties of the office.[38] To consider gross misconduct "the elements of corruption, clear intent to violate the law, or flagrant disregard of established rule must be manifest."[39] Otherwise, the misconduct is only simple.[40]

In relation to misconduct, the Court notes that the Code of Conduct and Accountability for Court Officials and Personnel (CCACOP), which took effect on December 21, 2025, finds applicability in the present case. It applies to all pending and future cases, except to the extent that its retroactive application would result in injustice or would not be feasible.[41] Canon III, Section 8 of the CCACOP provides that Court officials and personnel shall not receive gifts, tips, and other gratuities for assisting or attending to litigants, lawyers, or other court users. The Code also prohibits court officials and personnel from allowing their relationships to influence their official conduct.[42]

Here, there is substantial evidence that Caparroso willfully and intentionally allowed her personal relationships to influence her official conduct as a court employee. Caparroso admitted that she assisted Verzon in the processing of her marriage request to repay the latter for taking care of Caparroso's son who was confined at the Philippine Heart Center. She introduced the spouses to the court personnel who can process their marriage request. However, as previously mentioned, the marriage of Merca and Verzon did not go through the regular court processes. It was solemnized by Judge Maynigo despite not having been raffled to Branch 91.

The appearance of Capparroso's name and signature in the marriage certificate of Merca and Verzon is compelling proof of her participation in the scheme of officiating unraffled marriages. This is also supported by the photographic evidence from Atty. Alvaro that Caparroso assisted in an unraffled marriage sometime in January 2020.

The fact that these marriages are brought directly to Judge Maynigo without the fees being processed and paid to the Office of the Clerk of Court not only reeks of corruption but also flagrantly disregards an established protocol for the solemnization of marriages under Section 21 of Administrative Order No. 125-2007 in relation to OCA Circular No. 87-2008. We emphasize that these issuances are not mere restatements of general ethical principles but are directives that establish a distinct internal policy or rule of procedure that courts are mandated to follow. Consequently, such violation results in a separate offense under Canon V, Section 20 of the CCACOP.

As for Gabriel, it is beyond dispute that she is the court employee assigned to assist in wedding requests, coordinate with the couples on their preferred schedule, and the one who confirms the details in the marriage certificates. She even admitted having conversations with Judge Maynigo regarding the solemnization of unraffled marriages. This demonstrates that she had, in fact, known that unraffled marriages were being officiated in Branch 91. She likewise admitted assisting in two unraffled marriages in her Verified Comment. Thus, the Court finds wholly inaccurate her statement that she only assisted in raffled marriages. Furthermore, in her Verified Comment, she stated that as an ordinary rank and file employee, she had "no courage or power to go against the anomalous activities of Acting Presiding Judge Maynigo." This strongly implies that she was complicit in the conduct of the unraffled marriages.

For her involvement in the solemnization of unraffled marriages, despite knowledge that the same was highly irregular, Gabriel should be penalized not for simple misconduct, as recommended by the JIB, but for violation of Supreme Court rules, directives and circulars. Here, there was no showing of unlawful behavior, gross negligence or wrongful intention on the part of Gabriel which would classify her act as "misconduct." There was neither allegation nor proof that she derived gain or benefit from assisting in the unraffled marriages. Nevertheless, in the performance of her duties, she was remiss in following the Court's directives under Administrative Order No. 125-2007 and OCA Circular No. 87-2008. For this reason, she must also be meted with the appropriate penalty under Canon V, Section 22 of the CCACOP.

Caparroso and Gabriel's irregular conduct is contrary to ethical standards expected of court employees. The Court cannot countenance their act of impropriety as it negatively affects the dignity of the judiciary and the people's confidence in the institution. As We have expressed time and again, "[a]lthough every office in the government service is a public trust, no position exacts a greater demand for moral righteousness and uprightness from an individual than in the Judiciary."[43]

As for their respective penalties, under Canon V, Section 19 of the CCACOP, serious offenses include gross misconduct constituting violations of the Code. On the other hand, the violation of Supreme Court rules, directives and circulars that establish an

internal policy, rule of procedure, or protocol is classified as a less serious offense under Section 20 of the same Code.

Canon V, Section 22 of the CCACOP provides the corresponding sanctions for these violations, viz.:

> SECTION 22. *Penalties*.—
>
> (1) If the respondent is guilty of a Serious Offense, any of the following penalties shall be imposed:
>
> > (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 one year and one day up to two years; and/or
> >
> > (c) A fine of more than PHP101,000.00 but not more than PHP 500,000.00.
>
> (2) If the respondent is guilty of a Less Serious Offense, any of the following penalties shall be imposed:
>
> > (a) Suspension from office without salary and other benefits for one month up to one year; and/or
> >
> > (b) A fine of PHP 51,000.00 but not more than PHP 100,000.00. [44]

As found by the JIB, this is the first time that Caparroso and Gabriel were charged with administrative liability.[45] Thus, the mitigating circumstance of first offense must be appreciated in their favor.[46] Under Canon V, Section 25 of the CCACOP, if one or more mitigating circumstances and no aggravating circumstances are present, the Court may impose the penalties of suspension or fine for a period or amount not less than half of the minimum prescribed under the said Canon.

Considering that Caparroso is liable for multiple offenses arising from a single act (i.e. facilitating the unraffled marriages), she shall be found liable for all offenses but only meted with the penalty for the most serious offense.[47] Here, the most serious offense is gross misconduct.

The above considered, Caparroso is hereby fined in the amount of PHP 51,000.00 for Gross Misconduct and violation of Administrative Order No. 125-2007 and OCA

Circular No. 87-2008 whereas Gabriel is fined with PHP 26,000.00 for the violation of the same order and circular.

Dismissal of the charges against the other respondents

With respect to the other respondents, the Court finds that the evidence against them is insufficient for administrative liability to attach.

For Judge Dela Cruz-Espinosa, she was appointed as Presiding Judge of Branch 91 almost a month after the anonymous complaint was filed. This effectively negates her possible involvement in the anomalous transactions.

For Atty. Alvaro, despite the allegation that the marriage of Merca and Verzon had her consent and approval, there is nothing to support her involvement in the solemnization of unraffled marriages. She was even the one who gathered evidence and reported this irregular practice to Judge Burgos-Villavert. For this reason, she cannot be held administratively liable as a court personnel or as a member of the Bar.

Despite the appearance of Señorin's name in the marriage certificate of Merca and Verzon, there is no sufficient proof that she acted in connivance with other court personnel in the conduct of unraffled marriages. As attested to by Atty. Alvaro, Señorin was unaware that she was made a signatory to the marriage certificate. Considering that no other evidence ties her to the scheme, the charge against her must be dismissed.

Similarly, for respondents De Guzman, Abarcar, Dionisio, Chu, Carian, Batiles and Magat, there is no substantial evidence of their involvement in the solemnization of unraffled marriages. The processing and endorsement of unraffled marriage applications are beyond their respective duties and responsibilities as court employees. Thus, they must be absolved of administrative liability.

ACCORDINGLY, the Court finds:

1) Mailene A. Caparroso **GUILTY** of Gross Misconduct and violation of Supreme Court rules, directives and circulars, and is **ORDERED to PAY a FINE** in the amount of PHP 51,000.00; and

2) Gerelyn M. Gabriel **GUILTY** of violation of Supreme Court rules, directives and circulars, and is **ORDERED to PAY a FINE** of PHP 26,000.00.

Mailene A. Caparroso and Gerelyn M. Gabriel are **WARNED** that a repetition of the same or similar offense in the future shall be dealt with more severely.

The Anonymous Complaint against respondents Hon. Kathleen Rosario D. De La Cruz-Espinosa, Atty. Charisse Ann D. Alvaro, Kristine Bless A. De Guzman, Madonna L. Señorin, Ginalyn S. Chu, Edna P. Dionisio, Jonathan A. Abarcar, Shernalyn M. Carian, Virgilio V. Magat, and Alejandro M. Batiles is hereby **DISMISSED** for lack of merit.

SO ORDERED.

Caguioa, (Chairperson), Inting, Dimaampao, and *Singh, JJ.*, concur.

---

[1] *Rollo*, p. 21.

[2] *Id.*

[3] *Id.*

[4] *Id.* at 140.

[5] *Id.* at 20.

[6] *Id.* at 23.

[7] *Id.* at 70.

[8] *Id.* at 25.

[9] *Id.* at 8.

[10] *Id.* at 8-12.

[11] *Id.* at 12.

[12] *Id.* at 12-15.

[13] *Id.* at 106-107.

[14] *Id.* at 107-108.

[15] *Id.* at 135.

[16] *Id.* at 137.

[17] *Id.* at 91.

[18] *Id.* at 119.

[19] *Id.*

[20] *Id.* at 122-123.

[21] *Id.* at 122-124.

[22] *Id.* at 129-130.

[23] *Id.* at 80-81.

[24] *Id.* at 84-85.

[25] *Id.* at 87.

[26] *Id.* at 95-99.

[27] *Id.* at 116-117.

[28] *Id.* at 102.

[29] *Id.* at 145-148.

[30] *Id.* at 148-149.

[31] *Id.* at 149-150.

[32] *Id.* at 151-152.

[33] *Id.* at 160-161.

[34] **Office of the Court Administrator v. Delicana**, 953 Phil. 1, 19 (2024) [Per J. Hernando, *En Banc*]; **Rodriguez v. Eugenio**, 550 Phil. 78, 93 (2007) [*Per Curiam, En Banc*]; **Cosca v. Judge Palaypayon, Jr.**, 307 Phil. 261, 286 (1994) [*Per Curiam, En Banc*].

[35] 829 Phil. 53 (2018) [Per J. Bersamin, *En Banc*].

[36] *Id.* at 64.

[37] **Office of the Court Administrator v. Justalero**, 933 Phil. 955, 973 (2023) [Per J. Lopez J.Y., Second Division].

[38] **Maddela III v. Pamintuan**, 859 Phil. 148, 179 (2019) [*Per Curiam, En Banc*].

[39] **Office of the Court Administrator v. Tormis**, 794 Phil. 1, 24 (2016) [*Per Curiam, En Banc*].

[40] **Pinlac v. Llamas**, 650 Phil. 360, 369 (2010) [Per J. Brion, Third Division].

[41] CODE OF CONDUCT AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COURT OFFICIALS AND PERSONNEL (A.M. No. 26-06-11-SC), General Provisions, sec. 1, December 21, 2025.

[42] CODE OF CONDUCT AN[) ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COURT OFFICIALS AND PERSONNEL (A.M. No. 26-06- 11-SC), Canon II, sec. 2, December 21, 2025.

[43] **Villena-Lopez v. Lopez**, 882 Phil. 60, 64 (2020) [Per J. Delos Santos, *En Banc*]; **Re: Alleged Illegal Acquisition of a Career Service Eligibility by Ma. Aurora P. Santos**, 516 Phil. 18, 21 (2006) [*Per Curiam, En Banc*]; **Rabe v. Flores**, 338 Phil. 919, 925-926 (1997) [*Per Curiam, En Banc*].

[44] CODE OF CONDUCT AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COURT OFFICIALS AND PERSONNEL (A.M. No. 26-06- 11-SC), Canon V, sec. 22, December 21, 2025.

[45] *Rollo*, pp. 149-150.

[46] CODE OF CONDUCT AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COURT OFFICIALS AND PERSONNEL (A.M. No. 26-06- 11-SC), Canon V, sec. 24 (1)(a), December 21, 2025.

[47] CODE OF CONDUCT AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COURT OFFICIALS AND PERSONNEL (A.M. No. 26-06-11-SC), Canon V, sec. 26, December 21, 2025.

Source: Supreme Court E-Library | Date created: March 30, 2026
This page was dynamically generated by the E-Library Content Management System